

**Metro**

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952213.922.2000 Tel  
metro.net

**REVISED  
PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
JUNE 18, 2008**

**SUBJECT: 2008 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY**

**ACTION: ADOPTION OF 2008 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approve the following actions for the 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for Los Angeles County:

- A. Approve the corrections/clarifications summarized in Attachment A for the 2008 LRTP for Los Angeles County; and
- B. Incorporate revisions, as identified in Attachment B, adding a new two-page spread to the LRTP document containing language for new options for generating new or increased funding such as public-private partnerships, tolls/congestion pricing; and
- C. Adopt the resolution in Attachment C which adopts the 2008 LRTP for Los Angeles County.

**ISSUE**

The Draft 2008 LRTP was completed in mid-March 2008 and circulated for public comment for a 45-day public review period from March 12 through April 28, 2008. Upon consideration of public comments, the 2008 LRTP is submitted for Board action. This is the first update of the LRTP since 2001. The Draft 2008 Plan has been made available for public review and is now presented to the Board for final action.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

LACMTA is responsible for transportation planning and programming in Los Angeles County, in accordance with Government Code Section 130051. The purpose of the LRTP is to set the long-term direction necessary to proceed with project planning, design and engineering for projects that are candidates for future programming. State and federal transportation agencies require the LRTP to cover a minimum of a twenty-year period. Staff will continue to work with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to amend the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), if necessary, to ensure

consistency between the Final 2008 LRTP and SCAG's RTP which was adopted in May 2008.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The ongoing activities, programs and projects that are recommended in the 2008 LRTP, and that require funding have been included in the Board adopted FY09 budget in multiple cost centers and projects. The projects are funded with revenues identified in the 2008 LRTP.

Overall, the 2008 LRTP identifies programs and projects estimated at approximately \$152.5 billion. Projects and programs approved through the 2008 LRTP process require further Board approval at key milestones during the project development process, leading up to project implementation. The Chief Planning Officer is responsible for budgeting these costs in future years.

The 2008 LRTP is an update to the 2001 LRTP and is consistent with the previously adopted "balanced plan" approach that optimizes the multi-modal performance of a mix of projects and programs while being financially constrained. Countywide Planning and Development has updated the financial forecast and mobility performance analysis that supports the constrained preliminary recommendations for the 2008 LRTP. As a result of the updated financial forecast, it is clear that additional funds are needed not only to maintain and operate the existing system, but to pursue the ever-growing demand for new and unmet transportation mobility needs and air quality improvements.

The financial forecast conducted by staff for the 2008 LRTP includes substantial near-term transportation capital improvement cost increases related to rising commodity, energy, and surety costs. In addition, recent State legislation and anticipated federal funding decreases related to the declining federal Highway Trust Fund balance have forced us to look to local borrowing for near-term transportation capital projects. To optimize 2008 LRTP results, staff assumed that Proposition C 25% debt policy caps established by the Board will be raised to 60%. While similar assumptions have been made in the past and were ultimately not necessary due to project delays unrelated to funding, staff believes that the Board will need to raise the cap as early as 2013 based on the current financial forecast in this Draft 2008 LRTP.

### **Approach to Metro Transit Operating and Capital Structural Deficit**

The financial forecast of the 2008 LRTP is an analysis of countywide projected revenues and costs through the Plan's 2030 horizon date. As the largest cost portion of the forecast is for our transit service, the assumptions regarding how our transit operating and capital structural deficit is resolved continue to be critical aspects of the financial forecast. The 2008 LRTP preliminary recommendations have made the assumption that we will achieve a 33% fare recovery ratio by FY 2012 and maintain it. This will require a combination of strategies such as reducing unproductive service and increasing operating revenues.

## Increases to Financial Assumptions since Draft 2008 Plan

The Board took action in January 2008 to release the Draft 2008 Plan for public review. Since January 2008, several developments have occurred that may impact the financial forecast and projected costs and revenues contained in the 2008 LRTP. This estimated impact is approximately \$1 billion throughout the LRTP 2030 horizon date.

First, in November 2007, the Board took action to modify the annual fare units calculation used in the Formula Allocation Procedure (FAP) for LADOT for the purpose of defining its annual FAP subsidy by changing the base fare to \$.90 for express services and \$.25 for DASH services to be funded from the Prop A40% Discretionary Growth Over Inflation. The result of this action will increase the annual FAP subsidy by \$7.5 million beginning in FY08, and represents an increase of \$204 million in LRTP costs through the 2030 horizon date.

Second, in April 2008 the Board took action to provide bridge funding for Los Angeles County transit operators to support their eligible transit system safety, security and disaster response capital projects as established in the 2008 State Proposition 1B Transit Security Program. This represents an increase of ~~\$16.3~~ **\$14.8 million annually** for the life of the Bond.

Third, at the May 5, 2008 Workshop the Board took action not to implement some of the service reductions that are anticipated in the 2008 LRTP, and used one-time revenues to backfill the savings projected for 256,000 revenue service hours in FY09. This action represents an increase of \$782 million in LRTP costs, unless future additions in cost savings or revenues are identified.

Fourth, in both March and May the Board took action fund increases for Caltrans support costs for six projects in the highway program: Carpools on the I-5 (from 170-118), I-5 (from 91-605), I-10 (From I-605- Puente), the 5/14 Connector, the Carmenita Interchange, and SR-138 (from 175<sup>th</sup> to Largo Vista). These cost increases reduce the 2008 LRTP freeway escalation reserve (Freeway Contingency) amount by \$160 million.

Also, as work has progressed on the environmental clearance for the Crenshaw Boulevard transit project and San Fernando Valley Orange Line Canoga Extension, increases in project cost estimates have been identified. More refined project definitions and mitigation measures have been identified through the environmental clearance. Final project costs will be determined after completion of environmental documents and preliminary engineering.

The 2008 LRTP is a strategic guide for planning and programming for both short term and very long term projects and programs without over-committing the funds forecasted to be available. The 2008 LRTP financial forecast is intended to show our potential capital program funding partners, be they State, Federal, or even local taxpayers, that we have the resources to meet our financial commitments going forward to the Plan's 2030

horizon date. Some slight variations in near-term funding commitments are not unusual in a 20-year financial forecast. We will have to monitor, however, every few years how short-term fluctuations in costs and revenues are impacting the overall LRTP program.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board can approve the staff recommended 2008 LRTP, or may choose a different combination of programs and projects that the Board believes better meets the future mobility needs of Los Angeles County.

### **DISCUSSION**

Over the last two-and-a-half years, staff has developed a LRTP to identify multi-modal projects and programs that are recommended for funding over the twenty-five year period from FY 2005 through 2030. The 2008 LRTP identifies projects and programs estimated at approximately \$152.5 billion to be funded from federal, state and local revenue sources. However, due to the recent and significant increase in construction costs for capital projects combined with uncertain state and federal revenue sources, all funding for the 2008 LRTP is already committed through the Board-approved 2001 LRTP and other subsequent Board actions. The LRTP financial forecast has also impacted the schedule to complete some projects, particularly in the later years of the LRTP, and it has also precluded our ability to add important new projects to the 2008 LRTP.

The 2008 LRTP is also consistent with the 2001 LRTP recommendations for a balanced transportation program (i.e., highway, transit, non-motorized forms of transportation), with an emphasis on public transit to help meet growth in travel. This “balanced plan” approach optimizes the multi-modal performance of a mix of projects and programs while being financially constrained. In developing the 2001 LRTP recommendations, various countywide alternatives were evaluated using the transportation demand model. These alternatives consisted of different strategies for meeting future travel demand and were evaluated for their mobility benefit.

The 2008 LRTP also addresses significant changes that have occurred since the 2001 LRTP, including growth patterns, the latest technical assumptions, climate change issues, and the uncertain transportation funding environment. The LRTP is a key element of our planning process, as it proactively identifies transportation needs and challenges that Los Angeles County will face through 2030. The LRTP is periodically updated to ensure that transportation decisions are based on a plan that contains current data and assumptions.

### **Background**

An early step in the LRTP update process was to conduct a system and corridor performance analysis, as well as to update the Plan’s financial assumptions. In May 2006, the Board approved project performance criteria for planning and evaluating transportation projects to determine whether they should be included in the LRTP

update. Also, at the May 2006 Board meeting, an outline of the financial outlook through the Plan's 2030 horizon date was presented. Similar to the 2001 LRTP, the 2008 LRTP includes a "Constrained Plan" that identifies those projects for which current funding has been assigned, as well as a "Strategic Plan" that identifies those projects that could be funded if additional funding becomes available.

During summer 2006, our LRTP financial forecast changed because the State Legislature and the Governor added Proposition 1B to the November 2006 ballot. The LRTP schedule was delayed to capture the election outcome. Our updated financial assumptions and the attendant analysis were reviewed by the Board in February 2007 and identified \$6.6 billion in uncommitted funding that could be used for new transportation initiatives. Our LRTP financial assumptions were updated again and presented to the Board in August 2007, after the Board action in May 2007 to raise the fare recovery ratio target to 33%.

In January 2008, the Draft 2008 LRTP was presented to the Board and reflected another update to the LRTP financial assumptions in order to adequately address the rising construction costs over the past several years for all capital construction projects. Another change was the substantial shortages of transportation funds for Los Angeles County due to continuing shortfalls in the State's General Fund. Similar shortfalls are forecasted for federal funds due to expenses for the war and the declining value of the gas tax. Within this context, the Draft 2008 LRTP would set the stage for identifying new innovative funding options for generating new revenue that would help fully implement the Constrained Plan projects on an optimal schedule and potentially fund some Strategic Projects. Some options included pursuing opportunities such as public-private partnerships, tolls/congestion pricing, increasing local sales tax, and a countywide congestion mitigation fee.

Also at the January 2008 Board meeting, the preliminary recommendations for the Draft 2008 LRTP included a two-tiered list for the unfunded Strategic Plan. The first tier Strategic Plan proposes projects that have significant analysis and could be candidates for new funding initiatives for near-term implementation. The second-tier Strategic Plan identifies projects needing additional study but the potential to increase mobility upon further analysis. At this meeting, the Board approved the preliminary recommendations for the Draft 2008 LRTP and to release the Draft in March 2008 for a 45-day public review period.

### **Consultation and Outreach**

The 2008 LRTP was developed under the leadership and guidance of the Board. We also coordinated directly with its many stakeholders, including the nine sub-regions, Southern California Association of Governments, Caltrans, Metrolink, and municipal and local transit operators. We also regularly consulted with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and its subcommittees. At their May 14, 2008 meeting, TAC made a motion that comments submitted through the four subcommittees, namely Bus Operations Subcommittee, Local Transit Systems Subcommittee, Travel Demand Management and Air Quality and Streets and Freeways Subcommittee be formally

submitted to staff for consideration on how the comments would be incorporated into the 2008 LRTP and to report back to TAC at their June 11, 2008 meeting. In particular, the TAC expressed concern that it is difficult to make a motion when the 2008 LRTP cannot meet all of the unmet needs of the local jurisdictions, the County of Los Angeles and transportation providers for Los Angeles County.

An early step in the LRTP update process was to coordinate with the nine sub-regional Council of Governments (COG) and their respective subcommittees regarding their sub-regional transportation priorities and their perspectives. We also conducted a second outreach effort in the fall of 2007 with the sub-regions to ensure the subregional chapters were up-to-date for inclusion in the 2008 LRTP and represented each of the county's distinct geographic areas and transportation needs.

Finally, we coordinated with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) throughout the LRTP update process to ensure the 2008 LRTP projects were effectively integrated into the SCAG 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The SCAG 2008 RTP was adopted by SCAG's Regional Council on May 8, 2008 and included all projects proposed in the Draft 2008 LRTP. We will work with SCAG to amend the RTP at some future point to reflect the Board-adopted 2008 LRTP, if necessary. There has been precedent for such amendments, as the 2004 RTP was recently amended to incorporate Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) projects funded through the State Bond.

## **Outreach**

Once the Draft 2008 LRTP and its companion Technical Document were released for public review from March 12 through April 28, 2008, another extensive local outreach process was initiated. Forty-two outreach meetings were held from February 14 through April 30, 2008. These meetings covered all nine sub-regional COG governing boards and their respective subcommittees, Metro Technical Advisory Committee and respective subcommittees, and numerous public and private stakeholders. Seven community meetings were held across the County between March 26<sup>th</sup> and close of public comments on April 23<sup>rd</sup>. A list of the public outreach meetings is provided in Attachment D.

Activities undertaken to maximize community input included the following:

- Copies of the Draft 2008 LRTP and companion Technical Document were widely distributed (over 2,400 copies) and could be requested over the LRTP phone Hotline.
- The documents could be downloaded from the Metro website (approximately 10,000 copies have been downloaded).
- Information about up-coming LRTP community meetings was made available through public service announcements on a number of cable channels, radio, and advertisements in culturally diverse newspapers; distributed "Take-Ones" on Metro buses and trains and municipal operators; the LRTP phone Hotline; and the Metro website.
- Spanish translators were available at all meetings, and Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Russian translators were made available at appropriate cultural meeting locations. In

addition, a hearing-impaired captioning and sign language assistance was requested and provided at the Palmdale community meeting.

- LRTP Fact Sheets were translated into 10 languages: Spanish, Korean, Chinese (Mandarin), Tagalog (Filipino), Armenian, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Persian (Farsi), Japanese and Russian.

As a result, about 600 people participated in the seven community outreach meetings. Approximately 200 letters were received from elected officials, local jurisdictions, transportation agencies, subregional COGs, stakeholders and the public. In addition nearly 1,000 e-mails were received from primarily the general public and some from various organizations. Comments varied in their focus with the majority in general support for transportation strategies (i.e., rail projects, highway projects, and bus solutions) specific unfunded Strategic Plan strategies (i.e., support or opposition to transit projects such as the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension, Metro Subway Westside Extension, Metro Green Line Extensions, support or opposition to SR-710 Gap Closure, High Desert Corridor Freeway improvements, I-5 HOV and Truck Lane Improvements from SR-14 to Kern County Line,) increased funding for Call for Projects categories (i.e., bicycles, pedestrians, transportation demand management, and new sustainability type strategies such as "Complete Streets"). Comments also noted technical corrections, planning analysis and the need for additional transportation revenues. Attachment E contains summarizes all written and e-mail comments and responses to those comments that were received through the 45-day public review period.

Based on public comment, staff has proposed several modifications that would be incorporated into the Final LRTP. These are summarized in Attachment A.

### **New Two-Page Section for New Revenue Generating Funding Mechanisms**

The LRTP update process has shown us that public resources are extremely limited and inadequate to meet our mobility needs. Los Angeles County is constantly being confronted with significant funding challenges due to the uncertainty of funding from both state and federal resources. In response to Board direction exploring mechanisms for implementing both congestion pricing and public-private partnerships strategies, the Final 2008 LRTP document will provide a new two-page section describing these strategies and how they can help generate new funding sources for building much needed highway and transit projects, as well as improve mobility and air quality for Los Angeles County. See Attachment B for the language to be included in new two-page section.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Upon Board adoption of the 2008 LRTP, a final LRTP document will be prepared incorporating Board actions. This document will be made available for public distribution in October 2008. It should be noted, however, that approval of the 2008 LRTP does not constitute final Board action on individual projects. Projects will return to the Board for further action at key milestones in the planning, environmental and project development process. The 2008 LRTP was developed as a flexible, living

planning document that has the ability to respond to changes through the normal LACMTA planning process, as well as to be regularly updated every three to five years to reflect current conditions. Finally, we are working closely with Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to ensure the 2008 LRTP is incorporated into SCAG's 2008 Regional Transportation Plan for the six-county Southern California region.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Summary of Proposed Changes for Final LRTP
- B. New Two-Page Spread for Final LRTP for New Funding Mechanisms
- C. 2008 LRTP Resolution
- D. Summary of Public Outreach Meetings
- E. Public Written Correspondence Comments and Responses
- F. Public E-Mail Comments and Responses
- G. Public Comment Cards and Responses


Prepared by: Heather Hills, Director, Long Range Planning  
Brad McAllester, Executive Office, Long Range Planning and Coordination





---

Carol Inge  
Chief Planning Officer



---

Roger Snoble  
Chief Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT A

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE  
DRAFT 2008 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

NOTE: The Draft 2008 LRTP was distributed for review and comment on March 12, 2008. Nearly 2,400 copies were distributed and comments were requested by April 25, 2008. The following reflects all revisions proposed for the Final LRTP.

Revisions to Plan	
Page(s)	
Global	Reflect that the 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan is no longer draft.
Global	Add Catalina inset to figures.
2-3, 21-23	Re-order numbering of graphics (Figs. G, H, I, and J) so they are in numerical order.
11, 23	Add an additional countywide sales tax as a potential source of new revenue.
12, 13, 28, 30	Reflect the additional carpool projects that have opened since publication of the Draft Plan.
12	Reflect the various openings of the Metro Red Line extensions.
12, 13	Remove the highway projects that were not open in 1980 (portions of SR-118, I-210, and I-105).
12	Clarify that the highway projects under construction in 2008 also include carpool lane projects.
13	Remove the reference to carpool lanes opening on US-101 since 2001.
14	Clarify that the 14-ton reduction in air pollution is daily metric tons.
21, 33	Clarify that the Funded Transit Project on Wilshire is the Wilshire BRT.
21, 25, 33	Clarify that the alignments have not been determined for the San Fernando Valley North/South Arterial Bus Speed Improvements.
25	Add North County inset to Public Transportation—Recommended Draft Plan figure.
26	Revise reference to West Santa Ana Branch ROW Corridor High Speed Transit project.
26, 31	Clarify that the projects are listed in alphabetical order by score.
26	Add Metro bus and rail capital improvements to Public Transportation Strategic Plan.

27	Add discussion on Local Return Program and Complementary Paratransit.
27	Correct funding estimate for the Transit Capital Strategic Plan to reflect \$239 million, escalated to year of expenditure.
27	Add discussion on intercity rail service.
29	Add discussion on additional channels which provide real-time traffic info.
30	Update "Open Year" for I-405 SB Carpool/Auxiliary Lane: Waterford St to I-10 and I-5 Carpool Lanes: SR-14 to SR-118.
30	Update cost for I-5/Carmenita Rd Interchange Improvement to reflect \$389 million, escalated to year of expenditure.
30	Update cost for SR-138 Widening to reflect \$217 million, escalated to year of expenditure.
30	Update cost for I-10 Carpool Lanes (I-605 to Puente Ave.) to reflect \$199 million, escalated to year of expenditure.
30	Update cost for I-5 Carpool Lanes (SR-118 to SR-170) to reflect \$328 million, escalated to year of expenditure.
30	Update cost for I-5 Carpool & Mixed-Flow Lanes (I-605 to Orange County Line) to reflect \$1,244 million, escalated to year of expenditure.
30	Update cost for I-5/SR-14 Carpool Lane Direct Connector to reflect \$161 million, escalated to year of expenditure.
30	Update Freeway Escalation Reserve, based on revised project costs listed above, to reflect \$658 million, escalated to year of expenditure.
33	Clarify alignment of Westside Extension Transit Corridor.
35	Remove extraneous discussion on Call for Projects for arterials.
37	Revise legend in Fig. V to reflect increasing shade of green for increasing levels of flow.
39	Add funding estimate for System Management Constrained and Strategic Plans, as well as additional discussion on the Strategic Plan element.
41	Add discussion on ridesharing's cost-effectiveness and the private sector's involvement.
42	Revise text to highlight bicycle policies.

43	Add discussion on Metro's role in coordinating bicycle facility planning.
43	Correct funding estimate for the Bicycle Program and Pedestrian Constrained Plans to reflect \$337 million, escalated to year of expenditure.
43	Correct funding estimate for the Pedestrian Program Strategic Plan to reflect \$9.7 million, in 2008 dollars.
New	Add discussion on Innovative Funding Mechanisms (Congestion Pricing and Public-Private Partnerships).

Revisions to the Technical Document

Page(s)

6-7, 10, 19-20, 25, 27, 30-31, 33-34, 37-38, 43-44	Remove references to near-term projects funded by Call for Projects.
7-8	Update Arroyo Verdugo Cities unfunded subregional priorities project list.
7, 12, 33-35	Clarify references to proposed SR-710 extension.
10	Clarify that the US-101 Ramirez flyover is an HOV/on-ramp project.
11-17	Update Central Los Angeles unfunded subregional priorities project list.
19	Add Catalina to figure 2.6.
21-23	Update Gateway Cities unfunded subregional priorities project list.
27-30	Update North Los Angeles County unfunded subregional priorities project list.
35-36	Update San Gabriel Valley unfunded subregional priorities project list.
39-42	Update South Bay Cities unfunded subregional priorities project list.
44-48	Update Westside Cities unfunded subregional priorities project list.
55	Clarify discussion on progress in LA region in reducing air pollution.
70-71	Clarify that the Venice/Robertson station is now referred to as the Washington/National aerial station.
96-97	Clarify discussion on performance analysis conducted on highway and transit projects.
98, 99	Revise reference to West Santa Ana Branch ROW High Speed Transit Corridor project.
100	Provide additional language to describe variation in performance analysis for Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension and West Santa Ana Branch ROW High Speed Transit Corridor projects.

## **We're seeking new funds...through innovative approaches.**

The 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan calls for exploring new options to fund more projects. Two promising strategies are public-private partnerships and congestion pricing.

The 2008 Plan development process has shown us that public resources are extremely limited and that more could be done if new funding becomes available. As funds generated from traditional federal and state sources are limited, it is important to look at new locally-controlled sources or alternative project delivery methods to meet our future mobility and air quality needs. While we are exploring a variety of options, two strategies have emerged at this time that are particularly noteworthy – public-private partnerships and congestion pricing.

### **Public-Private Partnerships**

We are developing a Public-Private Partnership program to explore opportunities to partner with the private sector in funding new transportation projects. The purpose of the Public-Private Partnership program is to identify specific highway or transit projects that could be constructed through financing and project implementation arrangements with the private sector. Public-Private Partnerships have been successfully implemented in other cities in the United States and in countries around the world.

Our Public-Private Partnership program could potentially provide funding for transportation projects that are currently unfunded, or accelerate the construction of funded projects. Projects identified in the 2008 Plan Tier 1 Strategic (Unfunded) highway and transit lists are high-priority candidates for Public-Private Partnership opportunities.

Projects with the most promise for the Public-Private Partnership program will be determined through the following process:

- > **Step 1 – Project Feasibility.** Projects from the Tier 1 Strategic (Unfunded) highway and transit lists of the 2008 Plan, as well as from other sources, will be reviewed to determine their potential as Public-Private Partnerships. Considerations will include the status of environmental studies, financial feasibility, risk, and private-sector interest.
- > **Step 2 – Develop Detailed Project Definition.** As a project is deemed viable as a result of Step 1, the Board can decide to fund and complete the environmental

analysis for the project, subject to funding availability. During the final environmental review process, key areas will be addressed regarding optimizing project delivery options, opportunities for technical innovations, operations and maintenance policy, potential revenue generation, phasing of the project, and if necessary, enabling legislation.

- > **Step 3 – Public-Private Partnership Contract Agreement.** If Step 2 efforts confirm a project could succeed as a Public-Private Partnership, the Board initiates a solicitation process, conducting contract negotiations to clearly outline project roles and responsibilities, structure and standards, including risk allocations. Successful negotiations would result with the Board approving project funding, executing a Public-Private Partnership agreement.

Once the Board approved a Public-Private Partnership agreement and identified full funding of a project, the 2008 Plan would be amended to include the project in the Constrained (funded) Plan list.

## **Congestion Pricing**

Congestion pricing is a travel demand management strategy that has the potential for assisting Los Angeles County in meeting its mobility, air quality, and funding challenges. It is the concept of charging a fee for the use of a transportation facility based on the level of demand.

According to the US Department of Transportation, key congestion pricing benefits include reduction in delay, an increase in predictability of trip times, improvements to transit speed and reliability of service, increases in transit ridership, reductions in fuel consumption and vehicle emissions, and increased revenues for transportation improvements. Managing travel demand through congestion pricing has been successfully implemented in other cities across the nation and around the world. The closest examples are in Orange County on SR-91 and San Diego County on I-15.

Since June 2007 we have been pursuing congestion pricing initiatives by partnering with Caltrans, SCAG, and other agencies to develop a congestion pricing demonstration project. As a result of these united efforts, the US Department of Transportation has awarded Los Angeles County \$210.6 million in federal funds to implement the Los Angeles Region Congestion-Reduction Demonstration Initiative.

Funding from this Initiative will implement a demonstration pilot project that would initially convert existing high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes to high occupancy vehicle toll (HOT) lanes along I-10 and I-210. HOT lanes on the I-110 may also be developed subject to future financing availability (See Figure XX). Vehicles that do not meet the minimum passenger occupancy would be charged a fee for access to the HOT lanes for these facilities. Buses and vanpools would be allowed to access for free. Carpools may also have free access depending on the number of people in the vehicle and level of congestion. A fee structure would be designed to keep traffic on

the HOT lanes moving at speeds of at least 50 mph. These fees would vary by time of day and level of traffic congestion, with higher charges during peak-periods.

Revenues collected from the HOT lane fees would pay for HOT lane operating and maintenance expenses, and would also be used for improvements along the facility corridors. These improvements could include additional transit facilities and service, such as purchasing buses, enhancing transit centers and maintenance facilities, and expanding park and ride facilities.

Much work will be done to outreach to the public over the next several years as we move forward with this demonstration project. This project is anticipated to be implemented by December 2010 and to be in operation as a demonstration project for a one-year period. Upon its completion, the success of the project will be evaluated to determine it should be continued and if similar projects could be implemented in other parts of the county.



## Attachment C

### Resolution Board of Directors Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Adopting 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan for Los Angeles County

**Whereas**, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) is the agency responsible for long range transportation service planning and development of future transportation needs throughout Los Angeles County; and

**Whereas**, the LACMTA developed a 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan Executive Summary and Technical Document for Los Angeles County extending through the year 2030 herein referred to as “the Draft Plan”, and

**Whereas**, the Draft Plan has been presented at seven open community workshops scheduled at locations throughout Los Angeles County and at numerous other meetings including meetings of sub-regional councils of government, chambers of commerce, environmental groups, business groups and community groups, and

**Whereas**, the Draft Plan includes technical analysis necessary to meet Federal Title VI and Environmental Justice responsibilities; A public outreach process was conducted that maximized opportunities for all communities to meaningfully participate in the Draft Plan development process, including the transit dependent and minority communities, and

**Whereas**, the Board of Directors over the last year has held public workshops and open meetings on the policies, programs, selected projects and financial costs of the Draft Plan, and

**Whereas**, the Draft Plan has been publicly available for review and comment including two documents commonly referred to as the Draft 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan and Draft Technical Document attached hereto and included herein in their entirety by this reference, and

**Whereas**, the Draft Plan was revised in consideration of the public comments received and updated technical and financial information; The 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan and Technical Document extending through 2030 as revised is referred to as the “Final Plan,” and

**Whereas**, the Board of Directors desires to coordinate with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to ensure that the Final Plan is coordinated and integrated with the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and

**Whereas**, upon adoption, the Final Plan supercedes the Long Range Transportation Plan adopted on April 26, 2001, and

**Whereas**, the Board of Directors wishes to adopt the Final Plan as policy guidance and as a strategic planning tool for the LACMTA, and

**Whereas**, the Board of Directors considers the Final Plan to be the primary transportation planning tool to guide the development of future transportation needs throughout Los Angeles County through the year 2030.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:**

1. **The Board of Directors hereby adopts** the 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan and Technical Document as amended:
  - A. Technical Refinements and Revisions to the text of the 2008 LRTP and Technical Document as identified in Attachment A, and
  - B. Technical Refinements and Revisions to the financial costs and available revenues depicted in the 2008 LRTP and Technical Document, as identified in Attachment A.
2. **In adopting the Final Plan, the Board of Directors also directs staff to:**
  - A. Aggressively move forward in seeking additional revenue to accelerate projects in the Final Plan and to fund projects identified in the Strategic Plan, and
  - B. Specifically explore the feasibility of new local revenue sources such as a local sales tax, public-private partnerships, congestion pricing, and a congestion mitigation fee.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Board of Directors finds the Final Plan to be in conformance with the Regional Transportation Plan by the performance criteria, project selection and modeling results that indicate compliance;

The Board of Directors hereby authorizes the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Planning Officer and their staff to:

- A. Publish and circulate the Final Plan as amended herein and henceforth remove the draft notation, and

- B. To further represent the Final Plan as the officially adopted Long Range Transportation Plan policy and strategic planning tool of the LACMTA.

### CERTIFICATION

The undersigned, duly qualified and serving as Secretary of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct representation of a Resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority held on \_\_\_\_\_.

Michele Jackson  
Metro Board Secretary

Date:

(Seal)

## ATTACHMENT D

### PUBLIC OUTREACH MEETINGS ON THE

### DRAFT 2008 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

NOTE: The Draft 2008 LRTP was distributed for review and comment on March 12, 2008 for a 45 day Public Review period ending April 25, 2008. The following outlines the public outreach efforts made during the public review of the Draft 2008 LRTP.

Date / Time	Meeting	Location
Feb 14, 2008 2:00pm - 3:00pm	LACMTA Gateway Cities Sector Governance Council	The Gas Company 9240 Firestone Bl., Downey, CA
March 17, 2008 9:00am - 11:00am	Arroyo Verdugo COG	La Canada Flintridge City Hall 1327 Foothill Blvd., La Canada-Flintridge, CA
March 17, 2008 9:30am - 11:30am	LCMTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	LACMTA - Union Station Conference Room - 3rd Floor
March 18, 2008 9:30am - 11:30am	LACMTA Bus Operators Subcommittee (BOS)	LACMTA - Windsor Conf. Rm. #15th fl
March 19, 2008 10:30am - 12:30pm	LACMTA Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Air Quality	LACMTA - Pasadena Conference Room, 22nd Floor
March 20, 2008 9:30am - 11:30am	LACMTA TAC Streets and Freeways Sub-Committee	LACMTA - Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor
March 20, 2008 12 noon - 2 pm	South Bay COG Planning Directors Meeting	Torrance Library Meeting Room, 3301 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA
March 20, 2008 12 - 2:30 pm	San Gabriel Valley COG Planners TAC	Monrovia Community Center 119 W. Palm St. Monrovia, CA

Date / Time	Meeting	Location
March 20, 2008 4:45-7:00 pm	San Gabriel Valley COG Transportation Committee	Southern California Edison CTAC 6090 N. Irwindale Ave. Irwindale, CA
March 24, 2008 12:00-1:00 pm	San Gabriel Valley COG Public Works TAC	Arcadia Police Facility Conf. Rm. 240 W. Huntington Dr. Arcadia, CA
March 24, 2008 2:00 - 3:00 pm	LADOT/LA City Planning Dept.	City of L.A. LADOT Offices
March 26, 2008 9:00 - 11:00 am	San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership	4900 Rivergrade Rd., Suite A310 Irwindale, CA 91706
March 26, 2008 6:30 - 8:30 pm	South Bay COG - Infrastructure Working Group	Blue Water Grill 665 N. Harbor, Redondo Beach, CA
March 26, 2008 6:30 - 8:30 pm	LACMTA Citizen's Advisory Council	LACMTA - Union Station Conference Room - 3rd Floor
March 26, 2008 6:30 - 8:30 pm	Westside Cities LRTP Community Meeting	Plummer Park 7377 Santa Monica Blvd. West Hollywood, CA 90046
March 27, 2008 1:30 - 3 pm	LACMTA Local Transit Services Subcommittee	LACMTA Headquarters Windsor Conference Rm. #15th fl,
March 27, 2008 7:00 - 10:00 pm	South Bay COG Transportation Committee and Board	Torrance Cultural Arts Center George Nakano Theatre 3330 Civic Center Drive Torrance, CA 90503
March 27, 2008 6:30 - 8:30 pm	Metro Headquarters LRTP Community Mtg	One Gateway Plaza Board Rm. - 3rd fl. Los Angeles, CA 90012
April 2, 2008 12:00 - 2:00 pm	General Managers' Meeting	LACMTA Headquarters Malibu Conference Rm. #25th fl,

Date / Time	Meeting	Location
April 2, 2008 12:00 - 2:00 pm	GREEN LA Transportation Work Group	Environment Now 2515 Wilshire Blvd, Santa Monica, CA
April 2, 2008 5:30 - 7:00 pm	Gateway Cities COG Transportation Committee	Gateway Cities COG Offices 16401 Paramount Blvd., Paramount
April 3, 2008 6:00 - 8:00 pm	South Bay Cities LRTP Community Mtg	Carson Community Center Rm. #107 801 East Carson Street Carson, CA 90745
April 8, 2008 8:00am - 10:00am	Central City Association	Central City Association Offices 610 Olive St., 10th Floor, Los Angeles
April 8, 2008 6:00 8:00 pm	San Gabriel Valley LRTP Community Mtg	Potrero Heights Elementary School 8026 East Hill Dr. Rosemead, CA 91770
April 9, 2008 9:30 - 11:00 am	LACMTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	LACMTA Headquarters, Third Floor, Union Station Conference Rm, 3rd fl.
April 10, 2008 9:30 - 11:00 am	Westside Cities	City of Beverly Hills Public Library Beverly Hills, CA
April 10, 2008 11:30 - 1:00 am	Accessibility Advisory Committee	LACMTA Headquarters Union Station Conference Rm - 3rd fl.
April 10, 2008 6:00 8:00 pm	Gateway Cities LRTP Community Mtg.	Progress Park Plaza West 15500 Downey Ave. Paramount, CA 90723
April 14, 2008 10:30am - 12:30pm	North County Transportation Coalition	City of Lancaster City Hall, 44933 N. Fern Avenue, Lancaster, CA
April 14, 2008 6:30pm - 8:30pm	CD11 Neighborhood Empowerment Congress Transportation Committee	Felicia Nahood Senior Center, Rm. 2 11338 Santa Monica Blvd.
April 15, 2008 8:30 - 10:30 am	Las Virgenes-Malibu COG	Westlake Village City Hall 31200 Oak Crest Dr., Westlake Village

Date / Time	Meeting	Location
April 15, 2008 9:00 - 11:00 am	LOSSAN TAC	LACMTA Headquarters
April 15, 2008 6:30 - 8:30 pm	Redondo Beach City Council	Redondo Beach City Hall Council Chambers 415 Diamond St.; Redondo Beach
April 16, 2008 5:30 - 7:00 pm	San Gabriel Valley COG Transportation Committee	Southern California Edison CTAC 6090 N. Irwindale Ave., Irwindale, CA
April 21, 2008 12:00 - 2:00 pm	American Public Transportation Ass.	LACMTA Headquarters, Union Station Conference Rm, 3rd fl.
April 21, 2008 12:00 - 2:00 pm	Valley Industrial and Commerce Association - Government Affairs Committee	Tarzana Hospital 18321 Clark Avenue, Tarzana
April 22, 2008 6:30 - 8:30 pm	North Los Angeles County L RTP Community Meeting	Larry Chimbole Cultural Center Lilac Room - 1st fl. 38350 Sierra Highway, Palmdale, CA
April 23, 2008 6:00 - 8:00 pm	San Fernando Valley L RTP Community Mtg	Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center Room 1B 6262 Van Nuys Blvd, Van Nuys, CA
April 24, 2008 6:00 - 8:00 pm	County Federation of Labor	Millemium Biltmore Hotel 506 S. Grand Ave., L.A.
April 24, 2008 6:00 - 8:00 pm	Greater Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce Transportation Committee	Greater Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce 423 Bixel Avenue, L.A.
April 29, 2008 8:00 - 10:00 am	Gateway Cities COG Joint Planning/Public Works Committees	Gateway Cities COG Offices 16401 Paramount Blvd., Paramount
April 30, 2008 6:00 - 8:00 pm	LACMTA San Fernando Valley Service Sector Governance Council	Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center Room 1B 6262 Van Nuys Blvd, Van Nuys, CA

# Attachment E

## WRITTEN COMMENTS INDEX

ELECTED OFFICIALS .....	1
TAC SUBCOMMITTEES .....	13
CITIES.....	15
AGENCIES.....	32
ORGANIZATIONS .....	39
MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.....	62



**ATTACHMENT E  
RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE  
DRAFT 2008 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

NOTE: The Draft 2008 LRTP was distributed for review and comment on March 12, 2008. The following reflects staff responses to written comments received on the Draft LRTP through letters.

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p><i>David Dreier Adam B. Schiff United States Congress</i></p> <p><i>Grace F. Napolitano Hilda L. Solis</i></p> <p><i>04/25/2008 Joe Baca</i></p> <p>Members of Congress who represent the Gold Line Foothill Extension communities support the inclusion of the project in the Long Range Transportation Plan as budgeted for both operations and capital expenses. The Members of Congress identified strong support of constituent cities and colleges and universities along the proposed rail line, current economic benefits to San Gabriel Valley and for the growth forecasted for the area. Also support the possible future extension to the Ontario Airport. The extension of the Gold Line is identified as saving 1.5 million gallons of gasoline and reducing air pollution. The Gold Line is also described as being ready to begin construction immediately. The Members of Congress also listed the various federal financial investments from 2003 to 2008. Finally, the importance of bringing federal dollars to Los Angeles County was cited.</p>	<p>Comment noted. We note that given a lack of revenues from traditional funding sources and a significant spike in the construction costs, the 2008 Plan is unable to fund any additional projects not funded in the 2001 Plan. As a result, the Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Grace F. Napolitano United States Congress 38th District, California</i></p> <p><i>04/25/2008</i></p> <p>I write to extend my full support for the inclusion of the Interstate 5 (I-5) Carmenita Interchange project in the constrained portion of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (MTA) Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Draft 2008 Plan recommends full funding of the I-5 / Carmenita Rd Interchange project.</p>

*Comments from Elected Officials*

*Diane E. Watson  
United States Congress  
33rd District, California*

04/25/2008

Urges reconfiguration of the entire Expo Phase I project to be grade-separated for safety and if reconfiguration is adopted, pledges to seek matching federal funds for this purpose.  
Encourages Metro to add the Westside Subway project as a fundamental component of the LRTP.  
Disagrees with Metro recommendations concerning the Crenshaw/Prairie alignments and suggests northerly connection to Wilshire Boulevard via La Brea to Hollywood Boulevard.

The Long Range Plan identifies projects only at the system level. Decisions on project alignments are addressed through the transit corridor study planning process.  
This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.  
The Long Range Plan identifies projects only at the system level. Decisions on project alignments are addressed through the transit corridor study planning process.

*Jack Weiss  
Councilmember, District 5  
City of Los Angeles*

04/25/2008

Approves building Expo Phase 2.  
Requests Westside subway extension. Also notes the absence of a priority ranking system within each tier that raises concerns about how projects within the entire Tier 1 category will be selected should additional funding become available.  
Pursue public-private partnerships.  
Increase transportation demand management programs. They reduce the total number of vehicle trips. Metro has a successful program of ride-matching, carpool information, vanpools, and outreach. More funding and additional partnerships with other agencies would increase participation. Target rates should be set each year.

This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.  
This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.  
The Plan will include a new section on how the Plan supports public-private partnerships.  
Comment noted.

*Comments from Elected Officials*

<p><i>Jose Huizar Councilmember, District 14 City of Los Angeles</i></p> <p>The Downtown Los Angeles Streetcar should be added to the Strategic Unfunded Tier 2 category.</p> <p>Requests that the L RTP prioritize the Regional Connector and include it in the constrained list of projects.</p>	<p><i>04/25/2008</i></p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
--	--

*Comments from Elected Officials*

<i>Gilbert Cedillo State Senator 22<sup>nd</sup> District</i>	<i>Ronald Calderon State Senator 30<sup>th</sup> District</i>	<i>04/24/2008 Mark Ridley-Thomas State Senator 26<sup>th</sup> District</i>
<i>Bob Huff State Assembly 60<sup>th</sup> District</i>	<i>Mike Eng State Assembly 49<sup>th</sup> District</i>	<i>Charles Calderon State Assembly 58<sup>th</sup> District</i>
<i>Edward Vincent State Senator 25<sup>th</sup> District</i>		

It is our recommendation that the 710 Tunnel project be included in the Long Range Transportation Plan.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is proposing the use of Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) in the constrained draft of its 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), specifically to fund the 710 Gap Closure. This project meets the test of financial constraint through use of a toll-based PPP solution. SCAG has included this analysis in its RTP.

MTA's concern regarding the financial feasibility of the 710 Tunnel project and the need for confirmation of its potential funding commitments (as discussed at the January, 2008 MTA Board meeting) should be put to rest by the guidance SCAG received from the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) which allowed inclusion of PPP projects (at least through the EIR process) in the RTP. Specific language in SAFETEA-LU and USDOT's guidance on financial constraint specifically encourages projects to consider PPP as a potential funding source.

MTA's estimated cost of \$100 million for the design and environmental phases of the project appears to be unrealistic when compared to the environmental costs for the 710 South project, which has been budgeted at \$30-\$35 million for 19 miles of improvements.

A rate opportunity exists to defray 96% of the 710 Tunnel project's cost by using other investment strategies, including the use of private investor financing.

We, and other legislators representing Los Angeles County, believe that the 710 Tunnel project is of such enormous regional benefit that it is MTA's obligation to include it in the funded portion of the LRTP.

The Plan will include a new section on how the Plan supports public-private partnerships, and the steps for projects such as the 710 Gap to be funded through the Plan if new funds become available.

*Comments from Elected Officials*

<p><i>Mike Feuer Assemblymember 42<sup>nd</sup> District</i></p> <p><i>04/24/2008</i></p> <p>Expresses support for continuing the funding commitment for Expo Line Phases 1&amp;2.</p> <p>Move the Metro Subway Westside Extension to La Cienega and the City of Santa Monica from Tier 1 of the Strategic Unfunded portion of the LRTP to the constrained (funded) portion of the Plan on a priority basis when funding is identified.</p> <p>Include the I-10/Robertson/National Blvd. Circulation Improvement Project in the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Maintain the funding commitment to expansion of the Orange Line.</p> <p>Improve the 101/134 Corridor and add a connector between the 170 and 134.</p> <p>Maintain the funding commitment to Regional Surface Transportation Improvements and Transportation Management Programs.</p> <p>Maintain and expand funding for soundwalls.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Metro Subway Westside Extension to La Cienega and the City of Santa Monica is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>This project is a subregional priority and could be implemented if new funds become available.</p> <p>This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p> <p>Carpool lanes on the 101 corridor are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Jan Perry Councilmember, District 9 City of Los Angeles</i></p> <p><i>04/23/2008</i></p> <p>The Regional Connector needs to be prioritized and included in the fiscally Constrained Plan. My preferred alignment, and the alignment preferred by the Downtown Street Standards Committee, is underground.</p>	<p>This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Elected Officials*

04/22/2008

*Mike Eng  
State Assemblyman  
49th District*

*Luis Ayala  
Mayor  
City of Alhambra*

*John Tran  
Mayor  
City of Rosemead*

*Ernie Gutierrez  
Mayor  
City of El Monte*

*Matthew Lin  
Mayor  
City of San Marino*

*Sharon Martinez  
Mayor  
City of Monterey Park*

*Blanca Figueroa  
Mayor  
City of South El Monte*

The undersigned cities of the 49th Assembly District strongly support adding the Route 710 Tunnel project to the 2008 LRTP. Considering the action MTA and Caltrans made to pledge funds for preliminary studies on the feasibility of a 710 tunnel, the next step will be to undertake the environmental work, assuming the current technical studies are positive.

The EIS/EIR needs to be funded during the next four-year period. There appears to be significant interest to use private financing for much of the design, construction, and operation for the 710 freeway completion. MTA could possibly include the 710 Gap Closure in the baseline LRTP to be eligible for funds for necessary studies that may include an exploration of Public-Private Partnership opportunities. This will allow the tunnel to move forward without burdening other transportation projects needed in the region.

The MTA identifies completing Route 710 as the highest priority congestion reduction project in Los Angeles County. SCAG ranks the route's completion as the most significant enhancement to improving air quality in the Los Angeles basin and continued conformity with federal air requirements.

The Plan will include a new section on how the Plan supports public-private partnerships, and the steps for projects such as the 710 Gap to be funded through the Plan if new funds become available.

*Comments from Elected Officials*

<p><i>Mike Eng</i> State Assemblyman 49<sup>th</sup> District</p> <p><i>John Tran</i> Mayor City of Rosemead</p> <p><i>Sharon Martinez</i> Mayor City of Monterey Park</p> <p><i>Blanca Figueroa</i> Mayor City of South El Monte</p>	<p>04/18/2008</p> <p>Urge Metro to approve further analysis of Alternative 2 Route for Phase 2 of Eastside Extension of Gold Line from East Los Angeles.</p>	<p>This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Hilda Solis</i> United States Congress 32<sup>nd</sup> District, California</p>	<p>04/08/2008</p> <p>I strongly support the Metro Gold Line Foothill extension, a critical project for our communities. The Foothill extension is the only project proposed at the MTA that is ready to begin construction. It will also be the only light rail line servicing the San Gabriel Valley and the Inland Empire, communities that are expected to grow between 20 and 30 percent. The Foothill extension has and can continue to provide important contributions to our local economy. Over \$2 billion of private investment has been committed to transit oriented development projects along the corridor. Total economic benefits for the region are expected to exceed \$40 billion, including the creation of at least 2,000 new construction jobs. The project could save 1.5 million gallons of gasoline and cut 126 tons of carbon monoxide, 18 tons of nitrogen oxides, and 5 tons of particulate matter from the air each year. For one half of one percent of the MTA's total capital budget, and the inclusion of this project in the Long Range Plan, we could leverage as much as \$320 million in federal funds.</p>	<p>We note that given a lack of revenues from traditional funding sources and a significant spike in the construction costs, the 2008 Plan is unable to fund any additional projects not funded in the 2001 Plan. As a result, the Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Elected Officials*

*Ed Hernandez*

*State Assemblyman and Chair*

*San Gabriel Valley Legislative Caucus*

04/08/2008

The San Gabriel Valley Legislative Caucus is a group of 13 state legislators who represent hundreds of thousands of residents, employees, and employers within the San Gabriel Valley who are poised and ready to ride the Metro Gold Line Foothill extension. The current draft of the Long Range Transportation Plan did not place this project in the Recommended and Budgeted Plan and we find this unacceptable on several levels: Phase 2(A) of the project through Azusa is ready to build. Other projects within the Recommended Plan are not at the same level of readiness and have projected construction dates 15 years or more into the future. The San Gabriel Valley deserves its fair share of public transit funding and we believe a fair share of funding for the San Gabriel Valley is overdue. The Foothill extension project has the potential to bring in additional federal dollars for Los Angeles County. A capital investment of \$80 million has the potential to bring \$320 million from the Federal Transit Administration in support for Phase 2(A).

We note that given a lack of revenues from traditional funding sources and a significant spike in the construction costs, the 2008 Plan is unable to fund any additional projects not funded in the 2001 Plan. As a result, the Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.



*Comments from Elected Officials*

*Brad Sherman  
United States Congress  
27<sup>th</sup> District, California*

*03/31/2008*

The San Fernando Valley - Calabasas, Burbank, Glendale, Los Angeles City portion, and San Fernando – represents approximately 18% of the total population of Los Angeles County. The San Fernando Valley is particularly in need of transportation expenditures because our region remains one of the most congested in the county and state, and because this is the largest area of Los Angeles County that has virtually no subway or light rail service.

Metro proposes to fund the northern extension of the Metro Orange Line, as well as improvements to other north-south transit routes with a total cost of \$298 million. This represents some 6% of the total public transportation projects funded in the Recommended Draft Plan. Clearly an area with approximately 18% of the county’s population might well argue for more than 6% of the public transportation project dollars.

Among the Strategic Unfunded projects that you are considering is the I-405 Corridor Busway between the Metro Orange Line Sepulveda station and the Metro Green Line Aviation station. I commend you for including this project in the Plan, and hope that you would give it the highest priority. I also support funding for the Metro Red Line extension from the North Hollywood station to the Burbank Airport Metrolink station.

In addition to these transit improvements, Metro should further define and identify funding for highway improvements at the following interchanges listed in the Plan: US-101/SR-170, US-101/Sr-170/SR-134, and I-405/US-101.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted. These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

Comment noted.

*Comments from Elected Officials*

<p><i>Don Knabe Chairman Pro-Tem Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors</i></p> <p><i>02/22/2008</i></p> <p>I respectfully request that the MTA add a proposed transit center located in Torrance to Metro's Regional Transportation Plan. The City of Torrance is the 12<sup>th</sup> largest city in California and the 4<sup>th</sup> largest in Los Angeles County. The city has no viable transit center or hub. The lack of a significant transit center has nothing to do with the city's lack of desire for such a facility, but rather is due to a lack of available land large enough to be utilized for such a purpose. However, a prime piece of real estate has recently become available that would not only serve the city's purposes, but would also serve regional transit needs and the long-term interests of Metro.</p> <p>The city will contribute its own funds to the project, but is unable to secure the full amount. The city is soliciting additional funds from the federal government and from Metro. Please give the City of Torrance the utmost consideration for this project and also provide your assistance to have this item placed in Metro's Regional Transportation Plan so it may be given consideration for funding.</p>	<p>The Draft 2008 Plan does recommend continued funding for future competitive Call for Projects. The City of Torrance could submit this eligible project in the Transit Capital modal category. The Draft 2008 Plan reserves \$464 million for future Call for Projects in this modal category.</p>
<p><i>Ted W. Lieu State Assemblyman 53rd District</i></p> <p><i>Jenny Oropeza State Senator 28th District</i></p> <p><i>02/20/2008</i></p> <p>As the elected representatives of the City of Torrance, we are jointly writing to respectfully request that the MTA add a proposed transit center located in Torrance to Metro's Regional Transportation Plan. The City of Torrance is the 12<sup>th</sup> largest city in California and the 6<sup>th</sup> largest in Los Angeles County, with a night-time population of 150,000 residents.</p>	<p>The Draft 2008 Plan does recommend continued funding for future competitive Call for Projects. The City of Torrance could submit this eligible project in the Transit Capital modal category. The Draft 2008 Plan reserves \$464 million for future Call for Projects in this modal category.</p>

*Comments from Elected Officials*

<p><i>Gilbert Cedillo</i> <i>State Senator</i> <i>22nd District</i></p> <p><i>Mike Eng</i> <i>State Assemblyman</i> <i>49th District</i></p> <p>Direct Metro to move 710 Gap Closure into baseline LRTP. Could be funded through innovative financing as done elsewhere around the world. This project lends itself to a joint public/private toll project.</p>	<p><i>Edward Vincent</i> <i>State Senator</i> <i>25th District</i></p> <p><i>Bob Huff</i> <i>State Assemblyman</i> <i>60th District</i></p>	<p><i>Ronald Calderon</i> <i>State Senator</i> <i>30th District</i></p> <p><i>Nell Soto</i> <i>State Assemblyman</i> <i>61st District</i></p> <p>The Plan will include a new section on how the Plan supports public-private partnerships, and the steps for projects such as the 710 Gap to be funded through the Plan if new funds become available.</p>
<p><i>Mike Eng</i> <i>State Assemblyman</i> <i>49th District</i></p> <p><i>Ernie Gutierrez</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of El Monte</i></p> <p><i>Blanca Figueroa</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of South El Monte</i></p> <p>The undersigned cities of the 49th Assembly District strongly support adding funding for environmental studies to support the Route 710 Tunnel project to the 2008 LRTP. Considering the action MTA and Caltrans made to pledge funds for preliminary studies on the feasibility of a 710 tunnel, the next step will be to undertake the environmental work, assuming the current technical studies are positive.</p> <p>The EIS/EIR needs to be funded during the next four-year period. There appears to be significant interest to use private financing for much of the design, construction, and operation for the 710 freeway</p>	<p><i>Luis Ayala</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Alhambra</i></p> <p><i>Matthew Lin</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of San Marino</i></p> <p><i>John Tran</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Rosemead</i></p>	<p><i>Kevin Sawkins</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of San Gabriel</i></p> <p><i>Sharon Martinez</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Monterey Park</i></p> <p>Comments noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Elected Officials*

completion. This will allow the tunnel to move forward without burdening other transportation projects needed in the region.

The MTA identifies completing Route 710 as the highest priority congestion reduction project in the county. SCAG ranks the route's completion as the most significant enhancement to improving air quality in the Los Angeles basin and continued conformity with federal air requirements.

*Anthony J. Portantino  
State Assemblyman  
44<sup>th</sup> District*

*01/23/2008*

I write today in strong opposition of any proposal that moves the SR-710 Gap Closure project from the strategic projects portion of the LRTP into the "baseline" or Recommended Plan portion of the LRTP.

The residents of the 710 corridor have long been promised an impartial and fair process for determining the feasibility of a 710 gap closure. If the MTA proceeds today in moving this project into an inappropriate category in the LRTP, it will forever damage the process and its credibility with residents throughout the corridor. Last March, the Metro Board voted to include \$5 million from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) which was then matched by \$5 million from the STIP for "preliminary engineering and technical studies" on this project. It is imperative that this report be conducted in a fair and impartial manner and that all stakeholders understand that the proposed study is being entered into with no predetermined outcomes. Inappropriate movement of the project or inclusion of any language that enables work to be executed toward an EIR on this project at this time would be the worst possible decision for the MTA.

Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

The SR-710 Gap Closure project has not reached the stage where an update to the environmental clearance is being prepared so we have not engaged in any effort that would prejudice future routing decisions. Caltrans, in coordination with Metro, will continue to move forward with an objective preliminary engineering and technical study and we will soon begin a formalized public involvement process.

*Comments from TAC Subcommittees*

**Local Transit Systems Subcommittee (LTSS)**

04/24/2008

The LTSS supports comments of the Bus Operations Subcommittee, with the provision that any incentive funds guarantee remain revenue neutral for local operators. The LTSS suggests that the Final LRTP recognize the contributions of the Local Return Transit Operators as an essential link in the transportation network and eliminate confusion with "municipal operator". Additionally, the LRTP Technical Document should reflect in the Financial and Bus Programs Assumptions sections the capital and operating needs of the local operators; including the continuation of the incentive program funds.

Comments noted. The Final LRTP will refer more specifically to the contribution of the Local Transit Operators. The Financial Assumptions contained in the LRTP Technical Document can only address funding that Metro directly programs. The Local Return Program distributes funding directly to the Cities and the County of Los Angeles.

**Bus Operations Subcommittee (BOS)**

04/23/2008

BOS identified comments on the Financial Model and Assumptions including: addressing local funding solutions such as Congestion Pricing and local sales tax and including a significant new operating funding source for both Metro and the Municipal Operators to address growth in transit services during the Plan; identify in the discussion of the Municipal Operator Service Improvement Plan (MOSIP) that the program provides on-going support for bus expansion and improved service, and is funded through Proposition C 40% funds. Also noted that Metro was not the only recipient of Homeland Security Funds, and suggested that the capital assumptions made for fleet sizes of the Municipal Operators were outdated. Suggested that the Proposition A Discretionary Fund CPI cap be removed to help fund the service growth of both Metro and Municipal Operators during the Plan.

Comments noted. The Final LRTP Document will include a new section describing efforts to date in regard to Congestion Pricing and Public Private Partnerships as potential sources of new funding. Regarding the MOSIP and bus expansion funding, it was assumed throughout the Plan. The Final LRTP Technical Document will be changed to reflect the regional participation in the Homeland Security Grant funding.

**Streets and Freeways**

04/17/2008

When was the Technical Appendix released? The 45-day review period officially started March 12, 2008, and has anyone mentioned that all the materials should have been out before the start date for the comment period? It was noted that the most interesting material was in the technical appendix. Also, is TAC going have a chance to review the comments before it goes to the Board in June? Several members

Comment noted. TAC will be briefed on the LRTP Board Report at their June meeting.

*Comments from TAC Subcommittees*

stated that they believe they will be able to review comments.

Arroyo Verdugo Bike path is not feasible and should be taken out of the Plan. More funding should go towards bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Some of the projects identified as bike projects (on page 23 of the technical document) are not bike projects.

Complete streets should be funded through the Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI) category in the Call for Projects.

On page 75 of the Technical Document, the list under the Multimodal Program Assumptions Call for Projects categories, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds are not listed under the Bikeway and Pedestrian improvement sections and CMAQ funds are eligible for bike projects.

How the funding amounts were determined for the CFP, from the LRTP.

*Transportation Demand Management/Air Quality 3/19/2008*

TDM/AQ recommends that the LRTP acknowledge the importance of ridesharing and highlight the significance and cost-effectiveness of ridesharing on the future countywide transportation network.

TDM/AQ recommends that the LRTP recognize the efforts and commitments of the business community/private sector in reducing employee commute trips.

TDM/AQ recommends that the LRTP identify that funding included in the Constrained Plan for TDM programs should flow to non-auto modes in the event it can not all be spent on TDM projects and programs.

TDM/AQ recommends that the LRTP identify Metro's leadership role in coordinating bicycle facility planning in the region.

Projects identified in the 2008 LRTP subregional chapters reflect their unfunded subregional priorities and are the result of outreach conducted with the nine subregional Council of Governments (COG).

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Call for Projects funding levels were based on maintaining funding levels consistent with the 2001 LRTP.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

Comment noted.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

<p><i>Robert Griego</i> <i>City Manager</i> <i>City of Irwindale</i></p> <p>04/28/2008</p> <p>City Manager supports the inclusion of Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension into the Long Range Transportation Plan on behalf of the City of Irwindale. The Construction Authority's request of \$80 million has the potential to leverage \$320 million in Federal support. The San Gabriel Valley is the fastest growing region in the County in terms of population and employment; however, it is the only sector without a mass transit alternative. Irwindale has a large daytime population that would benefit from this project.</p>	<p>The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Robert G. Newman</i> <i>Director of Public Works</i> <i>City of Santa Clarita</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Santa Clarita has two comments to submit regarding the Draft 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Promote alternative modes of transportation such as high-speed rail and/or magnetic levitation to reduce and relieve demands on already congested corridors such as I-5 and SR-14. The North County region will experience the largest population growth within Los Angeles County and alternative modes of transportation such as high-speed rail and/or magnetic levitation will effectively address increasing travel demands.</li> <li>2) Increase Metrolink service on the Antelope Valley line to include additional peak hour trips, non-peak hour trips, weekend service, and reverse commute trips.</li> </ol>	<p>Comment noted. Metro will continue to monitor regional and state high speed rail proposals.</p> <p>Comment noted. Further enhancements to Metrolink service could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

Sumire Gant  
 Transportation Programs Officer  
 City of Long Beach  
 04/25/2008

The communities surrounding the I-710 freeway should receive Complete Streets treatments on major corridors to address quality of life issues. This should be part of the I-710 South Project.

Metro is to be commended for the promotion of the green Complete Streets concept throughout the document.

The LRTP should increase funding far beyond 1% of the total for bicycle and pedestrian improvements since they produce zero emissions and many auto trips can be replaced with them.

MTA should seek additional funding to address the gap in system preservation needs.

For the Gateway Cities subregional chapter, Long Beach requests the following be edited:

1. Under "Stakeholder Recommendations" (page 21), add a bullet entitled 'Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements', and another entitled 'Design and Construction of Green Complete Streets throughout the I-710 Corridor'.
2. In Figure 2.7 (page 22), identify the list of street improvements in Long Beach as 'Green Complete Street Improvements' rather than simply "Improve".

In Figure 2.7 (page 23), under Bicycle Improvements add, "Incorporate improvements within the updated Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan." Also, note that only the first two projects listed in this category are actually bicycle improvements. The balance are Goods Movement, ITS, Freeway and Metro Rail improvements that should be listed under those respective categories.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.

Metro will continue to partner with local agencies in securing additional funding for system preservation needs.

Changes to this section need to be coordinated with the appropriate COG.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.



<p><i>Pete Woolson</i> <i>City Manager</i> <i>City of Avalon</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Request to include the City of Avalon and Santa Catalina in the Long Range Transportation Map.</p> <p>The ferry routes to and from the mainland should be functionally classified as a public road "the same as any land based route." The City has FHWA concurrence with this.</p> <p>More than 60% of the residents are low-income Latinos and are a protected population under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>We will coordinate with the subregional COG regarding adding language to this section regarding ferry service to Avalon.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>P. Michael Paules</i> <i>City Manager</i> <i>City of San Gabriel</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>The City of San Gabriel firmly request that the 710 Gap Closure be included in the funded section of MTA's LRTP, under a new category which will allow this long delayed construction to be funded and constructed as a Public-Private-Project, or other similar project.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The 710 Gap Closure is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>David Kriske</i> <i>Senior Planner</i> <i>City of Burbank</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>The City of Burbank feels that Metro and local operators can work together to maintain local bus service while still achieving reductions in operating costs. The LRTP should establish a policy goal of enabling local agencies to assume operation of local transit lines in exchange for monetary support from Metro, while still allowing Metro to achieve necessary cost reductions.</p> <p>The Arroyo-Verdugo subregional discussion in the LRTP Technical Document does not include the complete project list submitted by the three subregional cities in February 2008. We request that this information be reflected in the revised LRTP</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final LRTP.</p>

The City requests consideration to include the 134 transit corridor between North Hollywood and Pasadena as a Tier 1 Strategic Plan Project.

The City supports inclusion of important regional rail transit proposals that will serve the City in the Tier 2 Strategic Plan, including the Burbank/Glendale Light-rail proposal, the Yellow Line (pending final alignment determination), and the Red Line Subway extension to Bob Hope Airport and the Golden State area of Burbank.

Any discussion of new roadway freight facilities or creation of an inland port facility should not occur without an equal commitment to developing freight traffic or port user fees that incorporate the full environmental and transportation costs of increased freight traffic on the region's roadways.

*Luis Ayala*  
*Mayor*  
*City of Alhambra*

04/24/2008

Mayor Ayala supports placing the 710 Tunnel Project in the Financially-Constrained Section of the Draft 2008 Plan as this project would be toll funded. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has proposed the use of Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) to fund the 710 Tunnel Project in SCAG's Draft 2008 Regional Transportation Plan. SCAG has been advised by the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) that including the 710 Tunnel Project as a PPP project would be allowed in SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan and allow future environmental work to commence. He also commented on the comparable cost of the 710 Tunnel Project and the 710 South Project, and identified the opportunity to partially fund the 710 Tunnel Project through the sale of the publicly-held surface right-of-way.

Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

Comment noted.

Comments noted. The Plan will include a new section on how the Plan supports public-private partnerships, and the steps for projects such as the 710 Gap to be funded through the Plan if new funds become available.

*Alan Corlin  
Mayor  
City of Culver City*

*04/24/2008*

We are pleased that the Exposition Light Rail project (Phases 1 and 2) has been included in the 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan.

We are also pleased that the Westside Subway Extension project has been included in the LRTP.

The City strongly urges Metro to add the I-10/Robertson/National Area Circulation Improvement Project to the Strategic Unfunded portion of the Highway category of the LRTP. This project will improve the traffic bottleneck on I-10 and around the future Exposition light rail transit station by reconfiguring the on/off ramp system and adjacent streets to rationalize traffic movements. The project is included in SCAG's 2008 Regional Transportation Plan and should also be reflected in the Strategic Unfunded portion of the LRTP. This project is one of the three top priority projects for the Westside Cities Council of Governments.

The City would also like to note several corrections/additions that we urge be made to the Technical Document of the Draft LRTP.

This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.

Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

This project is identified as a subregional priority and could be funded if new funding sources become available.

Changes will be incorporated into the Final Plan.

<p><i>Stephen A. Del Guercio</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of La Canada-Flintridge</i></p> <p>The City would like to commend Metro for its extensive work on the Draft Long Range Transportation Plan.</p> <p>The City would like to commend Metro for the inclusion of the SR-710 Gap Closure project in the Strategic Unfunded portion of the Plan. The City believes it is important that Caltrans be allowed to conduct its study regarding this issue to attempt to establish the feasibility of the project, which has not yet been established.</p> <p>The City strongly believes that the "Additional Soundwalls Beyond Unfunded Plan" should be moved from the Strategic Unfunded portion of the Plan to the funded portion of the Plan. The City's retrofit soundwall project is in this group (Phase II). The City has been making efforts, for many years, to obtain funding for our soundwall project along the 210 freeway. We have self-funded our required soundwall study (NESSR) at a cost of over \$600,000. We have consistently applied for federal funding for the project, obtaining \$250,000 in federal funds to go toward this estimated \$31 million project.</p> <p>The City supports the inclusion of the Gold Line Extension Project.</p>	<p>04/24/2008</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Draft 2008 Plan represents a constrained plan and is consistent with the Metro Board's adopted policy with regard to funding local jurisdictions' soundwalls.</p>
<p><i>Patrick V. DeChellis</i> <i>Deputy Director of Public Works</i> <i>County of Los Angeles</i></p> <p>We strongly recommend the inclusion of regional priorities such as additional HOV lanes, the 710 Gap Closure project, and the High Desert Corridor project as part of the fiscally constrained portion of the draft LRTP.</p> <p>Metro is forecasting a funding shortfall over the period of the LRTP. We agree that additional funds are needed to implement the projects</p>	<p>04/24/2008</p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Draft 2008 Plan seeks to explore new and innovative funding strategies such as tolling and congestion</p>

listed in the LRTP. We urge that proactive and collaborative steps be taken by the region under Metro's leadership to identify potential new funding sources to resolve the funding shortfall.

It should be explained how federal, state, and local funds available to the region are allocated to specific programs or projects in the LRTP.

We believe that as our roads and streets continue to deteriorate due to the funding shortfalls, repair costs will escalate exponentially in future years. As we expand our system to relieve congestion and improve air quality, we must recognize that it is equally or more important to maintain and preserve our aging infrastructure. Therefore, we recommend that Metro designate the preservation of local streets and roads as a top priority in the 2008 Draft LRTP and dedicate additional revenues for this purpose.

We strongly support the inclusion of at least \$4.215 billion for Metro's Call for Projects (CFP) as indicated in the 2008 Draft LRTP. We believe that the allocation to the CFP should be increased since the CFP addresses the local road system needs where virtually every trip, whether by bike, bus, or automobile, begins and ends.

As part of the long range planning process, environmental preparedness of critical projects should be emphasized. This could be achieved by giving projects with environmental clearance higher priority to receive available funding.

*Ernest G. Gutierrez*  
*Mayor*  
*City of El Monte*

04/24/2008

The City of El Monte wishes to support the efforts of our sister communities in the San Gabriel Valley in seeking transit improvement funds for the proposed Goldline Extension Alternative Two: 60 Freeway corridor alignment.

pricing, public/private partnerships, and a countywide congestion mitigation fee, including local sources that would help fund arterials and other local improvements.

Comment noted. A discussion of the financial forecast and assumptions is included in the Technical Document.

Metro will continue to work with the County and cities in support of seeking new revenues for system preservation.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

<p><i>Herb Katz  Mayor  City of Santa Monica</i></p> <p>04/23/2008</p> <p>Mayor Katz supports the inclusion of Expo Light Rail Phase 2 from Culver City to Santa Monica in the funded portion of the Draft 2008 Plan. Comments on various benefits of the Expo Phase 2 Line including the schools and jobs to be served on the Westside by the project. As part of the Westside Cities COG, he also advocates inclusion of the Westside Subway Extension and the I-10/Robertson/National Area Circulation Improvement Project as worthy of funding after the Expo Light Rail Phase 2 to Santa Monica.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Expo Phase 2 project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p> <p>The Westside Extension and I-10: Robertson/National could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Barry Brucker  Mayor  City of Beverly Hills</i></p> <p>4/23/2008</p> <p>City of Beverly Hills supports Westside Subway Extension, Exposition Light Rail to Santa Monica and the I-10/Robertson/National Area Circulation Improvement Projects</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Expo Phase 2 project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p> <p>The Westside Extension and I-10: Robertson/National could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Ernest G. Gutierrez  Mayor  City of El Monte</i></p> <p>04/23/2008</p> <p>The City of El Monte fully supports Metro's attempt to assign a ranking to prospective projects in the draft 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan based on fair and consistent cost-effectiveness measures. Nonetheless, we believe that Metro has overlooked three important projects: Rebuilding of the El Monte Busway Transit Station, development of a new dedicated bus only transit connection between the El Monte Busway Transit Station and Flair Business Park and the Mid Valley Rapid Bus Transportation Corridor.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Comment (Main Points)  
 Comments from the Cities and the County of Los Angeles

<p><i>City of Bradbury</i></p> <p><i>04/22/2008</i></p> <p><i>Richard G. Barakat</i>  <i>Mayor</i></p> <p><i>Bruce Lathrop</i>  <i>Mayor Pro-Tem</i></p> <p><i>D. Montgomery Lewis</i>  <i>Councilmember</i></p> <p><i>Richard T. Hale Jr.</i>  <i>Councilmember</i></p> <p><i>Brian L. Guthrie</i>  <i>Councilmember</i></p> <p>On behalf of the City of Bradbury, we respectfully request that you and your fellow MTA Board members include the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension in the MTA's Long Range Plan.</p> <p>The Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension will strengthen the entire Countywide transit system, alleviate traffic congestion along the freeway system, and help improve the region's air quality. We hope that you recognize the beneficial effect the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension will have on the San Gabriel Valley and Los Angeles County as a whole by supporting inclusion of the Foothill Extension in the Constrained Plan of Metro's Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Bill Workman</i>  <i>City Manager</i>  <i>City of Redondo Beach</i></p> <p><i>04/22/2008</i></p> <p>The Redondo Beach South Bay Galleria Regional multi-modal Transit Center should be incorporated into Metro's 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan as a regional transit center of strategic importance to regional transportation improvement, linkage and interconnection and should be added on page 41 of the Technical Document.</p> <p>The Metro Green Line extension between the South Bay Galleria and Pacific Coast Highway Harbor Transitway Station should be moved from Tier 2 further project definition status to Tier 1 status. Improvements to I-405 and I-110 freeway interchanges within the South Bay should be a priority in Metro's 2008 Long Range Transportation plan.</p> <p>Funding for installation and operation of signal synchronization along main arterials and local connectors in Redondo Beach and throughout</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is eligible to be funded through the Call for Projects and is included as a subregional priority.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

<p>the South Bay should be allocated.</p> <p>The Plan should require greater emphasis on coordination with municipal transit operators in filling service gaps and/or improving existing service levels as appropriate.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Bill Bogaard</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Pasadena</i></p> <p>04/22/2008</p> <p>Pasadena City council unanimously adopted a resolution reaffirming our support for the Gold Line Foothill Extension and we request that the project be included, with necessary local funding identified in the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan.</p> <p>The resolution also seeks a commitment in the LRTP for additional funding for capital and operating costs of local transit services and requests the LRTP recognize the on-going studies for SR-710 Freeway Extension and not presuppose the studies by defining a route for the project.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Joan English</i> <i>City of West Hollywood</i> <i>Assistant City Manager</i></p> <p>04/21/2008</p> <p>West Hollywood urges Metro to move the Westside Subway Extension (alignment should remain neutral until the alternatives alignment study is completed) from the strategic to budgeted constrained plan.</p> <p>West Hollywood expresses continued support for the Exposition Light Rail to Santa Monica project.</p> <p>West Hollywood urges Metro to add the I-10 Robertson/National Area Circulation Improvement Project to the strategic Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Westside extension is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p> <p>This project is a subregional priority and could be implemented if new funds become available.</p>



Comment (Main Points)  
Comments from the Cities and the County of Los Angeles

<p><i>Robert C. Harbicht</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Arcadia</i></p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>04/21/2008</p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Philip C. Putnam</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of South Pasadena</i></p> <p>The City of South Pasadena appreciates this opportunity to comment on the Draft 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan.</p> <p>As a first priority, South Pasadena needs to secure the complete elimination of the long-enjoined and now rescinded SR-710 surface freeway, and concomitant release from State ownership of the properties acquired for that surface route. South Pasadena does not oppose sound research of a bored tunnel alternative for SR-710, provided that the study remains "route-neutral" in fulfilling a proper purpose and need.</p> <p>The City also supports further emphasis on rail to move both goods and people in the Southern California region, and thereby reduce the present heavy reliance on motor vehicles, particularly diesel trucks.</p> <p>The City is grateful to support the 2008 LRTP in properly categorizing the "SR 710 Extension" as Strategic Unfunded. However, the Plan refers to the 710 project as either the "State Route 710 Gap Closure" or the "I-710 Extension". Both are incorrect. Caltrans identifies the project as the "State Route 710 Extension", and that reference will be used in this letter, with the request that Metro's final LRTP also conform to Caltrans' usage.</p> <p>The 710 Project cannot rank high for performance in the LRTP. The description of the project as "Add Mixed Flow + 1 HOV Lane in each Direction" is wrong, because the tunnel concept does not include an</p>	<p>04/21/2008</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Technology and alignments in the Draft 2008 Plan for both the Tier 1 and Tier 2 Unfunded Strategic highway projects are modeled for system-wide performance only.</p>

<p>HOV lane, and does not feature four lanes in each direction. Moreover, the projected cost of \$2.1 - \$2.7 billion does not conform to the extremely conservative \$3 billion cited in the 2006 Metro Technical Study.</p>	<p><i>Paul M. Eaton</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Montclair</i></p> <p>04/21/2008</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Jon Blickenstaff</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of La Verne</i></p> <p>04/07/2008</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>	
<p><i>Karen K. Davis</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Glendora</i></p> <p>04/02/2008</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>	

Comment (Main Points)  
Comments from the Cities and the County of Los Angeles

<p><i>Ellen Taylor</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Claremont</i></p> <p><i>Linda Elderkin</i> <i>Councilmember</i> <i>City of Claremont</i></p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p><i>Corey Calaycay</i> <i>Mayor Pro Tem</i> <i>City of Claremont</i></p> <p><i>Sam Pedroza</i> <i>Councilmember</i> <i>City of Claremont</i></p> <p><i>Peter S. Yao</i> <i>Councilmember</i> <i>City of Claremont</i></p> <p>04/01/2008</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Paul M. Eaton</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Montclair</i></p> <p>As Mayor of the City of Montclair, the proposed terminus of the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension from Sierra Madre Villa station to Montclair, as well as a member of San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), SANBAG's representative on the Gold Line Phase 2 Construction Authority JPA, and a member of the Southern California Regional Rail Authority, I appreciate the inclusion of the Gold Line Extension in the MTA's Draft Long Range Transportation Plan's list of Strategic Projects, but feel it falls short of meeting regional needs by not being included in the Constrained Plan.</p>	<p>04/01/2008</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

<p><i>Rob Hammond</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Monrovia</i></p> <p>03/25/2008</p> <p>The City of Monrovia urges MTA Board members to include the Metro Gold Line Foothill extension in the Long Range Plan. Extending the Metro Gold Line light rail system to the eastern edge of the San Gabriel Valley will benefit Los Angeles County by improving commuter mobility from the booming Inland Empire, providing accessible public transit to constituents countywide, alleviating traffic congestion on freeways, and improving the region's air quality index. The Foothill extension is ready to start construction. There is no right-of-way required to be purchased, all environmental reviews have been completed, there is full community support along the line, and all station locations have been sited. The only thing necessary from the Board to make this a reality is an \$80 million capital commitment and \$8 million per year for operations.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Audra McDonald</i> <i>Administrative Analyst</i> <i>City of Avalon</i></p> <p>03/25/2008</p> <p>The City of Avalon, located on Catalina Island, respectfully requests that Catalina Island and the ferry boat routes between the mainland (San Pedro and Long Beach) be included in the Long Range Planning Map.</p>	<p>Metro will consult with the subregional COG regarding more fully describing this service in the subregional chapter.</p>
<p><i>Rita L. Robinson</i> <i>General Manager</i> <i>City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation</i></p> <p>02/21/2008</p> <p>We recognize the LRTP as a key element of transportation planning in our region which identifies the transportation challenges that LA County will face through the year 2030.</p> <p>Greater attention needs to be paid to the needs and priorities of local neighborhoods/local transit markets; this should result in increased emphasis on local circulators, improved bikeways, and enhanced transit-oriented districts.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Plan dedicates funding for arterial system management, demand management, transit capital, and bicycle and pedestrian programs. These programs are funded through the Call for Projects and provide Metro and cities the opportunity to partner on regionally significant community needs.</p>

The City has recognized the importance of revitalizing the Los Angeles River and its environs; our efforts to transform the Taylor Yards area consistent with the LA River Master Plan vision have been hampered by the failure of Metro to relocate the Gold Line maintenance facility from its present location. Relocation of the facility should be addressed in the LRTP.

We look forward to working with Metro staff to substantially incorporate these comments and recommendations into the 2008 LRTP as this process proceeds to Metro Board adoption. We also look forward to a continued, mutually beneficial, close collaboration between the City and Metro as we address future transportation challenges and opportunities.

The City continues to work closely with Metro staff to amend the Congestion Management Program (CMP) and identify alternative funding sources for transportation programs. Any County-wide fee program should give credit to agencies that already have local impact fees. In addition, in any revision to the CMP, the City strongly requests that we receive "value" for our CMP credits, accumulated over many years.

Metro has deployed several longer "articulated" buses which are heavier than previous buses and the weight of the bus is not distributed evenly. The effect is to accelerate the damage to asphalt on City streets caused by bus operation. LADOT recommends that Metro make funds available to compensate the City for the impact of the heavier buses. One possible approach is for Metro to compensate the City for replacing asphalt with concrete bus lanes.

The City is concerned that the Metro Call-for-Projects, as presently

Metro is a supporter of, and actively involved in the Army Corp of Engineers process, which is focused on the revitalizing of the Los Angeles River. Metro will continue to coordinate and be actively involved with a river plan.

Metro is currently in the process of completing a comprehensive evaluation of the rail yard operating and maintenance facilities required to operate all rail and transit systems in the year 2030. The Draft 2008 Plan, however, does not include sufficient funding to relocate the Gold Line maintenance facility.

Comment noted.

Comment noted. Metro will work closely with the City on recommendations regarding the Congestion Mitigation Fee proposal.

Metro and the City of Los Angeles continue to work cooperatively on a number of infrastructure enhancements. The Draft 2008 Plan calls for implementation of bus-only lanes on the Wilshire Boulevard Bus Rapid Transitway and funding is reserved for \$200 million in 2026. Metro's buses comply with all applicable Federal and State weight limits. Because Metro's articulated buses distribute loads across three axles (and 10 wheels), they have less impact on city streets than two axle transit buses. At Gross Vehicle Weight Rated (GVWR), a 60' artic puts about 10% less weight on each tire than a typical 40' two axle transit bus.

Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan update process

administered, allows Caltrans to obtain funding for local freeway projects without local input. It is critical that local governments be allowed to review and comment on Caltrans' local freeway capital improvement projects.

LADOT continues to recommend that the LRTP reflect an emphasis on non-motorized access. In particular, bicycle and pedestrian access should be facilitated throughout the City, in order to establish an improved multi-modal transportation interface. It is our understanding that including non-motorized access as a priority in the LRTP would not significantly affect funding for other large capital improvement projects.

The City of Los Angeles requests that the following language be added to the 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan:

Major efforts are proceeding to reach a political and technical consensus regarding a preferred system of high speed transit for the region. The Los Angeles City Council has adopted a resolution in support of the high speed train system proposed by the California High-Speed Rail Authority. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has recommended a different system, known as High Speed Regional Transport (HSRT), based on magnetic levitation technology, for regional high speed transit. In an effort to determine which is the preferred system for the region, an Alternatives Study, funded by the Federal Railroad Administration, is in progress, with a projected completion date of June, 2008. Metro will monitor further planning efforts in this area, and will provide input, at the appropriate time, in order to assist the region in identifying and supporting a preferred high speed transit system.

LADOT has collaborated with the Los Angeles World Airports and the Port of Los Angeles in the preparation of this report. Further coordination on the evaluation and design of specific improvements is necessary with the Bureau of Engineering and Street Services.

identifies major transportation infrastructure capital projects such as transit and highway corridors. The Draft 2008 Plan identifies and prioritizes the Caltrans' highway capital projects for costs and schedules throughout the Plan 2030 horizon year, and the review period for the Plan is the opportunity for public comment.

Comment noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.

Comment noted. Metro is monitoring planning activities by the California High-Speed Rail Authority and the Southern California Association of Governments, and will continue to participate in these studies as they develop.

Comment noted.

Comment (Main Points)  
*Comments from the Cities and the County of Los Angeles*

<p><i>Jerry M. Givens                  Acting City Administrative Officer                  City of Inglewood</i></p> <p>The City of Inglewood requests that Metro include the La Cienega Boulevard Corridor Improvement Project into MTA's Strategic Long Range Transportation Plan</p>	<p><i>01/11/2008</i></p> <p>Comment noted. This project is a subregional priority and could be implemented if new funds become available.</p>
---	---

Comment (Main Points)

Comments from Agencies

Response

<p><i>Nicholas T. Conway</i>  <i>San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</i>  <i>Executive Director</i></p> <p>05/6/2008</p> <p>The San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments strongly recommends that the SR 710 Gap Closure and the Gold Line Foothill Extension be moved from the strategic plan into the financially constrained plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension and SR 710 Gap Closure are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Rich Macias</i>  <i>Interim Director of Planning</i>  <i>Southern California Association of Governments</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Due to Metro's LRTP adoption schedule, the final LRTP will not be available in time for consideration in SCAG's 2008 RTP update and this will require SCAG to amend the RTP at some point in the near future. The scheduling for the LRTP update should be better coordinated with the RTP to ensure a smoother regional planning process.</p> <p>SCAG encourages Metro to better coordinate its programming and long-range planning efforts to ensure that the project-level information being provided to SCAG for the RTIP and RTP are consistent with respect to project scope, schedule, cost and funding.</p> <p>The LRTP should go further in identifying and evaluating specific projects that may be strong candidates for innovative funding strategies.</p> <p>Figures 5.1 and 5.2 on pages 76 and 77 of the LRTP Technical Document refer to the Direct Travel Impact Model. Please include information on this model output in the LRTP performance discussion, including a comparison of model outputs and actual counts, such as transit boardings, screening volumes, and a comparison of the model's VMT output with Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Metro coordinated with SCAG regularly throughout the process to ensure that SCAG was aware of Metro's schedule and to ensure that all Metro constrained projects were included in the RTP.</p> <p>SCAG designed the RTIP database to be available and be edited by the jurisdictions. Since there are thousands of projects in the database, and 90 jurisdictions that have access to their own projects, it would be extremely difficult to continually check all projects to ensure that the RTIP is always consistent with the baseline projects in the LRTP.</p> <p>The Plan will include a new section on how the Plan supports public-private partnerships.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Modeling section provides an analysis based on the performance measures used in the LRTP.</p>



*Paul M. Nowatka  
South Bay Cities Council of Governments  
SBCCOG Chair  
Councilman, City of Torrance*

04/25/2008

The South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) strongly supports the Metro Green Line extension to the South Bay Galleria and beyond into the City of Torrance and requests that it be moved from Tier 2 (further project definition) to Tier 1.

Two of our cities are working on Regional Transit Centers that would be future stations for the Metro Green line – Redondo Beach which has received partial funding and Torrance which is in the initial stages. Both of these stations should be included in our list of projects on page 41 of the appendix.

The SBCCOG is very committed to working with Metro to find transit uses for the Harbor Subdivision.

The South Bay is served by Metro and several municipal operators. As Metro re-aligns their services, the need for greater coordination with the municipal transit operators becomes more important. The Plan should reinforce the coordination that is required to fill in gaps in service as well as enhancing service levels as appropriate.

Page 45 of the main report – SBCCOG is listed as 17 local jurisdictions when there are only 16.

We would encourage Metro to assist with funding projects such as the neighborhood vehicle pilot which look for non-traditional ways to maintain mobility in areas that are not heavily served by transit.

Also in the appendix on Page 38 under the bikeway and pedestrian improvement projects in our subregion, the plan lists Playa del Rey improvements. Playa del Rey is not in the South Bay subregion.

The bulk of the plan is a compendium of projects, not a strategic overview of what needs to be done to maintain even the current state of mobility in the Los Angeles County.

Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

This change will be made in the final LRTP

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment will be incorporated into the Final LRTP.

Comment noted.

In a time of aging infrastructure, SBCCOG believes that more attention and funding should be given to updating old structures such as outdated on and off ramps to freeways.

It is unclear whether the county will be able to take advantage of future innovations such as more real-time traffic management without a fund for such strategies.

The plan uses different comparison dates throughout so that it appears to use time periods to prove a point, not to show actual conditions. There are comparisons of achievement from 1980 (28 years), back to 25 years and 20 years.

Although the plan discusses a continued commitment to paratransit (Page 20), it doesn't address the impacts of an expanding senior and disabled population. How will the county respond to these changing demographics?

Flex-schedules and home offices are referred to on Page 21 but where is the plan and what level of resources will be given to this strategy? That is unclear.

While the plan discusses goods movement, it does not address the additional roadways that will be impacted in the future so that those issues can be addressed now. The I-110 is projected to carry as many trucks in 20 years as the I-710 does now. The comprehensive plan for dealing with all of the major roadways affected by the projected growth in goods movement still seems to deal with the outlying areas but not directed to those communities adjacent to the ports.

The SBCCOG has been funded by SCAG to install detectors in one or more arterials accessing the I-405 in order to more effectively manage the corridor. Such low cost strategies don't seem to be a part of this plan. Page 34 mentions integrating freeway and arterial systems but not specifically how.

Page 41 mentions a Metro Parking Policy but is very vague. What will it be and what funding will it have?

The discussion of Smart Growth Initiatives uses the Wilshire corridor

Comment noted.

Comment noted. The Transportation System Management mode of the Call for Projects program will fund \$1 billion in improvements.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted. The Transportation System Management mode of the Call for Projects program will fund \$1 billion in improvements.

Refer to the Metro Parking Policy which can be found at [www.metro.net/about\\_us/library/parking.pdf](http://www.metro.net/about_us/library/parking.pdf).

Comment noted.

as the example for implementation. Since most of L.A. County is not like the Wilshire corridor, there needs to be a strategy for helping areas with less robust transit.

When discussing programs for bicycles and pedestrians, it is stated that many of the shorter commuter trips can be made by cycling or walking. This does not acknowledge the big box phenomenon which would not be addressed by either of those two options. There is no mention (other than in the appendix under SBCCOG's list of projects) of neighborhood alternative-fueled vehicles which may be a better response for the county to look at. Additionally, when Metro funded a project to look at our transit stations for bike access, they found that the current access to the transit stations in our area was not hospitable to bikes. More attention needs to be given to transit access points and making them safer for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Comment noted.

*Douglas R. Failing  
Department of Transportation, District 7  
District Director*

04/25/2008

Convention is to define project limits in the direction of the post miles, that is from south to north and from west to east.

Comment noted.

Some projects listed in Caltrans Draft LRTP are not shown. These projects are I-210: Rosemead Blvd. to SR 57 add 5<sup>th</sup> mixed flow lane, the I-5 mixed flow and HOV lanes from I-405 to SR-14, The I-5 HOV lanes from I-10 to SR-2 and the I-5 HOV lanes from SR-2 to SR-13[sic].

Comment noted.

Of the 28 projects separately identified, 13 are either completed or under construction. This is misleading as to the magnitude of the Recommended Plan.

The 2008 LRTP programs funds from FY05 thru FY30.

One project is shown with priority over projects with greater need listed as unfunded (SR-57/SR-60 mixed-flow interchange).

Comment noted.

Project descriptions on several projects do not match Caltrans priority. Caltrans suggests the following:

Comment noted.

Complete description of project should be I-5 truck lanes (1 lane northbound from Weldon Canyon to Calgrove and 2 lanes southbound from I-5/SR-14 interchange to Pico/Lyons) and I-5 HOV lanes (northbound and southbound from I-5/SR-14 to Parker Rd).

Increased capacity not warranted on SR-14 between I-5 and Kern County Line.

Widening not warranted on SR-138 between I-5 to SR-14. Proposed developments adjacent to this route should be responsibility of developer.

Low priority for widening on I-605 (carpool lanes between I-10 and I-210) because congestion is mostly northbound and caused by termination of I-605 at I-210.

More realistic project is I-10 carpool lanes from I-110 to East LA interchange.

Low priority for widening on SR-57 (carpool lanes between SR-60 and I-210) because congestion is caused by lack of capacity on I-210.

More realistic project is SR-60 carpool lanes from I-710 to I-605.

More realistic project is SR-2 extension past current terminus at Glendale Boulevard.

Caltrans applauds the following: focus on gap closure in carpool lane system, use of technology to maximize roadway capacity and clear traffic incidents (including RIITS), congestion pricing/HOT lanes.

Comment noted.

Caltrans suggests a long range ITS program to fund the unfunded ITS programs.

Comment noted.

<p><i>Kia Mortazavi</i>  <i>Executive Director, Development</i>  <i>Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>OCTA provided a list of projects near the shared Orange/Los Angeles County border to identify coordination opportunities. OCTA also supports Metro's desire to continue delivering high-quality commuter rail service by investing in Metrolink. OCTA also acknowledges the work on the recently completed OC/LA Intercounty Transportation Study.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Honorable Art Brown</i>  <i>Chair</i>  <i>Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency</i>  <i>LOSSAN</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>LOSSAN suggested that the Plan does not identify the value of intercity rail as an integral part of the County's transportation system, and the history of its development in the region is not highlighted. Strategic unfunded improvements for intercity rail services and track capacity improvements are not included in the Public Transportation chapter. LOSSAN encourages Metro to incorporate provisions for intercity rail service in future updates of the Plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>James C. Ledford</i>  <i>Chairman</i>  <i>North County Transportation Coalition</i></p> <p>04/24/2008</p> <p>The North County Transportation Coalition (NCTC), a coalition of public sector leaders from the cities of Palmdale, Lancaster, Santa Clarita, and the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County, present the following comments:</p> <p>1) The LRTP fails to address the severe water shortage facing Los Angeles County. In response to a lack of an assured water supply, many jurisdictions are imposing measures that inhibit future growth. The MTA plan for the North County area does not address this critical issue.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The water issue is outside the purview of Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan. Metro uses SCAG's regional growth forecast for population growth assumptions.</p>

2) Discrepancies between the LRTP and SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) must be addressed in the LRTP. For instance, the High Desert Corridor is listed in SCAG's Constrained RTP, while remaining in the Strategic Unfunded category of the LRTP.

3) MTA ranked all North County projects last in the Strategic Unfunded list. NCTIC understands projects are ranked in accordance with many factors including population density. However, project ranking should give merit to projects in the North County that anticipate growth. The proposed High Desert Corridor can relieve traffic congestion in the entire Los Angeles area.

The City of Palmdale submitted miscellaneous comments:

- 1) Requested GIS and modeling data.
- 2) Noted the difference between SCAG's RTP Constrained Plan and Metro's LRTP Strategic Plan as far as the designation of the High Desert Corridor.
- 3) How will Metro address water shortage issues?
- 4) What is the true benefit associated with improving mobility/speed by 15% and air quality by 5%.
- 5) What other options were considered, besides rail and transit, to reduce total vehicles in the region?
- 6) How will congestion pricing benefit North LA County?

7) Were alternative fuels considered?

8) Do demographic assumptions require revising due to reduced water resources in the Antelope Valley?

9) Should more improvements be proposed in the Antelope Valley and North County due to the amount of projected growth?

10) SR-14 carpool lanes from Pearblossom to P-8 are complete—

Comment noted. Metro has advised SCAG of these projects that are funded in the Draft LRTP.

Comment noted. The Tier 1 and Tier 2 Unfunded Strategic highway and transit projects are analyzed on their system-wide performance of the transportation system both now and in the 2030 future, using existing and future populations and employment forecasts.

Please see Technical Document for summary of modeling and performance data.

Comment noted. Metro has advised SCAG of these projects that are funded in the Draft LRTP.

The water issue is outside the purview of Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan.

This reflects a systemwide improvement in mobility and air quality.

The plan recommends a evaluates major highway and transit projects, and reserves funding for other programs, such as arterial, bike, pedestrian and goods movement programs.

Results of the Congestion Pricing demonstration project will be assessed in future LRTP updates regarding applicability to other areas.

Clean fuels are discussed on page 67 of the Technical Document.

Metro is responsible for using the SCAG regional forecasts.

The Plan is based on performance analysis that considers projected growth

The financial model programs funds from FY 2005 – 2030.

- why are they in the Plan?
- 11) SR-14 carpool lanes from P-8 to Ave L will not open til 2027 but will likely be required sooner given growth projections.
  - 12) Plan should look at sustainability and identify means to address growth rather than react with transportation projects that will not be constructed due to funding shortfalls.
  - 13) Suggested adding several projects to the project list.
  - 14) Suggested including projects from the 2007 Call for Projects in the LRTP.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

Projects listed in the Technical Document are unfunded priorities whereas projects from the 2007 Call for Projects are funded.

The City of Lancaster submitted miscellaneous comments:

- 1) What is justification for all Antelope Valley projects being listed at the bottom of the Strategic Unfunded list—how can it be changed?

The Tier 1 and Tier 2 Unfunded Strategic highway and transit projects are analyzed on their system-wide performance of the transportation system both now and in the 2030 future, using existing and future populations and employment forecasts.

- 2) How can Regional Surface Transportation Improvements projects be verified on an individual basis since an aggregate cost of projects is listed.

The plan reserves funding for future RSTI projects that are selected through the Call for Projects process.

- 3) Suggested revisions to the description of the North Los Angeles County subregion in the Plan.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

- 4) Suggested revisions to the description of the North Los Angeles County subregion in the Technical Document.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

- 5) Suggested numbering the projects on pages 27 through 30.

Comment noted.

- 6) Suggested revisions to project descriptions.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

- 7) Suggested revisions to subregional discussion in Technical Document.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

The County of Los Angeles submitted miscellaneous comments:

- 1) Suggested revisions to project descriptions.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

The City of Santa Clarita submitted miscellaneous comments:

- 1) Suggested promoting alternatives modes of transportation.
- 2) Suggested increasing Metrolink service on the Antelope Valley line.
- 3) Suggested including projects from the 2007 Call for Projects in the LRTP.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Projects listed in the Technical Document are unfunded priorities whereas projects from the 2007 Call for Projects are funded.

- 4) Suggested revisions to project descriptions.

Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.

<p><i>Linda J. Briskman</i>  <i>Chair</i>  <i>Westside Cities Council of Governments</i></p> <p>Please support the following 3 projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Exposition light rail to Santa Monica.</li> <li>2) Westside Subway Extension.</li> <li>3) I-10/Robertson/National Area Circulation Improvement.</li> </ol>	<p>04/18/2008</p> <p>The Exposition Light Rail is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding. The Westside Subway project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is identified as a subregional priority and could be funded if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Terry Dipple</i>  <i>Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments</i>  <i>Executive Director</i></p> <p>The Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments respectfully requests that the Metro Board include US 101 Corridor improvements in the constrained portion of the 2008 LRTP.</p>	<p>04/14/2008</p> <p>This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>



*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Dr. Adrian T. Moore</i> <i>Vice President</i> <i>Reason Foundation</i></p> <p>04/28/2008</p> <p>Supports public-private partnerships and congestion pricing strategies and suggests that the roadway spending should receive the majority of funding as well as HOT lanes. Metro Rapid buses on HOT lanes along the entire freeway network should improve travel times. Toll truckways serving the ports should be included in the funded plan, and additional links to Riverside along the SR 60 and between Glendale and Palmdale should also be included.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>James Watt McCormick</i> <i>Coalition for Rapid Transit</i></p> <p>04/28/08</p> <p>Suggests that Metro more aggressively seek to deliver a grade separated public rapid transit system. Supports the Wilshire Blvd. Subway to the Sea, regrets that it is not included in the funded portion of the plan.</p>	<p>This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Darrell Clarke</i> <i>Sierra Club Angeles Chapter Transportation co-chair</i> <i>Sierra Club</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>The Sierra Club provides comments on projects for the Recommended Plan including: support for Expo Phase II and the Gold Line Foothill Extension to Azusa only if it does not jeopardize funding for Expo Phase II, operational funding for a privately constructed Metro Green Line extension to LAX, zero-emission buses beyond the 15% minimum and consideration for Electric Trolley Buses, and additional funding for bicycles, pedestrians and “complete streets”. Tier 1 Projects are generally supported although it is noted that most of the projects are east-west and not north-south. The Burbank/Glendale Light Rail project and the West Santa Ana Branch ROW Corridor Project should be moved to Tier 2 Projects, while the I-405 Corridor Busway should be considered as Tier 1. Metrolink service should be expanded to provide 30 minute headways and</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

electrification should also be considered. The I-10/Robertson/National Blvd. Circulation Improvement Project should be added to the Strategic Plan in addition to the conversion of HOV lanes to HOT lanes. The Plan should more explicitly document evaluation criteria for mobility, air quality, global warming and sustainable energy. Metro should consider shifting its bus operations from fossil fuels to sustainable energy. The Plan should identify the sources and uses of funding by project type.

*Stephanie Taylor  
Transportation Work Group Coordinator  
Green LA*

*04/25/2008*

Suggests a different set of performance criteria for projects. Alternatives other than a “no build” are not presented. Suggests that Metro set ambitious goals for increasing mode share for transit bicycles and pedestrians and fund these modes accordingly. Metro should shift from fossil fuels to sustainable electric power. Suggests more detail be made available in assumptions, and data used in preparation of the Plan. Proposes that Metro shift resources from road building to transit, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, expand local and Metro Rapid systems, purchase more low and zero emissions buses, create more bus only lanes, introduce electric trolleybuses, consider potential upgrading of existing transit infrastructure (for example, Orange Line Busway to Light Rail), research and study the effect of fare pricing on ridership levels. Also suggests the I-405 Corridor Busway Project be moved from Strategic Unfunded Tier 2 to Tier 1.

Comments noted.

*Comments from Organizations*

*Marianne Kim  
Principle Public Policy Analyst  
Automobile Club of Southern California*

04/25/2008

The Draft Plan does not assume an increase in federal and state fuel excise tax rates, which is inconsistent with SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan. Suggests that the Plan contain descriptions of possible revenue generating strategies for transportation funding, and that list of projects in the constrained and strategic plans are incomplete. Identifies an inconsistency with the amounts shown for the Call for Projects funding between the Plan and Technical Documents, and the status of Goods Movement funding.

Comments noted. Regarding the Call for Projects funding, the Final Plan document will reflect consistent Call for Projects funding levels.

*Denny Zane  
Executive Director*

*Los Angeles County Transportation Funding Collaborative/Move LA*

04/25/2005

Considering the financial constraints limiting additional capacity to the transit system, Move LA suggests a ½ cent sales tax measure for more funding. Plan goals and objectives should be more clearly articulated and used for weighting, investments for highway/freeway system need to be justified against environmental criteria. Also a near-term, five-year program needs to be developed to improve the existing system, especially the bus system and Metro should encourage if not require transit and pedestrian-oriented policies of communities expecting to receive funding or local project investments from Metro.

Comments noted. The Plan seeks to explore new and innovative funding strategies as a way of generating needed sources of revenue for projects.

*Barbara Broide  
President*

*Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd Homeowner's Association*

04/25/2008

Homeowner's Association supports continued funding for Expo Phases 1 & 2, moving the Subway Extension to La Cienega and Santa Monica from Tier 1 of the Strategic Unfunded Plan to the Constrained Plan on a priority basis when funding is identified, and place the I-10/Robertson/National Blvd. Circulation Improvement Project in the Strategic Plan.

The Expo Project Phases 1 & 2 is in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding. The Westside Extension is in the Strategic Unfunded Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available. The I-10/Robertson/National Blvd. project is a subregional priority that could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Sharon Sandow President/CEO West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce</i></p> <p>The Chamber supports the inclusion of Expo Phase 2 in the Constrained Plan. The Chamber also supports the Westside Subway Extension, however notes the Plan identifies an alignment along Wilshire Boulevard.</p>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Comments noted. The maps depicting the Westside Subway Extension will be modified in the Final Plan.</p>
<p><i>Manuel Criollo Lead Organizer Bus Riders Union</i></p> <p><i>Barbara Lott-Holland Co-Chair, Planning Committee Bus Riders Union</i></p> <p>The Bus Riders Union (BRU) suggests that expansion of the bus system and bus fleet is the most effective method to improve transit and attract new riders. Fare reductions are also cited as a proven method for increasing ridership. The BRU does not support the proposal to increase debt service payments of Prop C funds as this might threaten discretionary operations and bus capital funds. The BRU suggests bus-only lanes as a cost effective method of reducing automobile travel.</p>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>James V. Camp Board Member National Association of Industrial and Office Properties</i></p> <p>Innovative financing methods such as private-public partnerships and transit oriented joint development must be evaluated.</p> <p>Since VMT is increasing, additional lane miles should be added to accommodate this and to increase mobility.</p>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Comments noted. The Draft 2008 Plan seeks to explore new and innovative funding strategies such as tolling and congestion pricing, public/private partnerships, and a countywide congestion mitigation fee, including local sources that would help fund arterials and other local improvements.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

Our region is “shouldering” the movement of goods to the rest of the state and country, with little tax money returned from Washington, D.C. The Cities and the County must work together in a strong unified voice to get our “fair share” .

To save construction costs, HOV lanes and light rail lines can be elevated above existing rights-of-way (to save on purchasing the land needed).

Rail expansion is good and there should be more (Gold Line Foothill Extension, Green Line Extension to LAX). The rail lines should all be connected.

*Melody Kanschat  
President  
Los Angeles County Museum of Art*

04/25/2008

I am writing on behalf of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, to express this institution’s strong support for several transportation alternatives that are being studied as part of the MTA’s ongoing alternative analysis and long range plan development.

We believe like other major world cities a vibrant Los Angeles of the future must expand its heavy-rail subway reach throughout the metro area. We have developed our master real estate plan to allow for accommodating a major subway stop at Wilshire and Fairfax and/or Wilshire and Ogdan Boulevard.

We support the proposed subway extension Wilshire alignment option

As ardent supporter of the acceleration of the MTA’s plans for the subway to the sea, we have made our facilities available for community meetings and are happy to continue to do so.

The Plan includes a Goods Movement Chapter that highlights the importance of goods movement strategies.

Comment noted.

Comment noted. The Strategic Plan (Unfunded) identifies various rail projects that could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

Comment noted.

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Susan Yackley President The Yackley Group</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>We have assembled a list of 213 signatures of people who support the Subway Westside Extension to La Cienega and then to the sea.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Jennifer Klausner Executive Director Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition</i></p> <p>04/24/2008</p> <p>Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition would like to see bicycle transportation play a much larger role in Metro's long range transportation planning and for budget allocations to reflect this.</p> <p>The Draft Long Range Transportation Plan advocates for alternatives to driving alone, citing strategies such as transit-oriented development, smart-growth, energy efficiency and Complete Streets. In fact, bicycle transportation will play an important role in all of these strategies.</p> <p>In these times of budget constraints and environmental concerns, the cost-effective and sustainable solutions that bicycle transportation offers deserve to be more than an afterthought in long range planning; they should be made a strategic priority.</p> <p>To that end we strongly recommend the following: 1) increase funding; 2) prioritize inclusion of bicycle facilities in all projects; 3) score projects with bicycle elements higher; 4) provide bicycle education for agency staff; 5) encourage and facilitate multi-modal trips by expanding bicycle commuter parking at Metro stations, accommodating more bikes on buses, providing more space for bikes on trains, and assuring continuous bikeways along rail lines; 6) expanding bicycle promotion; and 7) expanding bicycle education.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Eli Lipman Director of Energy Security Program American Jewish Committee</i></p> <p>04/24/2008</p> <p>Expressed support for the mobility options described in the Draft 2008 Plan, particularly increased public transit, and coordination with cities and Municipal Transit Operators for easier access to transit stops and destinations. Also expressed support for public-private partnerships as a way to finance public transit alternatives.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Draft 2008 Plan seeks to explore new and innovative funding strategies such as tolling and congestion pricing, public/private partnerships, and a countywide congestion mitigation fee, including local sources that would help fund arterials and other local improvements.</p>
<p><i>Habib F. Balian Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority</i></p> <p>04/24/2008</p> <p>Various concerns over the performance analysis used to rank strategic transit projects including: total cost of Foothill Extension was used instead of Metro's contribution to project cost, the Corridor Need characteristic is spurious, that certain measures were not considered in the analysis including construction duration, project readiness, legislative priority, and the fact that funded projects that have not advanced through alternatives analysis were not analyzed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. In May 2006, the Metro Board adopted the performance measures to be used to evaluate unfunded transportation projects, and the results are reflected in the Draft 2008 Plan.</p>
<p><i>Roger Christensen Chairperson Metro Citizens' Advisory Council</i></p> <p>04/24/2008</p> <p>The Metro Citizens' Advisory Council has voted to support the Draft 2008 Long Range Plan. We understand the financial challenges and hope that the Board and Metro staff will continue to search for efficiencies.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Brendan L. Huffman President &amp; CEO Valley Industry &amp; Commerce Association</i></p> <p>04/24/2008</p> <p>We are glad that Metro has gone to great lengths to develop a substantive plan to address many of our region's most pressing transportation infrastructure concerns.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

VICA has identified four primary areas which we believe need to be addressed:

- 1) Improvement of the 101/134 corridor, including the addition of a connector between the 170 and 134 freeways.
- 2) Improvement of the Sepulveda Pass. This could come either in the form of freeway improvement/expansion, or by the construction of transit infrastructure in the form of light rail.
- 3) Extend the Orange Line to more of the San Fernando Valley's larger residential and employment centers as well as connecting it with more regional public transportation modes.
- 4) We support extending Metro's Red Line further into the San Fernando Valley, either above or below ground.

*Jack Babbitt  
Chair*

*Wilmington Neighborhood Council*

*04/23/2008*

Suggests higher commuter transit use if it was faster than freeway travel; light or high speed rail along freeway medians would be an incentive for increasing ridership. Accelerate the implementation of traffic improvements to gain 11% travel time reduction. Promote incentives for ride-share, staggered shifts, 4-day work weeks, telecommuting, etc. The \$12.2 million allocated to the bicycle plan would be better utilized on regional goods movement. Initiate legislation to prevent the State from using gas taxes for purposes other than transportation. Provide incentives for mixed-use development to reduce commutes, increase affordable housing and create jobs.

Comment noted. The Strategic Plan identifies carpool lanes on the 101 corridor as improvements that could be done if new funds become available.

Comment noted. A busway on I-405 between the Westside and San Fernando Valley has been proposed in the Strategic Plan and could be implemented if new funds become available.

This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

Comment noted.

Comments noted.



*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Paul J. Dyson President Rail Passenger Association of California</i></p> <p><i>04/23/2008</i></p> <p>The Plan doesn't mention intercity passenger train service provided by Amtrak and Caltrans. This service between San Luis Obispo and San Diego provides mobility for the residents of Los Angeles County and benefits County residents by reducing congestion and pollution.</p> <p>The Plan fails to recognize the benefit of investment in Metrolink service in the northwest, north, and northeast San Fernando Valley. The many miles of single track railroad severely limits capacity and extends the journey time for passengers, while any disruption to service is exacerbated. The MTA should emulate Orange County by using Metrolink as the core system for the San Fernando Valley, fed by coordinated bus services. MTA should also explore the electrification of the Metrolink system.</p> <p>The MTA should be supporting the Los Angeles Union Station run through tracks project.</p> <p>RailPAC considers the best use for the MTA owned right of way known as the Harbor Subdivision linking downtown with LAX and the South Bay is to open it as a continuation of the Metrolink system.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Harbor Subdivision Corridor is currently under study.</p>
<p><i>Michael L. Miller Chairman San Gabriel Valley Legislative Coalition of Chambers</i></p> <p><i>04/23/2008</i></p> <p>We urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Ron Wood President &amp; CEO San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership</i></p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>04/23/2008</p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Gerald A. Silver President Homeowners of Encino</i></p> <p>Our organization requests that no funding or further study of any expansion project on the 101 freeway be approved. We strongly oppose adding any additional lanes in either direction on the freeway.</p>	<p>04/23/2008</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Tenants &amp; Building Mgrnt Lake Corson Building (266 signatures)</i></p> <p>We strongly urge the MTA to re-classify the Gold Line Foothill Extension/San Gabriel Valley from the Tier 1 unfunded to the funded projects.</p>	<p>04/23/2008</p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>James V. Camp Board Member National Association of Industrial and Office Properties</i></p> <p>We urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>04/23/2008</p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Carol E. Schatz President &amp; CEO Central City Association of Los Angeles</i></p> <p>04/22/2008</p> <p>Requests that the streetcar system in Downtown Los Angeles be placed in the Strategic Unfunded Tier 2 category.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Scott Carr Partner Transcending Pictures</i></p> <p>04/21/2008</p> <p>We commend the MTA on its extensive accomplishments during the past 25 years and the extensive work that has been undertaken by your staff to identify and fund alternative modes of transportation to help reduce congestion, minimize travel times, and improve the environment. The Transportation Council of the Century City Chamber of Commerce has reviewed Metro's 2008 Draft Long Term Transportation Plan and we are pleased that Phases 1 and 2 of the Exposition Light Rail Project are included in the Recommended Draft Plan.</p> <p>The next critical priority is the westward extension of the subway. Only such a high-capacity alternative can meet the already high demand for travel to Century City and key Westside destinations.</p> <p>We also support a north/south connector from Expo light rail to Century City and parking facilities at the Expo stations; expansion of Rapid bus services, including Metro, Santa Monica, Culver City, and Commuter Express, to and from Century City-especially after 5:30PM to accommodate the needs of employees; and a transportation connector between Beverly Hills and Century City.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Thomas M. Priselac President &amp; CEO Cedars-Sinai Health System</i></p> <p>Please support the following 3 projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Exposition light rail to Santa Monica.</li> <li>2) Westside Subway Extension.</li> <li>3) I-10/Robertson/National Area Circulation Improvement.</li> </ol>	<p><i>04/21/2008</i></p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is a subregional priority and could be implemented if new funds become available.</p>
<p><i>Blaine P. Fetter Samuelson &amp; Fetter</i></p> <p>We urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p><i>04/21/2008</i></p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Diane B. Dixon Senior Vice President Avery Denison</i></p> <p>We urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p><i>04/21/2008</i></p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Diana Stoney Secretary Citizens United to Save South Pasadena</i></p> <p>04/21/2008</p> <p>Remarks that adding freeway lanes or closing gaps shifts gridlock and air pollution to other areas. Comments that it is irresponsible to include the 710 gap closure project in the LRTP as feasibility studies have just begun, in contrast, priority should be given to the Gold Line Foothill Extension.</p>	<p>Comments noted. These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Ray Schuldenfrei President Outpost Estates Homeowners Association</i></p> <p>04/20/2008</p> <p>The Outpost Estates Homeowners Association represents approximately 450 homes between Runyon Canyon Park and the Hollywood Bowl. The Homeowners Association does not support the widening of US 101 between SR-27 and SR-2 in Downtown Los Angeles; neither the east-west segment, particularly as it crosses the Cahuenga Pass due to the elimination of parallel roadways or the north-south segment south of the 134 Interchange as it duplicates the Metro Red Line. The Homeowners Association requests that maps depicting the potential Westside Subway extension show an alignment west from Hollywood and Highland.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The maps depicting the Strategic Westside Subway extension will be revised for the Final LRTP.</p>
<p><i>Montclair Chamber of Commerce</i></p> <p>04/17/2008</p> <p>Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension needs your support. They ask Metro to reconsider our decision and place this important project in the final transportation plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Renee A. Fortier Transportation Director UCLA</i></p> <p>We urge the Metro Board to prioritize and fund a heavy rail line (subway) to the Westside of Los Angeles. Given existing congestion and delay on the Westside and the forecasted degradation of traffic conditions, we urge the Board to move the "Subway to the Sea" project to the funded portion of the Plan.</p>	<p>04/17/2008</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Nat B. Read Chair 710 Freeway Coalition</i></p> <p>Coalition advocates completing 710 gap closure with a tunnel commissioned a study that suggests that tolls are needed to raise revenue to complete the project, a third category is needed for L RTP projects i.e., "potential revenue producing projects", these projects must be financially constrained, the project studies should include a "public sector comparator", public and private examples can be offered as models and state legislation will be needed.</p>	<p>04/17/2008</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SR-710 gap closure is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Gretchen Lewotsky Vice President State and Local Government Affairs Environmental Operation Fox Entertainment Group</i></p> <p>As a member of the Transportation Council of the Century City Chamber of Commerce we have reviewed Metro's 2008 Draft Long Term Transportation Plan and are pleased that Phases 1 and 2 of the Exposition Light Rail Project are included in the Recommended Draft Plan. The next critical priority is the westward extension of the subway.</p> <p>Other improvements we support include a north/south connector from Expo Light Rail to Century City, parking facilities at the Expo stations, expansion of Rapid bus services to/from Century City and a transportation connector between Beverly Hills and Century City.</p>	<p>04/16/2008</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Westside extension is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

*KyMBERLEIGH RICHARDS  
Public & Legislative Affairs Director  
Southern California Transit Advocates*

04/14/2008

Our organization is in basic agreement with most of the projects and their rankings in the LRTP.

Comment noted.

The Burbank/Glendale light rail project has not received sufficient study to qualify it for inclusion in the Tier 1 Strategic Unfunded project list. We suggest this project be moved to Tier 2.

Comment noted. The Burbank/Glendale Light Rail project was environmentally cleared in the past and therefore met the definition for inclusion in the first tier that includes projects currently under study or environmentally cleared and/or had route refinement studied.

The West Santa Ana Branch ROW Corridor Maglev project requires a significant amount of additional study before it would qualify as a Tier 1 project and we suggest that it also be moved to Tier 2.

Comment noted. The West Santa Ana Branch ROW Maglev project, as currently under study with the Orange line Development Authority, meets the definition for inclusion in the first tier.

The I-405 Corridor Busway project under Tier 2 Strategic Unfunded has been significantly studied under the Metro Connections project. The San Fernando Valley and Westside/Central service sector governance councils last year put forward a joint motion for expediting an express bus service in the northern half of this corridor. We suggest this qualifies as a Tier 1 project, especially as the remaining HOV lanes on I-405 are already in the constrained plan.

Comment noted. The I-405 Corridor Busway project still requires a transit corridor study plan process to evaluate route, mode, alternatives, cost-effectiveness, environmental impacts, and mitigations in order to meet the definition for inclusion in the first tier.

As gaps in the HOV lane network are filled, the opportunity exists for additional express bus service and we urge that feasibility studies be performed as completion dates for these projects grow closer.

Comment noted.

*Comments from Organizations*

*Harold L. Katz  
Senior Partner  
Katz, Fram & Co.*

*04/10/2008*

On behalf of Katz, Fram & Co., MTA is to be commended on its extensive accomplishments during the past 25 years. Now we have to face the next 25 years, and for the first time the public must be educated to the fact that what is planned for and built now is to serve the community over a 50-100 year period. Century City, with its 40,000 jobs, is an important driver of the economy in greater Los Angeles. Transportation improvements that serve Century City enhance mobility throughout the region. Also, MTA should be congratulated on its outreach program through community meetings.

The Century City Chamber of Commerce is pleased that Phases 1 and 2 of the Exposition light rail project are included in the Recommended Draft Plan. The next critical priority is the westward extension of the Subway to the Sea. Only such a high-capacity alternative can meet the already high demand for travel to Century City and key Westside destinations. It must be stressed that most of the benefits will go to those who live in other parts of Los Angeles and travel to work in Century City or the Westside.

Other improvements supported by our firm include: A north/south connector from Expo light rail to Century City, and parking facilities at the Expo stations.

Expansion of Rapid bus services, including Metro, Santa Monica, Culver City, and Commuter Express to and from Century City – especially after 5:30PM to accommodate the needs of employees.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.



<p><i>Judy R. Pons</i> President Arcadia Chamber of Commerce</p> <p><i>Beth Costanza</i> Executive Director</p> <p><i>Gil Stromsoe</i> Past President</p> <p><i>Beth Costanza</i> Government Affairs Forum Chairman</p> <p>The Arcadia Chamber of Commerce urges the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>04/08/2008</p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Jim Short</i> Certified Public Accountant Montgomery, Niemeyer &amp; Co.</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>04/08/2008</p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Harriet A. Johnson</i> President Residents' Association of Westminster Gardens</p> <p>Please provide funding and construction of the Gold Line Extension at the earliest possible date.</p>	<p>04/08/2008</p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Edward C. Ortell</i> President, Board of Trustees Citrus College</p> <p><i>Michael J. Viera</i> Superintendent/President Citrus College</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>04/07/2008</p> <p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Mary Ann Powell CEO/General Manager Pacific Park</i></p> <p><i>04/04/2008</i></p> <p>The Westside is a crucial economic engine for Southern California. It has more than 650,000 jobs and more than 61 million square feet of rentable office space. Our organization is pleased to see Phase II of the Exposition light rail line in Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan.</p> <p>It is also great to see the Westside Subway Extension in the LRTP. The "Subway to the Sea" from downtown to Santa Monica will serve as a vital transportation link in this congested region.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Tajquah J. Hudson Vice President, Strategy &amp; Business Development Saint John's Health Center</i></p> <p><i>Lou Lazatin President &amp; CEO Saint John's Health Center</i></p> <p><i>LaTisha Starbuck Vice President, Mission &amp; Ethics Saint John's Health Center</i></p> <p><i>04/04/2008</i></p> <p>The Westside is a crucial economic engine for Southern California. It has more than 650,000 jobs and more than 61 million square feet of rentable office space. Our organization is pleased to see Phase II of the Exposition light rail line in Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan.</p> <p>It is also great to see the Westside Subway Extension in the LRTP. The "Subway to the Sea" from downtown to Santa Monica will serve as a vital transportation link in this congested region.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Paul A. Larsen Milam &amp; Larsen, LLP</i></p> <p>04/03/2008</p> <p>Milam &amp; Larsen, LLP is a law firm located in Pasadena. I am a resident of Monrovia. Both this firm and I strongly support fully funding the Gold Line Foothill Extension from the Sierra Madre Villa station through Azusa and ultimately to Ontario Airport. The members and employees of this firm already use the Gold Line as much as we can, but our use is substantially restricted by the abrupt end at Sierra Madre Villa.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Susan Bursk President &amp; CEO Century City Chamber of Commerce</i></p> <p>04/01/2008</p> <p>The Century City Chamber of Commerce would like to see the following transportation projects considered among your top priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A subway connection into Century City.</li> <li>Extension of light rail along the Exposition route: Phase 2 to Santa Monica.</li> <li>A north/south connector from Expo light rail to Century City and parking facilities at the Expo stations.</li> <li>Expansion of Rapid bus services, including Metro, Santa Monica, Culver City, and Commuter Express, to and from Century City – especially after 5:30PM to accommodate the needs of employees.</li> <li>Transportation connector between Beverly Hills and Century City.</li> </ul> <p>Please avoid short-sighted quick fixes such as the lack of over/under passes along the Expo route, and make sure the subway extension is built wide enough to accommodate express trains in the future.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

*Michael L. Miller  
Chairman  
San Gabriel Valley Legislative Coalition of Chambers*

*03/31/2008*

The San Gabriel Valley Legislative Coalition of Chambers of Commerce is very disappointed that the MTA has not included the Metro Gold Line Foothill extension in the Long Range Transportation Plan. For less than 5 percent of the money allocated for the projects to be completed in 2010 or less than 2 percent of all the funding for Metro rail projects, the people in the county will get one step closer to a rail system that connects to Ontario Airport and sends people to Los Angeles from the airport. The Coalition of Chambers strongly recommends the MTA Board allocate \$80 million for the next phase of the Metro Gold Line Foothill extension.

Comment noted. We note that given a lack of revenues from traditional funding sources and a significant spike in the construction costs, the 2008 Plan is unable to fund any additional projects not funded in the 2001 Plan. As a result, the Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

*Leron Gubler  
President & CEO  
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce*

*03/27/2008*

Urge the MTA Board to expand the subway system to Los Angeles' Westside.

While our organization supports the ultimate vision of a "subway to the sea", we believe a more strategic approach would be to proceed with the leg from Hollywood & Highland through West Hollywood to connect with the Wilshire Blvd alignment prior to extending the subway beyond the 405 freeway.

Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

During the transit corridor study planning process, specific right-of-way alignments are considered.

*Comments from Organizations*

*Steven Karr  
President*

*South Pasadena Preservation Foundation*

*03/24/2008*

The SR-710 project is not designated correctly in the Draft 2008 Technical Document. Supports the classification of the SR-710 Gap Closure project as Tier 2 project, not Tier 1 due to the change in scope of the project, lack of environmental study, and changes to cost estimates.

Comment noted. The correction will be made to the SR-710 designation will be made in the Final LRTP Technical Document.

As a result, the Draft 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan has identified a Strategic Plan, which identifies projects that are important to our county and could be implemented if new funding sources become available. The SR-710 Gap Closure is one of those projects on our Strategic Plan list. Projects that are in the Strategic Plan are not considered baseline projects. In addition, placing the project on the Strategic Plan does not impact or predetermine the route of the SR-710 Gap Closure. Metro plans to move forward with an objective preliminary engineering and technical study.

*Aviv Tuchman  
President*

*Westwood Homeowners Association*

*03/21/2008*

We are very much in favor of a subway to the Westside of Los Angeles to the ocean. While we understand that various routes are under consideration, we would very much like to ensure that there is a stop in Century City and in Westwood Village.

Comment noted. The Westside extension is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

It is also very important to our constituents that the subway not tunnel under our houses.

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>James E. Henwood President Fairplex</i></p> <p>Our organization urges the MTA Board to move the vital Foothill extension project from the Strategic Unfunded category into the Recommended and Budgeted Plan.</p>	<p><i>03/21/2008</i></p> <p>Comment noted. We note that given a lack of revenues from traditional funding sources and a significant spike in the construction costs, the 2008 Plan is unable to fund any additional projects not funded in the 2001 Plan. As a result, the Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Daniel C. Walsh CEO &amp; President Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce</i></p> <p>Our organization urges the MTA Board to support the proposed, but currently unfunded, extension of the Red Line to the Westside, popularly known as the Subway to the Sea. We recommend that the Red Line continue along Wilshire from the Wilshire/Western station through Beverly Hills, then turning southwest under Santa Monica Blvd to Century City, then to points further west (Westwood and Santa Monica).</p>	<p><i>03/18/2008</i></p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Denny Zane Executive Director Subway to the Sea Coalition</i></p> <p>One of the most significant opportunities before the Metro Board is the opportunity once again to begin the planning and development of the Wilshire Blvd subway, the Subway to the Sea.</p> <p>We are pleased to see the Subway to the Sea recognized as an essential Tier 1 project in the Strategic portion of the Long Range Plan and accept the very practical arrangement whereby inclusion of the Subway is organized in two phase.</p> <p>We only regret that, as of today, Metro is unable to include the Subway to the Sea as part of the funded portion of the plan.</p>	<p><i>No Date</i></p> <p>Comment noted. The Westside extension is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

*Irwindale Chamber of Commerce*

The Irwindale Chamber of Commerce applauds Congress member Solis, Dreier and Schiff for their bipartisan support of Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension. We hope all legislators in the San Gabriel Valley will come together to encourage the Metropolitan Transportation Authority to place funding for this project as a highest priority.

*No Date*

Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Number of Written Comments Received (over 50)</i></p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Metro Subway Westside Extension Number of Written Comments Received (several)</i></p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the development of a subway or light rail system connecting the downtown Los Angeles area with the Westside in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is (these projects are) included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Mark Egerman Jeffery S. Levine Allan L. Alexander</i></p> <p>Please support the following 3 projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Exposition light rail to Santa Monica.</li> <li>2) Westside Subway Extension.</li> <li>3) I-10/Robertson/National Area Circulation Improvement.</li> </ol>	<p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is a subregional priority and could be implemented if new funds become available.</p>



*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Gerald J. Pass</i></p> <p>I am very interested in seeing the entire Expo Rail Line fully funded as well as completed, downtown LA to Santa Monica</p> <p>As an Ontario resident for over forty years, I urge you to include the Gold Line Foothill Extension in your final transit phase funding and it must be a priority.</p>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p>This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p>
<p><i>Thomas A. Rubin</i></p> <p>Comments that not all options for transportation were considered in the Draft 2008 Plan including inter-county and longer trips, projects in the “baseline” were not evaluated, expansion of the bus system as an alternative to other transit and non-transit projects was not studied, and that the impact to transit system users of its guideway transit-priority has not been considered.</p>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Comments noted. The Draft 2008 Plan was developed in accordance with the process and performance measures applied by the Board at the beginning of the Plan update process.</p>
<p><i>Nicholas Lake</i></p> <p>Does not support conversion of carpool lanes to toll lanes, and various comments regarding restoration of former Red/Yellow Cars, extension of rail system (maps provided), replacement of CNG by electric/solar power for buses, support of grid system over hub and spoke, transit service should be run all night, replace the Orange Line with light rail, lower fares, merge MTA and Metrolink.</p>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Clara Solis</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Metro's major priorities should be to increase the public's use of public transportation and use its policies to improve the environment and health of LA County residents.</p> <p>Supports increasing the gas tax to allow free rides on all public transportation.</p> <p>More minibuses and shuttles should be provided along the Gold, Blue, Green and Red Lines.</p> <p>Provide very recognizable MTA bikes that could be used and left at various MTA sites.</p> <p>Opposes congestion pricing on carpool lanes.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Barbara Monahan Burke and Rita C. Villa</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Studio City residents expressed concern that the existing infrastructure is beyond capacity and no resources are identified to support the density projected in the Draft 2008 Plan. Does not support carpool lanes being added to the US 101 Freeway, which would cause unmitigated environmental impacts and identifies community opposition to the project. Object to the limited exposure for public comment on the LRTP.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Jim Shafer</i> 04/24/2008</p> <p>Requests 11 items to be added to the LRTP: Downtown Connector; Westside subway extension; second set of Metrolink tracks for service every 15 minutes; shuttle buses like DASH circulating around each rail station; goals to get the 12-minute map to become a 5-minute map; modify the Harbor Freeway Transitway to resemble the branding of the Orange Line; modify I-10 bus lanes to resemble branding like the Orange Line; use turnstiles with a station agent in a booth at each gate; start a Dodger Stadium Shuttle, or a spur off the Gold Line; create a pedestrian tunnel between the Orange Line and the Red Line stations in North Hollywood; create a pedestrian tunnel from the Pershing Square Red Line station to Broadway; and charge a toll to all freeway users to fund transit projects.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Jean L. Tardy-Valleraud</i> 04/24/2008</p> <p>Supports Expo Phases 1 and 2.</p> <p>Supports extending Westside subway, north/south connector from Expo to Century City and parking facilities at Expo, expansion of Metro Rapid especially after 5:30 PM, and a transportation connector between Beverly Hills and Century City.</p>	<p>These projects are included in the Constrained Plan and are recommended for funding.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Rufus Clark IV</i> 04/23/2008</p> <p>Suggests improvements on Metro buses to assist hearing impaired passengers, including keeping fare structure information in clear view on the fare box, and adding LED destination readers on bus and train ceilings so passengers know where they are.</p> <p>Metrolink should consider straightening out some curves so that trains can go faster and be more competitive with freeways. Supports more trains. Requests to slow the construction of all freeways.</p> <p>Supports construction of a Metrolink tunnel through the San Gabriel Mountains to Palmdale.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Charles A. Adelman</i> 04/22/2008</p> <p>The Draft Long Range Transportation Plan is a fatally flawed document. It is a blueprint for failure, a recipe for disaster. There are three inter-connected problems that our LRTP needs to address: traffic congestion, air pollution, and global warming.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Herbert E. Youngren</i> 04/21/2008</p> <p>The corner of Fairfax and 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave has only one bus bench and many elderly people waiting for one of four buses, while across the street there are two bus benches. One bench should be moved across Fairfax to the Farmers Market side of the street.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p>
<p><i>Phillip Jon Brown</i> 04/20/2008</p> <p>There is not enough of a plan for transportation improvement for the Westside LA Basin area. The specific need is to develop a system of BRT in smart growth corridors.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Annette Mercer</i> 04/20/2008</p> <p>The completion of the Exposition Line to Santa Monica (in the funded portion of the plan) is critical to serving the population and employment centers west of downtown.</p> <p>The extension of the subway to Century City and Santa Monica should be funded.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>T.A. Nelson</i> 04/18/2008</p> <p>Please extend the Metro Purple Line from Western Ave through Beverly Hills to Santa Monica, and build a cross-downtown LRT line.</p> <p>Please build a historic streetcar line on Broadway along LA's downtown theatre district.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>T. Ishihara</i> 04/18/2008</p> <p>Most of your bus drivers are not pulling up to the curb as they should.</p> <p>Need some kind of agreement with the movie companies not to block the bus stop when they are making a movie so we won't have to walk to another bus stop.</p> <p>Limited bus lines such as #330 do not stop in front of the City Hall, which I consider an important and convenient stop. Can there be a change modification so line #330 stops in front of City Hall. The recording on the bus does mention a stop on 1<sup>st</sup> St. and Main, however, the bus stop sign does not show line #330 so most of your drivers refuse to stop by City Hall.</p>	<p>Your comments will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p> <p>Your comments will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p> <p>Your comments will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p>
<p><i>Mevita F. Beaty</i> 04/15/2008</p> <p>Would like to see more 24 hour service of our bus and train system.</p> <p>Really likes the bus service that goes down Locust St. including lines #40, #740, #212, #312, #211, #711 and #607.</p> <p>Please go easy on increasing the senior and disabled fares since most live on a fixed income and Metro is their only transportation.</p> <p>Would like to see all the bus drivers announce the stops.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

*Mary E. Dougherty*

04/04/2008

It is critically important for the future that all fixed-rail transportation systems be planned with full grade-level separations. It is important that light rail move unimpeded by cross-traffic to be at its most efficient operation. Speedy transportation is critical in getting people to use public transportation instead of automobiles. The lack of funding is not a sufficient excuse for failing to implement grade-level separation.

As our ports expand and imports increase, it is vitally important that we provide fast and efficient transportation of goods and services through the San Gabriel Valley to Colton and other distribution centers without impacting local traffic. Thus, grade-level separation is needed for heavy rail or any other mode of goods transportation that might be considered.

Comment noted.

Comment noted. The Plan includes a Goods Movement Chapter that highlights the importance of goods movement strategies.

*Comments from Members of the Public*

*Adrian Aguilera*

*03/27/2008*

The light rail transit system in Los Angeles County is not bad but it has a couple of major flaws. First, the great majority of rail lines go through Union Station. It is too centralized a system. To increase LRT ridership, new rail lines should be built that completely bypass the City of Los Angeles. Having to go through Union Station then coming back out proves too time consuming and costly for many people. Buses can serve some of the public's needs, but are ultimately dependent on street traffic to get around and get stuck in the same traffic jams as automobiles do. Many bus lines do not connect well between Los Angeles and Orange counties. No rail lines directly connect major beach cities in LA County to major Orange County cities either.

Comment noted.

Building subways is astronomically expensive. Since we have the best highway system in the world, we should build LRT systems through our existing highways as has been done along the I-105 and I-10 freeways.

Comment noted.

It is great that Metro is thinking about potential partnerships with the private sector to raise funds. A modest tax increase would be OK with most people as long as it is temporary and the money allocated would be used exclusively for mass transit development and construction.

Comment noted.

LRT ticket rules must be enforced. Many people simply do not pay to use it. Revenue could be increased substantially if turnstiles are built in every station.

Comment noted.

*Frank J. Zgonc*

*03/26/2008*

Do not bow to the pressures of those cities coordinating for the extension of the Metro Gold Line. This project as planned is too costly and will under serve the vast majority of commuters on the freeways and it will not provide enough relief for the freeway congestion that we suffer.

Comment noted.

A comprehensive light rail plan should be developed for all the communities along the 210/134/101 corridor from San Bernardino to Pasadena, Glendale, the San Fernando Valley, and Thousand Oaks.

Comment noted.

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Sean</i> 03/23/2008</p> <p>As a regular bus rider who is retired, please do not raise the monthly bus passes anymore. My fixed income can't handle any further increases.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Michael B. Montgomery</i> 02/04/2008</p> <p>In response to the letter to you of January 23, 2008 from the Honorable State Senators Cedillo and Vincent, Assembly members Eng and Huff, and others, as a former Mayor of South Pasadena and a municipal law attorney for forty years, it must be relayed to you that the aspirations expressed in the letter cannot be met. Study documents released by court order demonstrate that toxic air conditions will increase substantially in South Pasadena, Pasadena, and Los Angeles if the 710 extension is constructed as proposed. The toll concept is infeasible because of construction costs. The "710 Extension Tunnel Project" is premature and should remain right where it is, off the baseline L RTP.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Fred Gaines</i> No Date</p> <p>The plan should set forth what we need to do to move faster than we do now, not slower. It should include what has to be built, what people will have to do and what it will cost to move faster.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>



*Comments from Members of the Public*

*Carl Olson*

*No Date*

The plan has no positive performance measure for speeding up freeway traffic.

Comment noted.

The Plan has no method to survey the entire motoring public.

Comment noted.

Improving freeways for the public should get a lion's share of the funding. The plan is backwards by giving the majority to public transit.

Comment noted.

The Plan should open all proposed carpool lanes to all drivers.

Comment noted.

The plan should not include threats of value pricing or other types of tolls.

Comment noted.

**Attachment F**

**E-MAIL COMMENTS  
INDEX**

**CITIES..... 1**

**ORGANIZATIONS ..... 3**

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC..... 9**

## ATTACHMENT F

### RESPONSES TO E-MAIL COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT 2008 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

NOTE: The Draft 2008 LRTP was distributed for review and comment on March 12, 2008. The following reflects staff responses to written comments received on the Draft LRTP through e-mail.

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments from Cities</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>04/25/2008</i></p> <p><i>Robert L. Brager Public Works Director/City Engineer City of Malibu</i></p> <p>Increased growth in this five city sub-region and in the counties of Ventura and Santa Barbara directly impacts the subregion's existing transportation system, and with more severity in the future. What modal transportation improvements are included in the Plan that will address the impacts resulting from increased transient traffic through the Las Virgenes/Malibu subregion, specifically for PCH, Malibu Canyon Rd, and Kanan Dune Rd?</p> <p>What modal transportation improvements are included in the Plan that will address the impacts resulting from increased transient traffic through the Las Virgenes/Malibu subregion on US-101?</p>	<p>The Draft 2008 Plan reserves \$4.2 billion for future Call for Projects. The Las Virgenes/Malibu cities could submit eligible projects in the Call for Projects for Subregional improvements.</p> <p>The Draft 2008 Plan identifies carpool lanes on the right US-101 corridor in the strategic (Unfunded) portion of the plan. Strategic Plan Projects could be funded if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><i>04/23/2008</i></p> <p><i>Deborah Chankin Director of Public Works City of Bellflower</i></p> <p>The Bellflower Transit Center is a transit project concept which we believe is important to our City and has not been included in the LRTP. While this project is not funded, we request that it be incorporated into the unconstrained plan.</p>	<p>The Draft 2008 Plan recommends continued funding for future competitive Call for Projects. The City of Bellflower could submit this eligible project in the Transit Capital modal category. The Draft 2008 Plan reserves \$464 million for future Call for Projects in this modal category.</p>

*Comments from Cities*

<p><i>Tom Long Councilmember City of Rancho Palos Verdes</i></p> <p>04/21/2008</p> <p>It is our understanding that the City of Rancho Palos Verdes may lose its only direct bus service to downtown LA. Our City requests time to offer input on this possible cancellation of service.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p>
<p><i>Margaret Finlay Councilmember City of Duarte</i></p> <p>04/04/2008</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa, Claremont, and the Ontario Airport in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available to generate needed sources of revenue for these strategic projects.</p>
<p><i>Mary Ann Lutz Councilmember City of Monrovia</i></p> <p>04/01/2008</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa, Claremont, and the Ontario Airport in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

Comment (Main Points)

Response

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Alexander G. Pugh Senior Public Policy Manager Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Metro should identify project candidates for public private partnerships and congestion pricing.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Plan will include a new section on how the Plan supports public-private partnerships.</p>
<p><i>Friends 4 Expo Transit</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>The Exposition LRT Phase II (from Culver City to Santa Monica) should remain the top priority in the Public Transportation Recommended Plan.</p> <p>Adding the I-10/Robertson/National Blvd Circulation Improvement Project to the Highways Strategic Plan would relieve the bottleneck adjacent to the Expo Line Culver City interim terminus, scheduled to open in 2010.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p> <p>This project is a subregional priority and could be implemented if new funds become available.</p>
<p><i>Hall P. Daily Assistant Vice President, Government &amp; Community Relations California Institute of Technology</i></p> <p>04/25/2008</p> <p>On behalf of the California Institute of Technology (Caltech) in Pasadena, please include the Gold Line Foothill Extension in the Recommended and Budgeted Plan.</p> <p>With the Foothill Extension poised for construction almost immediately, in contrast to other projects still in planning stages, failing to prioritize this extension would be a costly missed opportunity to access as much as a 4:1 federal match to the regional investment for the first extended segment from Pasadena to Azusa.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

*Diane Forte*  
*Southern California Director*  
*The Climate Group*  
 04/25/2008

Various questions and comments regarding the proposed projects' impacts on air quality, use of potential sales tax revenues to develop additional programs to fund public transportation, the number of Metro Rapid corridors included in the Plan, the type of air pollution removed in the Plan, the timeframe for the bus-only lane study, why the Metro Rapid bus expansion projects were not ranked, a suggestion that a chart be included in the Plan comparing the costs of the strategic projects, and a question regarding the timeline of the Wilshire Boulevard Rapid Transitway.

Comments noted. Specific air quality and energy impacts will be identified as each project is environmentally cleared. Considering the shortage of traditional funding sources for the Draft 2008 Plan, the Plan seeks to explore new and innovative funding strategies such as an additional Countywide sales tax, tolling and congestion pricing, public/private partnerships and a countywide congestion mitigation fee as a way of generating needed sources of revenue for strategic projects. The Draft 2008 Plan includes 28 Metro Rapid Corridors. The types of air pollution removed by the Draft 2008 Plan are ROG, NOx, PM 2.5, PM 10 and CO, and are illustrated on page 47. In June of this year, Metro Rapid service will provide over 380 miles of service through 31 cities and the County of Los Angeles. The Los Angeles County Bus Speed and Street Design Improvement Plan should begin in June 2008 and will take approximately 12 months to complete. The Metro Rapid Bus Expansion Corridors beyond the Constrained Plan were not ranked as these corridors have not yet been specifically identified so their performance cannot be analyzed at this time. The estimated costs for the Strategic Projects are contained in the Technical document beginning on page 97.

*Barbara L. Musselman*  
*President*  
*League of Women Voters of the Claremont Area*  
 04/24/2008

Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa, Claremont, and the Ontario Airport in the 2008 Long Range Plan.

Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Brian McNerney President/CEO La Verne Chamber of Commerce</i></p> <p>04/21/2008</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa, Claremont, and the Ontario Airport in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Alan Kaye President Beverly Hills Residents' Association</i></p> <p>04/19/2008</p> <p>We urge support for the unfunded extension of the Red Line to the Westside and on to Santa Monica. We support the Beverly Hills Mass Transit Committee's unanimous recommendation to the City Council to continue the Red Line from the Wilshire/Western station down Wilshire Blvd through Beverly Hills then turning southwest.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Melina Watts Malibu Creek Watershed Coordinator Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains</i></p> <p>04/16/2008</p> <p>Bus lines are needed along the following venues: Highway 27: Topanga Canyon Mulholland from Pacific Coast Hwy to Topanga Canyon Blvd. Kanan from Pacific Coast Hwy to 101 Fwy</p> <p>These lines would run from Pacific Coast Hwy to the 101 with a variety of stops. A huge number of day laborers are obligated to hitch hike to get to work everyday and community members are stuck with cars as the only realistic transportation alternative. Some people use bicycles but with current road conditions, this is dangerous!</p>	<p>The Draft 2008 Plan will promote improvements in the quality and reliability of Metro and municipal bus services over the next 20 years. Recommendations for specific bus lines are addressed through Metro's transit service planning process. Your comments will be forwarded to our Transit Service Planning staff.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Joe Linton Policy Associate Livable Places</i></p> <p>The bike and ped numbers appear wrong in the printed document. Could you clarify the amount of funding in the Metro LRTP for bikes and ped, strategic and constrained?</p>	<p>04/09/2008</p> <p>While the Draft Plan identifies a total of \$241 million for bicycle projects and \$241 million for pedestrian projects through 2030, the correct amounts should be \$337 million for bicycle projects and \$337 million for pedestrian projects through 2030. This will be corrected in the Final 2008 LRTP.</p>
<p><i>Joe Cosney President Leisure Lake HOA</i></p> <p>The Homeowners Association of Leisure Lake Mobile Estates sent a letter to the MTA on July 10, 2007 requesting that a soundwall be considered on SR-14 at our community, the western boundary of which is SR-14. Included with the letter was a petition signed by the residents and a sound study done by Caltrans. As of this date, we have not received a reply from the MTA. We again ask that funding and construction for a soundwall be considered under the 'Soundwall Retrofit' program.</p>	<p>04/06/2008</p> <p>A letter dated March 14, 2007 was sent from Caltrans to the Homeowners Association of Leisure Lake Mobile Estates indicating that, the Leisure Lake Mobile Home Park was developed after the construction of Route 14 freeway, and therefore does not qualify for soundwall consideration at this time.</p>



*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Sheila Estaniel Director of Marketing and Events Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce</i></p> <p><i>04/04/2008</i></p> <p>Please support Phase II of the Exposition Light Rail Line. The Westside is a crucial economic engine for Southern California with more than 650,000 jobs and more than 61 million square feet of rentable office space. More than 300,000 people come into the Westside each workday and its destinations attract many of the more than 25 million tourists who visit Los Angeles County each year.</p> <p>It is a pleasure to see the Westside subway extension in Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan.</p>	<p>This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Audrey Lynberg Legislative Chair West Covina Chamber of Commerce</i></p> <p><i>04/01/2008</i></p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa, Claremont, and the Ontario Airport in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Organizations*

<p><i>Samantha O'Neil Director of Government Affairs Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce</i></p> <p><i>04/01/2008</i></p> <p>The Santa Monica Chamber is pleased to see both Phase II of the Exposition light rail and the Westside subway extension in Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan. It is very important that the Exposition light rail project be finished all the way to Santa Monica, with stops that serve our hospitals, employment centers (Water Garden area), downtown, and Santa Monica College, as soon as possible.</p> <p>The Santa Monica Chamber traveled to Washington, DC (taking with us then-Mayor Richard Bloom) and Sacramento to advocate for federal and state match dollars for Southern California transit improvements last year. Both trips will be repeated this year.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Judy Thorndyke Executive Director Westminster Gardens</i></p> <p>On behalf of the 200 people living or working at our retirement community in the City of Duarte, we ask that you please fund the Gold Line Extension out to Ontario.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Number of E-mail Comments Received (Over 500 comments in support and several in opposition)</i></p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station eastward in the Constrained 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Metro Subway Westside Extension Number of E-mail Comments Received (Nearly 200 comments in support and several in opposition )</i></p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the development of a subway or light rail system connecting the downtown Los Angeles area with the Westside in the Constrained 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Metro Exposition Light Rail Number of E-mail Comments Received (Over 100 comments in support)</i></p> <p>Urge the Metro Board continued support of Exposition Light Rail Projects Phase I and II.</p>	<p>Expo Lines 1 &amp; 2 are recommended for funding.</p>
<p><i>Barbara Evans    Wesley Whitton    Adam Reese Michael Ambbs    David Kennedy    Jeffrey Kelly Gregg Fuller      Michael Kelley    Jim Clemson</i></p> <p>Please build subways to the Westside, the Eastside, the San Fernando Valley, and to the beaches. We want a system that runs 24 hours a day with state of the art security. We also want rail to Dodger Stadium, Century City, LAX, Van Nuys, and Burbank. These systems should be seamlessly integrated with Metrolink, Downtown streetcars, and high speed rail to San Francisco, Las Vegas, and San Diego.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

*Andrew Matzen Cory Loomis  
Zane Selvans Dave Tseng*

Encourage increased bicycle and pedestrian funding and implementation of “complete streets” policy. Non-recreational infrastructure is needed for bicycling. Bicyclists feel unsafe on city streets, as motorists do not believe cyclists are entitled to use the road. Law enforcement should use the models of San Francisco and Portland to apply policies regarding bicyclists.

Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.

*Al Sethuraman Alison Kendal Aurisha Smolarski  
Edwin Nazarian Jade DeCosta Janette Hoffman  
Jay Ross Ron Ayson Todd Benshoof  
Rebecca Kahlenberg*

Supportive of suggestions made by the Los Angeles Bicycle Coalition including:

1. Increase the amount of money for bicycle and pedestrian projects in the strategic plan:
  - Budget allocated to bicycles should be at least \$24 million a year.
  - Metro should commit to funding bicycle and pedestrian improvements every year - even using local sales tax monies if state funds are unavailable.
  - In order to create safer streets for cyclists we need more bike lanes and more bicycle facilities throughout the city.
  - Metro talks of “changing the way people think”. But you need to make it possible for people to change their behaviors. We need to encourage people to ride their bikes. Designating specific parts of the road for bike use and shared use will encourage people to ride and make the bicycle a viable form of transportation. It will also improve motorist behavior toward cyclists and improve cyclist safety.
  - By encouraging people to ride bikes, Metro’s vision of creating a “more balanced transportation system”; of reducing

Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.

*Comments from Members of the Public*

congestion, greenhouse emissions, and air pollution; and encouraging a healthier and better quality of life is addressed. Bikes are the solution.

- The rest of the nation and the rest of the world have realized this. Now it's time that Los Angeles realizes this. Metro can help make it happen. We would like to see at least \$24 million per year budgeted to making Los Angeles a cleaner and healthier place by increasing bicycle facilities and awareness throughout the city.

2. Every project initiated should include bicycle facilities, bike lanes, and bikeways to create alternatives to driving:

- This would actually help to reduce extra spending if these initiatives are incorporated during the initial phases instead of regarding them as separate projects.
- Projects in all modal categories that include bicycle accommodations should be given more points in Metro's scoring criteria. For example, an RSTI project that includes bike lanes, or a pedestrian sidewalk improvement project that includes bike racks, should be given more points in those categories.
- Include bikeways paralleling Metro transit projects; include feeder projects and link public transportation hubs with bicycle lanes.
- This addresses the needs of under-served populations.

Metro should provide funding for roadway resurfacing on regionally significant corridors. Poor road surface conditions create a greater hazard for cyclists than for any other road user.

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Efren S. Ibarinas</i> 05/08/08 Provided a list of suggestions including: powering down of escalators when not in use, cleaning seats of bus and trains every three months if not monthly, allowing passengers to board buses "not in service", using different route numbers for routes that have more than one destination, combining local and rapid stop locations, install cameras on buses to capture rider pass-ups at stops.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Maria Peña</i> 05/02/2008 Opposed to HOT lanes on the 210 Freeway, considers the extension of the Gold Line to Montclair as a better project.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Bill Pope</i> 05/01/2008 Suggests that the Plan does not do enough to reduce greenhouse gases, dependence on foreign oil, gridlock or accommodate projected population growth. Proposes that telecommuting and micro cars could help reduce congestion. Also suggests that growth should be stopped until intersections comply with General and Community Plan Policies. Supports completion of Regional Interchange Loop for light rail downtown, rerouting of Metrolink to service Ontario and Orange County airports, the Expo Line, Wilshire BRT not subway, and the Gold Line extension to Pomona. Suggests that added arterial capacity can be achieved through one-way street pairs (Flow Boulevards) and the re-striping of freeway and arterial lanes for half-width micro commuter cars.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Robin Grabs</i> 05/01/2008 Suggests the centermost freeway lane become a train lane, the next lane become a carpool lane and the rest for mixed flow traffic. Taking public transportation for his commute takes too long.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Michelle Mowery</i> 04/30/2008</p> <p>Comments on the damage to curb lanes of streets by heavy articulated buses. Suggests more funding for bicycle facilities in the region, and for bicycle parking at rail stations. Identifies changes to strategic unfunded projects submitted by the Subregional COGS in the Subregional Chapter of the Technical Document. Also suggests that CMAQ funding should be added to Regional Bikeways and Pedestrian Improvements Call for Projects discussion in the Technical Document.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Andy Sze</i> 04/28/2008</p> <p>The Gold Line Extension project should include sufficient commercial, retail, residential, and industrial development to go with each station. The proposed station for Pomona lies in an industrial area. The station should be moved to a location where there is a better mix of industrial, residential, and commercial land uses such as where the track crosses Towne Ave.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Antonio Edward-Allah</i> 04/26/2008</p> <p>Support for the Gold Line Foothill Extension and various suggestions for the Regional Connector; converting the Harbor Transitway to rail with an extension to the Burbank Airport, and by 2050 to near Magic Mountain; and extension of the Green Line to Torrance and Orange County to Disneyland.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Gregory D. Wright</i> 04/24/2008</p> <p>Suggestions to the MTA Board to improve service:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Install electronic message signs at subway and rail stations displaying train departure times.</li> <li>2) Use uniquely colored LED headsign lights to identify approaching buses and distinguish Metro Rapid buses from regular and local buses.</li> <li>3) Install shade patch-making structures on monopoles at bus stops to</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p>relieve heat reflected from paved streets.                  4) Provide more seats in Red Line subway stations and more restroom facilities, at least at the major hub stations.                  5) Promote traffic calming in all its forms on LA's arterials and freeways to enhance transit user safety.                  6) Continue to promote the important low carbon attributes of public transportation (slogan: Cut Your Carbon, Go Metro!).                  7) Promote the 36-hour four-day work week at the federal and state level.</p>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p><i>Lucia and Daniel Walker</i></p> <p>Identified a list of projects to be added to the constrained plan by setting higher goals for funding including: rail to LAX from Green Line, passenger rail service along the Harbor Subdivision funded by not building the Crenshaw project, Foothill extension of the Gold Line to Ontario Airport, extension of Green Line to Metrolink station, north-south rail link between San Fernando Valley, UCLA and LAX, extension of subway to Santa Monica, and Regional Connector. Also suggested improvements to Metrolink services, completing the 710 Freeway gap with tunnels, support for congestion pricing/HOT lanes and Metro's support for high speed rail if the initiative is approved by the voters.</p>
<p>Comments noted. The Draft Plan 2008 identifies "strategic" unfunded priorities and projects such as the ones identified here that are regionally significant but require new revenue sources to be implemented.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Supports the development of heavy rail subway lines as having greater mobility benefit over light rail. Supports toll lanes and new carpool lanes replacing general purpose lanes to promote BRT service on freeways. Supports increased use of freight rail over trucks. Advocates the removal of the bicycle restrictions on Metro Rail during rush hours.</p>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p><i>Michael Eshleman</i></p>



*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Kevin Klowden</i> 04/25/2008</p> <p>Does not support the current naming conventions used for stations in the rail systems or the diagrams in the rail stations. Supports the Green Line extension to LAX and proposes and extension of the Expo or Blue Line to Dodger Stadium. Also supports completion of the Expo Line to Santa Monica.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Emiko Isa</i> 04/25/2008</p> <p>Various comments suggesting more community meetings throughout the comment period, the use of more specific ridership and other quantifiable goals for data collection to justify proposals, and support for subsidy of public transportation, alternate fueled vehicles, rapid transit as opposed to heavy rail, and demand management through congestion pricing and conversion of HOV lanes to HOT lanes.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Laramie Bowron</i> 04/25/2008</p> <p>The Plan sounds excellent and it will be great to see the formation of bike paths and the overall emphasis on environmental concerns. MTA should focus more on taking stress off existing streets and highways rather than making them bigger. MTA should instead focus on separating transportation by purpose and constructing bike paths that parallel highways.</p> <p>Take goods movement off our highways and onto rail cars.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p> <p>The Plan includes a Goods Movement Chapter that highlights the importance of goods movement strategies.</p>
<p><i>Roger Noriega</i> 04/25/2008</p> <p>It is imperative that the Gold Line to Montclair and the Blue Line to Santa Monica be the top priorities in the LRP.</p>	<p>Comment noted. These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Melanie Winter</i>                  04/24/2008                  Identifies the need for additional rail lines in the San Fernando Valley including Red Line extension to Burbank Airport and elevated rail in the center of the 405 from the Sylmar Metrolink station to the Green Line. General comments that the Orange Line and Rapid Buses are not rapid enough, service is too infrequent, and existing rail service and connector buses need to operate later in the evening. Supports more Class 1 bikeways and increased Call for Projects funding for bikeway projects. Supports complete streets with storm water management and native landscaping for projects. Supports TODs with additional parcels acquired for open space, solar energy, and a better balance of office and live/work space.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Jane Reifer</i>                  04/25/2008                  Orange County resident who supports the extension of the Metro Green Line to the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station and that this project be moved to the Recommended Plan. Comments on the current difficulty in transferring by bus to the Metro Green Line from the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Roberto Woo Velazquez</i>                  04/25/2008                  Supports inclusion of the Silver Line in the Draft 2008 Plan.</p>	<p>This project is (these projects are) included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Josef Bray-Ali</i>                  04/25/2008                  "Transportation" in the LRTP only includes autos.                  MTA may be able to access retail sales tax with some legislation help in Sacramento.                  Crash and injury statistics should be included in a map and tied to individual projects.                  A livability survey should be done before and after each MTA project to measure the impact of the project.                  Noise and air quality standards with before and after comparisons and mapping should be done for each project.</p>	<p>Comment noted.                  Comment noted.                  Comment noted.                  Comment noted.                  Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Michele Chavez</i>                  04/25/2008                  The bike lanes we have do not connect to one another and there is no clear, consistent, safe way to get across town, either east to west or north to south. In order to create safer streets for cyclists, we need more bike lanes and routes, and more bicycle facilities throughout the Antelope Valley. It would actually help to reduce extra spending if these initiatives were incorporated during the initial phases of projects rather than later. All projects that include bicycle accommodations should be given higher priority. Projects that include bike lanes and bike racks should be done first. Bikeways should parallel Metro transit projects and public transportation hubs should be linked with bicycle lanes. Metro should also provide funding for roadway resurfacing to increase bicycle safety. Finally, funds should be allocated for the widening and maintenance of existing bike lanes.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Jason D. Kogan</i>                  Suggestions for the MTA Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continue funding for EXPO Line Phases 1 and 2.</li> <li>2. Include the I-10 Robertson/National Blvd Circulation Improvement Program in the Strategic Plan.</li> <li>3. Move Metro's Subway Extension to La Cienega and Santa Monica from Tier 1 of the Strategic Unfunded portion of the LRTP to the Constrained (funded) portion on a priority basis when funding is identified.</li> </ol>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Expo Lines 1 &amp; 2 are recommended for funding.                  This project is identified in the Subregional Section of the plan.                  These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Jose L. Perez</i>                  Please expand the rail service to the Antelope Valley. Also, dedicated busway lanes help to increase efficiency and speed of public transportation during peak hours.                  Regarding the Draft Plan's proposal to use joint private and public funding sources for projects, it is a concern that this mixing of funds will lead to unnecessary expenditures that will ultimately undermine the Plan's proposals.</p>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Comment noted.                  Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Susan Rorke</i>                  Security personnel should be stationed at Park and Ride lots to prevent theft. Perhaps by charging a daily or monthly nominal fee to utilize the lot with an attendant and an electronic gate, or maybe an electronic gate that uses a monthly card for access. Also, please make a rule that all bicycles using the trains must use the last car to enhance passenger safety.</p>	<p>04/25/2008</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Mike Bone</i> 04/25/2008</p> <p>Urge the MTA board to prioritize the extension of the Green Line to connect with LAX.</p>	<p>This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Jennifer A</i> 04/25/2008</p> <p>The Long Range Plan makes for an unbalanced transportation system and there is an ineffective focus on rail lines. Metro must find funding for more bikeways and pedestrian linkages! 1% just isn't cutting it when walking and biking are the least expensive and produce NO emissions! The highest percentage of public transit funds should be spent on buses and bus-only lanes rather than rail. It's cheaper, easier, and faster to build.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Heather Cushman-Dowdee</i> 04/25/2008</p> <p>Using the Metro system is entirely too expensive. Taking public transportation needs to be cheaper than using automobiles.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Wally Marks</i> 04/25/2008</p> <p>Please support the proposed, but currently unfunded, extension of the Red Line to the Westside, and the Green Line extension from the Redondo Beach station to the South Bay Galleria. Wilshire Blvd is the backbone of the Westside and its gridlock must be relieved, and the South Bay needs better circulation and connectivity.</p>	<p>Comment noted. These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Nancy Kaleel</i> 04/25/2008</p> <p>Please do not include the Strategic Unfunded proposal to add carpool lanes on the 101 freeway between SR-27 and SR-2 in downtown Los Angeles. Also, please revise your 2030 population projections for Los Angeles County based on accurate residence data (which will have to be created from scratch as it currently does not exist). Another issue of concern is that the ITS message boards on freeways actually cause traffic to halt. These funds could be better spent elsewhere. In</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p>addition, MTA has allowed developers with their so-called “smart growth” to actually impede mobility. These proposed mixed use developments stop traffic on Ventura Blvd and on Sepulveda as a variety of vehicles attempt to access these structures. Finally, regarding the document itself, if some of the abbreviations used were spelled out throughout the document so that readers could understand it, a separate glossary would not be necessary.</p>	
<p><i>Murry I. Rozansky</i> 04/25/2008</p> <p>Let's dispose of the subways and build a monorail system for 5-10 times less money.</p> <p>MTA should freeze all spending for surface fixed guideway transit systems and use the money for highway and road improvements and for elevated transit systems. Also, CNG or LNG fueled engines should be used by Metrolink.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Ellen Blackman</i> 04/24/2008</p> <p>Actions should be taken beyond meeting the basic requirements to make pedestrian pathways user-friendly for persons with disabilities. The Technical Document focuses on bike paths, but there needs to be greater focus on pedestrian pathways. Most bikeways are also available to pedestrians, and there is a concurrent need for accessibility for persons with disabilities. Transit projects should be included that go beyond the basic ADA requirements to make transit more user-friendly for persons with disabilities.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Cheri Dickinson</i> 04/24/2008</p> <p>Suggestions for the MTA Board:</p> <p>Build flyovers for pedestrians where necessary.</p> <p>Fund the Expo Line through a mileage tax at the pump and a ballot measure dedicated for Expo.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>James K. Suhr</i> 04/24/2008</p> <p>Please make the Expo Light Rail Phase 2 to Santa Monica and the Red Line extension to Santa Monica immediate investment priorities. In addition, we need north/south connectors between the ports/South Bay/LAX through the Westside and to the San Fernando Valley along the I-405 corridor in order to continue to thrive and have any chance of meeting our mobility and air quality needs for the next 20 years.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Expo Phase 2 is recommended for funding. Additional projects in the Strategic Plan for reference corridors could be funded if new funding sources became available.</p>
<p><i>Sarah Hays</i> 04/24/2008</p> <p>It is good to see that Exposition LRT Phase II from Culver City to Santa Monica is a top priority in your Recommended Plan and is slated to open in 2016.</p> <p>Other projects to be encouraged include the future construction of a downtown connector, a subway down Wilshire Blvd, and some kind of north-south off-road transit parallel to the 405 Freeway.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Polly Chu</i> 04/24/2008</p> <p>Bus-only lanes should be built through congested areas, and kids should be allowed to ride for free when accompanied by an adult.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Frederick Dennstedt</i> 04/24/2008</p> <p>Every transit line should have 12-minute or better frequency during the week, and the system should run all day and all night, every single day of the year. Technology should be used to inform passengers exactly where their bus or train is and when it is expected to arrive so our schedules can be planned accordingly. Our urban rail system should be expanded to serve the economic centers of our region, with Metrolink service running every hour during the week and every two hours on weekends. We also need to build more busways and provide more Rapid buses with rail-like amenities such as ticket vending machines and multiple door access.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p>Buses and trains must be kept clean and comfortable, and provide a friendly environment that makes people happy not to be in their cars. We should have a goal of more than 50% of our residents being transit users.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>John Purpura</i> 04/24/2008 Increase service in southeastern Los Angeles County, including rail line to Norwalk Metrolink Station and BRT down the ROW southwest into/near Cerritos Mall/Cypress College/India Village (Artesia). In addition, all freeways need at least two carpool lanes.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Katie Bennett</i> 04/24/2008 Transit hubs with express bus service in bus only lanes should be provided with spokes of neighborhood feeder buses. Bikes should be seamlessly integrated, and allowed on trains during rush hour. Rapid and local buses should share the same stop locations. Customer service should be enhanced with higher standards for the busiest routes. Generate more ad revenue from trains and buses. Build rail to LAX and the ocean.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>James Kushner</i> 04/24/2008 The so-called Plan is not a plan. Rather, it is a list of projects anticipated to be realized during the next 20 years. The Plan should offer an image of a full public transport build out to accommodate a post-automobile city. The cost of the system should be estimated, and alternatives such as bus rapid transit and designated bus lanes and busways, as well as heavy and light rail and the possibility of personal transit should be evaluated.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>



*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Cristin</i> 04/24/2008 Draft 2008 Plan does not identify locations for bicycle paths to be developed, and maps of rail and busway alignments are not clear. Monorails as an alternative to busways or light rail are not included.</p>	<p>Comments noted. More specific information on the bicycle path network is contained in the Metro Board-adopted Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan.</p>
<p><i>Frank Kortum</i> 04/24/2008 The Plan would be improved by inclusion of the following projects: “Run through” tracks that would relieve train congestion at Union Station. Improvements to the transition between I-110 northbound and I-5 northbound. Connections between the Green Line and LAX, and between the Green Line and the Norwalk Metrolink Station.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment noted. Comment noted. These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Michael Manahan</i> 04/24/2008 Between downtown Long Beach and downtown LA there are some 19 light rail stations. With the exception of downtown Long Beach, all of the stations are nothing more than a stop in the middle of nowhere.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Freya</i> 04/24/2008 LA’s Metro subway needs fare gates. The “Honor System” does not work.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Scott A. Reimers</i>                  04/24/2008                  If the 210 freeway is going to succumb to a reduction in capacity by limiting use of a lane to only certain occupants, then in exchange the MTA should support a light rail line as an alternative means of travel.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Paul Mason Fotsch</i>                  04/24/2008                  Do not spend anymore on lanes or freeways for the automobile. Rather, create bus only lanes on all freeways and major streets throughout the region and increase the minimum for HOV lanes to 3 persons. Eliminate hybrid car access to HOV lanes.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Donna Gooley</i>                  04/24/2008                  Metrolink should not be expanded until the Metro bus system is up and running well. Currently, the bus system is running extremely poorly. In addition, congestion pricing as recommended for Los Angeles County will be a disaster. Please do not implement this here.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Priyanka Wali</i>                  04/24/2008                  Congratulations to Metro for putting together such an incredibly impressive Long Range Transportation Plan.                  Over 100 people that live in the Monterey Hills area commute to LAC/USC County Hospital and the USC Medical School every single day. If it were available, they would use a Metro service between these two locations.</p>	<p>Comment noted.                  Your comment will be forward to our Transit Service Planning staff.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Kenneth S. Alpern</i></p> <p>04/24/2008</p> <p>Please establish the following order of rail projects in the LRTP:</p> <p>Constrained Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Exposition Phase II to Santa Monica.</li> <li>2) Crenshaw Corridor LRT project between LAX and downtown.</li> <li>3) Gold Line Foothill Extension to Azusa.</li> <li>4) Operational funding (only) for private-LA World Airports funded Green Line Extension to LAX.</li> </ol> <p>Strategic Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Downtown Light Rail Connector.</li> <li>2) Wilshire Blvd. Rail Extension to Century City.</li> <li>3) Eastside LRT to Whittier.</li> <li>4) Wilshire Blvd. Rail Extension to 405 Freeway.</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Diana Crews</i></p> <p>04/23/2008</p> <p>It would be great to take public transportation during the work week if it were more accessible. Unfortunately, most commuter oriented bus lines do not run near large residential areas. An expanded DASH-style line would certainly be a good, immediate start to avail what currently exists to more residents in our densely populated San Fernando Valley.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Dominic Mercado</i></p> <p>04/23/2008</p> <p>Please improve the Metrolink San Bernardino Line for the San Gabriel Valley. The trains are very full. Perhaps if a transit station was built in Pomona, a train could travel only between Union Station and Pomona.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Kevin Finkel</i> 04/23/2008 Please add as much rail (on its own right-of-way) as possible to the public transportation system.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Zachary</i> 04/23/2008 Better promotion of Metro's current express lines (534, 920, 444) and tidying up the schedules to make the lines more frequent and convenient for people to ride would help get people to switch over from their cars to buses. A transitway should be installed along the middle of either the 101 or 405 freeway between LA and the San Fernando Valley.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.  Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Maria de la Luz Garcia</i> 04/23/2008 Describes bicycling experiences along Grande Vista St (between Leonis and 8<sup>th</sup> St) and Santa Fe St (between Leonis and 7<sup>th</sup> St) as needing improvement with bike lanes due to high cyclist use and vehicle congestion.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Rodger McIntyre</i> 04/23/2008 High-speed rail should be encouraged in Los Angeles County. Many other cities have embraced high-speed rail, why has Los Angeles County and California in general failed to utilize such technology?</p>	<p>Metro is monitoring High-Speed Rail planning activities by the California High-Speed Rail Authority and the Southern California Association of Governments. Metro will continue to track their progress.</p>
<p><i>Karena Mediate</i> 04/22/2008 Regarding the Westside Subway Extension, put it on Olympic Blvd only or bypass Beverly Hills altogether and have the stop at Santa Monica and Wilshire.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Comment (Main Points)

Response

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Kevin Roham</i> 04/22/2008 A monorail in the County of Los Angeles would be more attractive than the subway.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Connie Craig</i> 04/22/2008 As a member of the Green Party, it would be great to see more people ride public transportation.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Kent Lin</i> 04/22/2008 The lack of analysis, assessment, and funding for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension from the Sierra Madre Station in Pasadena to Ontario Airport makes this 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan draft version incomplete. In addition, the Draft Plan fails to analyze and address the potential tunnel proposal for the 710 connection from Pasadena to South Pasadena to Alhambra.  The MTA Board should not be misled by the low ridership numbers on the Gold Line because the majority of passengers do not buy tickets and there is a far larger ridership count than what the records reflect. There are no physical barriers in any of the stations to prevent non-paying riders from boarding. This lack of enforcement results in lack of funding for critical projects such as the Gold Line Extension to Azusa and potentially Ontario.</p>	<p>Both the Foothill Extension and the 710 gap closure were analyzed and are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan. Strategic Plan projects could be funded if new funding resources become available.  Comment noted. Future ridership forecasts used in the Draft Plan for the Gold Line Extension were based on 2030 travel demand model forecasts, not existing boarding data.</p>
<p>The demand management analysis in the 2008 LRTP must be reassessed to reflect correct current and future ridership for all Metro Rail lines, especially the Gold Line and the Foothill Extension.  The MTA Board has allocated the majority of its funds for bus services so that little remains for Metro Rail.</p>	<p>Comment noted.  Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Christopher Tuffy</i></p> <p>04/22/2008</p> <p>Left turn signals should be minimized. Traffic wishing to turn left should instead turn right at the next intersection, right again and then right again for a freer flow of vehicles.</p> <p>More Metro Rail should be built, especially to LAX!</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Katherine Breeden</i></p> <p>04/22/2008</p> <p>Encourage increased bicycle-related infrastructure funding in the Plan. Los Angeles has the potential to be a great bike-friendly city due to relatively flat terrain and mild weather. With the price of gasoline rising, need to promote public transit and biking. Bicycle use will improve public health, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and foster a sense of community.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Carl Olson</i> 04/22/2008</p> <p>The Plan has no positive performance measure for speeding up freeway traffic.</p> <p>The Plan has no method to survey the entire motoring public for attitudes toward expanding freeway capacity and speeding up freeways.</p> <p>Improving freeways for the public should get a lion's share of funding since 95% of the public are motorists. Additionally, since freeways are intended to be free for all, the Plan has to open all proposed carpool lanes to all drivers.</p> <p>The Plan should not include "value pricing" or other types of tolls on freeways.</p>	<p>The Plan has several mobility performance measures that determine the Plan's mobility benefit including speed and person throughput. Both of these measures show that the future Plan makes a positive contribution in improving mobility.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Zane Selvans</i> 04/22/2008</p> <p>All Metro routing and scheduling data should be made publicly accessible in a machine readable format so it can easily be integrated into Google Transit.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Chris Ledermuller</i> 04/22/2008</p> <p>Urban rail projects designed to carry 25,000 or more boardings per day should be considered for major investment studies for Los Angeles County.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Donna O'Connor</i> 04/21/2008</p> <p>Please widen Highway 138 from Palmdale to the San Bernardino County line.</p>	<p>The Draft 2008 Plan recommends full funding of the SR-138 Widening project and it is included in the Draft 2008 Plan's Constrained (funded) Plan.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Larry Stuckey</i></p> <p>04/21/2008</p> <p>2% of the budget in the Plan is too small to make Los Angeles a bicycle friendly city. To encourage bicycle use, more bike lanes and facilities are needed. Other cities in the United States and Europe have done more for bicycle transportation. Projects in all modal categories should be given more points if they include a bicycle element. New transit projects should include a parallel bikeway, and public transportation hubs should be linked with bikeways. Roadway resurfacing on regionally significant corridors should be funded. The budget should be increased to \$24 million per year.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Carolyn Miller</i></p> <p>04/21/2008</p> <p>Budget for bicycles in the Plan should be \$24 million per year. Los Angeles needs more bike lanes, bikeways, and facilities for cyclists to encourage people to ride. More would ride if they felt safe. Metro needs to support an alternative to driving. Shared road use will encourage bicycling and improve motorist behavior towards cyclists. Additionally Metro should provide funds for road resurfacing for cyclist safety.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Chitomi Stevenson</i></p> <p>04/20/2008</p> <p>It's important to improve transportation, but education should be supported more than transportation.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>



*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Angela Trinh</i> 04/20/2008</p> <p>The carpool lane gap closures and installations proposed for I-10, US-101, and I-405 are good, however a carpool lane is needed to continue from I-10 east past downtown.</p> <p>More people are taking the Express buses, but there are fewer spaces to park to get to the bus. The Del Mar park-n-ride lot is always overcrowded by 7AM.</p> <p>Frequent service is needed for the express lines (not the Rapids). If the recommended planned funding figures for buses (capital costs) include more buses, that's good. If not, then it should and it should include funding for operations and maintenance as well.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Draft 2008 Plan contains the Metro Parking Policy in the Demand Management chapter and acknowledges that work is needed to plan the growth of park-n-ride lots that are safe and convenient for travelers to use.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Stephen DeGrey</i> 04/20/2008</p> <p>Resident of Palmdale is interested in bike paths on Avenue O between 30<sup>th</sup> Street West and 10<sup>th</sup> Street West to cross the Antelope Valley safely by bicycle, and connect with the Sierra Hwy and Bolz Ranch Road paths.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Rodger McIntyre</i> 04/19/2008</p> <p>Highway 138 should be re-routed due to increased truck traffic that presents Palmdale citizens with rising and very substantial safety risks.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Mike Antos</i> 04/19/2008</p> <p>Please support the Gold Line Foothill Extension and the Rapid bus line from the Del Mar Gold Line station to the Burbank Metrolink station.</p>	<p>Comment noted. These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Nina Hostetler</i> 04/19/2008</p> <p>Regarding the Westside Subway Extension, instead of having SE and SW branches south from Wilshire, it would be more economical to have one north-south branch, at right angles to Wilshire. It might then be extended to Crenshaw, La Brea, Fairfax, or La Cienega, before going south to the Exposition Line. There is a lot of traffic on Wilshire right now. A line could be extended to the 405 freeway then south to the 105. Later, another line could be added north to the Orange Line along the 405. This would help alleviate congestion on the 405, especially around the airport.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>James Richter</i> 04/19/2008</p> <p>The region must create stronger disincentives for people to make single passenger vehicle trips and create a comprehensive and efficient system of alternative transportation.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Paul</i> 04/18/2008</p> <p>Before you extend the Gold Line, you need to extend the service hours for existing rail lines.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Ryan Snyder</i> 04/18/2008</p> <p>Encourage increased bicycle and pedestrian funding in the Plan. Currently these two modes receive only 2% of the budget but comprise 3.5% of all work trips. These modes deserve a more equitable share of the funding. No mode can do more to reduce greenhouse gases. Please double the amount funded for bicycle and pedestrian modes.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Doug Shapiro</i> 04/18/2008</p> <p>Suggests more accessible and safer bike lanes, painted a bright color. Provide effective and recognizable bike racks, colored to stand out and provide security for the bike frame and wheels.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Bicycle Planning Staff.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Ron Milam</i> 04/17/2008 Encourage allocation of at least \$25 million per year to bicycle and pedestrian projects. Alternatively transfer funds from other projects that increase automobile capacity. MTA should adopt a "Complete Streets" policy.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Michelle Selvans</i> 04/17/2008 Would like to see bicycle and pedestrian improvements become just as central to transportation in LA as public transit. Safe conditions for cycling including infrastructure improvements such as bikeways, bicycle boulevards, bike lanes, sharrows. These improvements are needed to increase bikeable routes. The Plan should allocate 4% of the total budget to bicycle and pedestrian transportation improvements.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Cody Nash</i> 04/17/2008 Increase funding for bicycle infrastructure in the Plan. The safety of cycling could be increased through more infrastructure and awareness of relevant traffic laws. More people are turning to bicycles as an alternative to cars with rising fuel prices, climate problems, and health benefits; but cycling should be a safer and easier choice.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Michael de Villiers</i> 04/17/2008 Please prioritize the Westside Subway Extension to Santa Monica.  Why is the Silver Line being planned? It is a duplication of existing rail serving, or soon to be serving, these areas.  Until rail is available, Rapid bus lines should have dedicated lanes, at least during peak hours.  MTA should not be in the business of building roads and freeways.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.  Comment noted.  Comment noted.  Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

*Kenneth S. Alpern*

04/17/2008

Please support the Green Line extension to LAX and the Crenshaw Line LRT alternative over the BRT alternative.

Please support the Downtown Light Rail Connector as the next major project to be included in the constrained LRTP

All city, county, and federal budgets need to take a more appropriate and balanced approach to include our transportation needs, and will enjoy favorable funding initiatives if the specific benefits of these initiatives are clearly articulated to the taxpayer.

Whether it is the creation of Construction Authorities (such as those that exist for the Expo and Foothill Gold lines), or the creation of new tax corridors, we must create an environment that allows for the expedited and simultaneous funding and construction of multiple transportation projects.

The environmental benefits of high-capacity transit lines are very favorable, but the benefits toward our economy and quality of life must be emphasized first.

If the City of Los Angeles wants to enjoy a Westside (Wilshire Corridor) transit project within years and not decades, it needs to either create a new construction authority, tax corridor, or other mechanism to expedite its funding and construction while not interfering with that of light rail projects that access the entire county. Similarly, with billions being devoted in private funding towards downtown development, it should be relatively easy to fund the Downtown Light Rail Connector, with most or all coming from the private sector.

Parking/multimodal transportation centers should be created at all major mass transit stations to accommodate all modes of commuting, and the dogmatic paradigm of parking structures causing increased traffic and adjacent residential parking problems needs to be re-

Comment noted.

This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

The Draft 2008 Plan contains the Metro Parking Policy in the Demand Management chapter and acknowledges the importance of park-n-ride lots that are safe and convenient for travelers to use.

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p>evaluated and possibly abandoned. Mixed use development (with sufficient parking) to enhance our commercial corridors and mass transit ridership can increase our local economy, improve mobility, and help our environment and quality of life.</p> <p>There are insufficient financial incentives to have private businesses and/or government agencies change their hours of operation to encourage commutes during off-peak hours.</p> <p>SCAG needs to be on the same page with respect to its Maglev project as Metro, LADOT, the OCTA, the RTA, and Caltrans; and they need to revisit more cost-effective alternatives such as the very successful Metrolink service that provides long-distance commuters with an alternative to using their cars.</p> <p>Freight rail grade separation and other incentives to provide a cheaper and more efficient alternative to unnecessary and environmentally problematic truck traffic should be expedited for the benefit of the local and national economy, and legislation should be passed to either incentivize or require truck traffic to be redirected to off-peak hours.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Plan includes a Goods Movement Chapter that highlights the importance of goods movement strategies.</p>
<p><i>Andre Mitchell</i> 04/16/2008</p> <p>Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition member would like to test converting one lane of a major street to bicycles only. This test would set an example of what LA can do to cut down on traffic, congestion, and pollution.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Bicycle Planning Staff.</p>
<p><i>Sharon Martinez</i> 04/16/2008</p> <p>Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition member supports adequate funding for bicycle lanes in upcoming projects. Safety is an issue with cyclists; more would cycle if they felt safe. Cites the Pacific Electric Trail in Rancho Cucamonga as a successful project for attracting people to cycling as transportation.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Olivia Buckwheat Kelly</i>                  04/16/2008                  Encourages increased bicycle and pedestrian project funding in the Plan. Commitments should be made every year and improvements should be made throughout the county. Bicycle lane projects like those in Denmark, New York and Berkeley should be tried here.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Megan Boone</i>                  04/16/2008                  Not enough consideration is given to alternate forms of transportation including cycling. All new road projects should include bike paths &amp; walkways &amp; existing roads should be converted. Cyclists should always have their own lane as an option.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Matt Ruscigno</i>                  04/16/2008                  Provided a website link illustrating a city's (Portland) active involvement in creating infrastructure for bicycling.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Elizabeth H. Morrison</i>                  04/16/2008                  Bicycle funding should be doubled. More bike lanes and facilities should be made available. People should be encouraged to use bicycles as transportation, more bicycle lockers should be located at Metro Rail stations, and larger lockers should also be available. Every Metro project should integrate bicycle and pedestrian travel from the beginning. There is more interest in alternative modes of transportation but it needs to be a viable option for people to change their behaviors.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>David J. Hasenauer</i> 04/16/2008</p> <p>LA County Bicycle Coalition member urges dedicating more than 2% of the budget to pedestrian and bicycle projects. More people would bicycle to commute if it were safer by providing safer lanes, dedicated routes, good lighting, and road surfaces. These costs, if implemented with other road improvements, should be minimal as would the maintenance costs.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Eliza Wheeler</i> 04/16/2008</p> <p>Describes commitment to using public transportation and non-car ways of travel, and suggests that if more walkable/bikeable routes were available to Metro services, more people would be willing to use them. Plans for expanding Metro should include more bike facilities and ample budget to build them.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Morgan Beeby</i> 04/16/2008</p> <p>Los Angeles lends itself to being an ideal city for cyclists with straight streets and excellent weather. Metro should allocate a larger portion of funds to promote a long-term cycling vision.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Margaret McCain</i> 04/15/2008</p> <p>Describes the need for bike lanes at Wilshire Blvd and the 405 Freeway due to safety concerns for cyclists.</p> <p>Suggests that at least \$24 million per year in the Plan should be budgeted to meet increasing numbers of cyclists and the need for more bike lanes and facilities. This will encourage bicycle use. Every project initiated should include an alternative to driving.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.</p>
<p><i>Don Brunner</i> 04/15/2008</p> <p>Please fund Metro Rail.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Erik Klass</i> 04/14/2008 The solution to our traffic woes is rail for all parts of the city. Please do whatever is necessary to bring LA up to the rest of the world. I suggest a \$1 per gallon gas tax. That will get people out of their cars and fund the subways.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Mitch Browz</i> 04/14/2008 Suggestions: Finish the Green Line extension to LAX and build the Metro to the sea.  It is also necessary to build more freeway lanes. Carpool lanes do little to decrease congestion. Building more freeway lanes along with more public transit does.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.  Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Jeremy Jozwik</i> 04/11/2008 The Alameda Corridor East project has been awarded funding from the state, and the Silver Line is in the unfunded list of future projects. With the new San Gabriel length of the ACE being built, it is important that Metro and the ACE communicate with one another to prevent the Silver Line from being cancelled due to irreversible alterations to the Union Pacific ROW.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>



*Comments from Members of the Public*

*Matthew Hetz*

04/10/2008

It is important that the Green Line experience not be repeated, and no further transit systems be built in the middle of freeways. It is inhumane to place people in the middle of freeways, locked in the confines of the stations, subject to the noise, exhaust, and particulate matter. Compared with the bus, rail and subway offer a far superior quality of ride, and is much better for the transit rider.

There is an urgent need to construct as much rail and subway as quickly as possible in West Los Angeles. While acknowledging the financial restrictions, the accelerating threat of global warming does not allow us to wait. The Downtown Connector is also of vital importance, and the Green Line must be built to go to LAX directly. The Purple Line continuing westward is also of vital importance to the city.

In the Strategic Unfunded Harbor Subdivision section of the report, it may be assumed that Alternative Rail Technology (ART) refers to Maglev. Maglev is a technology best left for the science fiction pages.

Southern California is woefully inadequate to the needs of bicyclists. Riding conditions are threatening and dangerous on busy streets which do not have safe bicycle lanes.

Comments noted.

Comment noted. This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.

The Alternative Rail Technology refers to Diesel Multiple Units technology.

Comment noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.

*Sue Huang*

04/10/2008

Los Angeles could learn a lot from the system set up in Tokyo. The two cities have much in common, including urban sprawl, a population dependent on commuting, and an earthquake issue. The difference, of course, is that in LA, communities are linked together primarily by freeways, whereas in Tokyo, they are linked together primarily by subway and train lines. Tokyo's metro system consists of an above ground circular rail, which goes in both directions, encircling the entire city. Cutting through this circular construct runs an above ground horizontal rail line. In these two strokes, Tokyo allows for commuting from north to east and from west to south.

Comment noted.

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Jasmine Diaz</i> 04/09/2008 The MTA Board should consider a rail line from the San Fernando Valley to the Westside, including Culver City or LAX.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Scott Barrow</i> 04/09/2008 MTA should turn LA into as pedestrian and commuter friendly a city as Tokyo or London. It would also be nice to see LA make lists like the ones shown at <a href="http://blog.wired.com/cars/2007/12/four-best-airpo.html">http://blog.wired.com/cars/2007/12/four-best-airpo.html</a>.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Kelvin Lam</i> 04/09/2008 MTA should consider adding more interchange stations between Metrolink lines, particularly between the Orange County Line and San Bernardino Line. The only connection junction with the Orange County Line is at the downtown LA Union Station, leaving no alternative but to drive the 57 freeway, or for those in Riverside, to drive the 91 freeway. Perhaps a station can be developed at a mid-point, maybe in the Pomona/Industry area, to branch a connection line directly to Fullerton.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Elizabeth Hernandez</i> 04/08/2008 Please do not put the extension of the Red Line to Santa Monica (Subway to the Sea) in a higher priority than the smaller/cheaper projects. This one project will kill all the funding for the other projects that were on the drawing boards before this project. Please fund the extension of the Gold Line to Whittier, extension of the Gold Line to Montclair, and the extension of the Green Line to the Norwalk Metrolink station before you fund the super expensive Red Line extension.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Tina Lawson</i></p> <p>04/08/2008</p> <p>The expansion of rail lines needs to be supported.</p> <p>Public transportation needs to be cleaned up. Individuals should not be screaming, defecating/urinating, or assaulting other passengers on transit vehicles.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Nina Kaufman</i></p> <p>04/08/2008</p> <p>It is important to make bicycling a viable commuting alternative. For that to be the case, many of our bike lanes and bikeways need to be extended. There is no safe route for a person bicycling to go over the Sepulveda Pass from the Westside to the San Fernando Valley. There also is no safe north/south route from Mar Vista to Westwood by bicycle.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system</p>
<p><i>Anonymous</i></p> <p>04/08/2008</p> <p>The MTA Board should implement innovative programs that will shorten commute times and reduce smog: more bus-only lanes, taxing peak hour driving, more incentives to take public transit, more bike lanes and education, and more public awareness campaigns about using public transit and bicycles.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Draft Plan focuses on transportation strategies that encourage alternatives to the single occupant auto.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

*Adriana Nussdorf*

04/07/2008

Bike-only transportation networks should be introduced. People generally would ride their bikes to work if they only live a few miles away and there is a convenient path that is isolated from cars, making it safer and more comfortable to ride. A "bikeway" is different from a bike path in that riders would not share the road with any cars, making it basically a bike-only highway. Bikeways should be connected to common town centers, with stations every few miles serviced by private sellers. In order to ride the bikeway, riders must register for it every year for a moderate fee. Only people with good vision and above a certain age would be able to register. They must also read the rules and sign that they are willing to comply with them. Rules include the responsibility to be a safe rider. Proof of registration may be requested at any time by a bikeway security officer. Also, at the stations along the way, there should be shower facilities and locker rentals to be used only by registered bikeway users to encourage riders to use bikeways for longer distances.

Comment noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system

*Freya*

04/03/2008

The 720 Metro Rapid line is intolerably crowded and slow. No matter how many 720s are running along Wilshire, every one of them is intolerably crowded because we use the 720 as if it was a heavy rail line.

Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.

Heavy rail to the ocean need not be a subway tunnel. If subway tunnels prove too expensive, perhaps elevated platforms above traffic can be used along Wilshire and other arterials, as is done in Chicago, New York, Boston, San Francisco, and other cities.

Comment noted.

Metro should decrease crowding on buses. All Metro buses are too crowded and slow. Some passengers now refuse to ride Metro buses for this reason, and sometimes passengers miss stops because of the crowding. Another suggestion is for Metro to develop express bus routes from downtown LA to UCLA, Westwood, and Santa Monica

Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p>Beach. Currently, only Santa Monica 10 runs express to the ocean and that is not even a Metro bus.</p>	
<p><i>Sally Nicholson</i> 04/02/2008 It would be easy to implement passenger ferries for commuters to various piers close to other transit services: South Bay, Marina del Rey, Malibu, Santa Monica, or Long Beach. Instead of digging up old railway lines, use them for trams or light rail.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Ificouldcmupwit1</i> 04/02/2008 No new freeway construction work should be done (including the 710 gap) or new mixed flow lanes. These are large investments that will just be clogged in a few months time and leave us with the same problems that we have now. The MTA should be giving more priority to the Metro Rail and bus systems rather than freeway construction. The focus on freeways should be on upkeep and maintenance, not expansion. Some suggestions regarding Metro's strategic long range plan: 1) The Vermont corridor subway should be included in Tier 1. 2) The rail line from Union Station to LAX on the Harbor Subdivision should run as multiple DMU units. It is a long distance and would work well with commuter rail service. 3) The Gold Line foothill extension should run as light rail only to Azusa and then as commuter rail service to Ontario Airport. 4) The Green Line extension to Norwalk should have a higher priority. It will allow people from Orange County to go to LAX, the South Bay Galleria (with that extension), and all of the routes along the Green Line (and the jobs there). It seems that the Green Line extension is redundant with respect to the Crenshaw corridor project. 5) Any Maglev project should not be in the LRTIP since it is not intended for long distances, is prohibitively expensive, and is not proven. 6) The I-405 corridor project should be</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comments noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p>replaced with subway technology and not BRT technology. Buses are too slow for the Sepulveda Pass and will not have the necessary capacity.</p>	
<p><i>Paul Leimbach</i> 04/02/2008 Subway construction is the most expensive transportation system to build. Building rail systems above existing freeways encourages people who are stuck in traffic to use the faster moving rail line, thus reducing traffic on the freeway. Unlike the Orange (bus) Line, a rail system would not have to stop at intersections that slow it down. Building such a system above the 405 freeway from the San Fernando Valley to LAX (perhaps even farther) would be a great option.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Michael de Villiers</i> 04/01/2008 There is a desperate need for congestion relief on the Westside, and a big part of the congestion is due to traffic coming from the San Fernando Valley. The Westside and the San Fernando Valley need a fast, high volume connection to LAX. Please consider changing the priority of the 405 Corridor Busway project to Tier 1.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Maxine Judkins</i> 04/01/2008 It has again come to the attention of the MTA riders who live in Playa del Rey or work out here that MTA is again planning to change the services provided in this area. The only service that is provided to Playa del Rey is MTA line #115 which runs once an hour beyond Sepulveda and Manchester and is never on time. There are times that one has to wait not just one, but two hours. Residents have collected over a hundred and fifty signatures asking for better bus service in this area. This petition was taken to the office of Councilman Bill Rosendahl asking for help, but we were told that he had nothing to do with transportation services.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Chris Schaefer</i>                  04/01/2008                  Fund the transportation projects with lower cost per mile first (at-grade light rail instead of heavy rail). Please fund the extension of the Gold Line East Side to Whittier, both Green Line extensions, and the Gold Line extension to Montclair first before funding the Westside subway extension. With the limited amount of funding, please spread the projects out over LA County instead of sinking it all in one project in one geographic area (Subway to the Sea).                  Replace the proposed Maglev project with off the shelf technology such as light rail or DMU (Sprinters) along the Santa Ana branch line.                  Instead of building a whole new light rail line from Union Station to Burbank, please consider extending the Metro Red Line from the North Hollywood station to the Burbank Airport Metrolink station.</p>	<p>Comment noted.                  Comment noted.                  Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Coachocd</i>                  04/01/2008                  Urge MTA Board to consider construction of a subway system that runs the length of Santa Monica Blvd from Century City to Silver Lake then downtown to Union Station. A "circle" type subway system consisting of the Red Line, Purple Line, a Sepulveda Pass Line, and a Ventura Blvd line would also be desirable.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>John Lynch</i>                  03/31/2008                  Please stop taking bike lane space from the right shoulder of streets after re-paving and re-striping. Not providing adequate space for bicyclists to maneuver in traffic makes this mode of transportation much less safe.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Simon Ganz</i> 03/30/2008</p> <p>Urge MTA Board to expand LA's rail network by constructing a North-South line for the San Fernando Valley and Westside. Most people in the Valley have to take a bus to the Red Line, then switch lines at least once in order to get downtown. Since a dedicated busway is being considered for the 405, and that North-South trip is one of the most heavily traveled in the entire city, it deserves a real rail line, either light rail along the 405, or a subway cutting through the hill somewhere else.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Michael Romero</i> 03/30/2008</p> <p>The MTA Board ought to consider construction of a system of dedicated tunnels or roadways for our large trucks.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Renata Valree</i> 03/28/2008</p> <p>As a new resident to the Antelope Valley, it is surprising to learn that so many community members, young &amp; old, have no means of public transit, particularly those who reside between 30<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> Streets between Avenues J and K. Budgetary constraints were cited as the reason for minimal recent service changes and for no new buses being added to the existing fleet. All potential stakeholders and decision-makers should take into consideration the need to provide transportation services for the rapidly growing areas between 30<sup>th</sup> Street West and 50<sup>th</sup> Street West.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Brian Kenehan</i> 03/28/2008</p> <p>Having recently moved from Los Angeles to San Diego because the traffic was just too much, it is imperative that the MTA Board develop a better rail system. With the amount of tax dollars coming into the area, they should figure out some better ways for getting people around other than by car. Now living in downtown San Diego, the trolley is a very convenient transportation option.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>



*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Lee Stickler</i> 03/28/2008</p> <p>The MTA Board should consider developing a train service to the west side from the Silverlake area. This community is extremely underserved by our current rail system. In addition, a light rail from LAX to the Valley would eliminate a lot of traffic and travel delays and reduce pollution as well.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Richard Schumacher</i> 03/27/2008</p> <p>The Exposition LRT Phase 2 must use the existing right-of-way. An alternative route along streets would be a waste of resources.</p> <p>The regional connector should be a high priority.</p> <p>The 710 gap closure should be a high priority.</p> <p>Do not expend any resources on maglev projects except to discourage them.</p> <p>At least one rail link into LAX should be a high priority. If the first rail link is an extension of the Green Line, then a further extension of the Green Line to the Norwalk Metrolink station should also be high priority.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Maurice Sparks</i> 03/27/2008</p> <p>The MTA Board ought to consider converting the number one lane of every freeway and converting them to rail. If there is objection to this one lane takeover, then go overhead with a monorail or beneath with subways, or a combination of all three. The Green Line, which goes from nowhere to nowhere, but coincidentally runs down the center of the 105 freeway, cuts short of LAX by a mile.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Dave Winter</i> 03/27/2008</p> <p>It is a disappointment that the Green Line ends at Manhattan Beach instead of continuing on into Long Beach. The MTA Board should consider a long term plan to extend it through the South Bay area into Long Beach to meet up with the Blue Line.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The extension of the Green Line through South Bay is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Robert Perez</i> 03/24/2008</p> <p>The MTA Board should expand the heavy rail system currently used only on the Red and Purple lines. This rail technology should be expanded to resemble the BART system in the San Francisco Bay Area. This system should emerge from the subway mode once it leaves the Los Angeles metropolitan area and run along the freeway median as it heads toward the San Gabriel Valley, Gateway cities, or Harbor areas. In the case of the San Fernando Valley, it could run in a combination of subway, elevated track, and along freeway medians. This system could cover Los Angeles County via the freeway system.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Carlos Tower</i> 03/22/2008</p> <p>The MTA has done an amazing job. There are noticeable improvements throughout LA County. Having lived and spent time in many other metropolitan areas, I like the direction that Metro is headed.</p> <p>The subway and light rail system are areas of concern in the LRTP. It's good to see Phase 2 of the Expo Line in the funded plan. It's important to finally extend the system to the west. Regarding the Wilshire Blvd transitway, it is hard to imagine where or how it can be constructed without further congesting the traffic riddled street even more. An alternate project should be included in its place. It is also surprising to see the important Crenshaw Blvd corridor project on the funded plan.</p> <p>Regarding the strategic unfunded projects, the Regional Connector is</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. These projects are included in the Strategic</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p>definitely the project of next highest importance. The subway to the sea is also an important step in developing the LA subway system. It is disappointing to see the Gold Line extensions behind a Burbank light rail that has no completed studies. The Gold Line extension is ready for construction and is only seeking funding. This project was previously considered high priority. In the Final LRTP, the Regional Connector should be given highest priority among the strategic unfunded projects, followed by the Gold Line extension to Azusa and the subway to La Cienega of equal rank.</p>	<p>(Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Cheng Chen</i> 03/21/2008</p> <p>Why doesn't Metro allow people to park their cars overnight in the Metro station parking lots? It would be nice to take Metrolink to Union Station then change to the Metro Red Line and Blue Line to Long Beach. This would be possible if people were allowed to park their cars at the Long Beach Blue Line station overnight in order to drive to work from the station in the morning.</p>	<p>The Draft 2008 Plan contains the Metro Parking Policy in the Demand Management chapter. Metro recognizes the transition to and from public transit should be as seamless as possible. The existing Metro Station parking program helps manage parking resources and anticipates future parking demand. The Draft 2008 Plan acknowledges that work is needed to plan the growth of park-n-ride lots that are safe and convenient for travelers to use.</p>
<p><i>Gerlonda Battles</i> 03/21/2008</p> <p>MTA is involved in long range transportation project planning without addressing short range problems with the condition of local buses. The "7900" series of buses are falling apart and the only time their condition is addressed is when MTA Customer Relations is contacted with complaints. Is there no on-going maintenance plan for keeping local buses in sound condition?</p> <p>How can these kinds of conditions be allowed to exist while MTA is so heavily invested in long term plans for expansion and construction? The bus lines to and from work at the University of Southern California are affected by construction on the Expo Line. The irony is that with all the money being heaped into this project, riders have to contend with the physically uncomfortable and disgusting conditions of local buses. Rather than wait for complaints, local buses should be checked for structural integrity and insect infestation with some scheduled regularity.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p> <p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

*Jay Ross*

*03/20/2008*

Urge MTA Board to reject the roadway construction projects in Los Angeles. They are developed by traffic engineers who do not listen to the residents, and they are based on poor policy choices that falsely claim that building more roads will reduce congestion and improve traffic flow. Think about the long term and fund only mass transit projects in Los Angeles. It has already been learned that freeways are harmful. Reject all of the road widenings, and support mass transit and bicycle lanes instead. Some of the road widenings that should be rejected are on National, Normandie, Laurel Canyon, the Sepulveda Tunnel, and Lincoln.

The 710 tunnel should be rejected. It is not a "missing link", and it will do nothing to reduce congestion. The huge cost is not worth it. That money should be spent on mass transit instead (maybe the nearby Gold Line extension through the San Gabriel Valley) which will bring greater benefits to Los Angeles County. The High Desert Corridor in north LA County should also be rejected. This project only encourages car ownership, and good transfers can be accomplished by rail. Plus, the environment is too fragile and too valuable in the desert to be paved over and polluted more. Carpool lanes should be funded on the I-5 and 101, as well as extensions of the Green Line, Gold Line, and Purple Line. High speed rail and maglev should also be funded. Higher taxes are acceptable to fund mass transit projects that help the community as a whole.

Comments noted.

Comment noted. The Draft Plan focuses on transportation strategies that encourage alternatives to the single occupant auto.

*Stephanie Schwedler*

*03/20/2008*

MTA needs to stop wasteful spending. It should be required that every Metro employee or any person who accepts compensation from Metro utilize MTA's transportation services for at least one week of every month.

Comment noted.

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Stewart Chesler</i> 03/19/2008</p> <p>Page 26 lists two projects on the Strategic Unfunded list that overlap:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Metro Gold Line Extension from Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa.</li> <li>2. Metro Gold Line Extension from Sierra Madre Villa to Montclair.</li> </ol> <p>It would make better sense to list them as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Foothill Corridor (Phase I): Metro Gold Line Extension from Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa.</li> <li>2. Foothill Corridor (Phase II): Metro Gold Line Extension from Azusa to Montclair.</li> </ol> <p>Also on page 26, please specify what exactly is in store for Reseda, Sepulveda, Van Nuys, Lankershim, and San Fernando under the North/South San Fernando Valley project.</p> <p>Page 31 lists carpool lanes for US-101 in Tier 1 of the Strategic Unfunded Plan. Given the lack of ROW, it doesn't seem feasible to build them, especially between Downtown Los Angeles and Calabasas. In addition, why would Metro want carpool lanes on the Hollywood Freeway when there is already a subway beneath it? At a minimum, this part of the project should be dropped.</p> <p>Also on page 31, the I-710 South project is ranked below the Ventura Freeway projects. Considering all the truck traffic on I-710 and the economic impact the project would have on the county, shouldn't this project be ranked above the Ventura Freeway?</p> <p>The Plan should spell out what is meant by the Wilshire BRT project in a footnote on page 26 since it appears that a major portion of it will be going forward with new Small Starts funding during the next three years.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Ken Wakita</i> 03/18/2008</p> <p>LA needs an efficient mass transit system!!</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

*Alexander Friedman*

*03/17/2008*

Los Angeles needs a comprehensive, reliable subway system. This is the only solution to street gridlock. Our current mass transit system is inadequate for the vast majority of Angelinos to get to/from their destinations. The two major subway projects (Wilshire Blvd and Santa Monica Blvd) should be only the beginning of our future comprehensive citywide subway network.

To encourage people to walk more, a pedestrian-friendly and attractive environment needs to be created. Beautification and cleaning-up greatly increases safety levels, attracts more tourism, and increases our city's economy.

Although many streets citywide are wide enough to create bike lanes (Class II paths), no improvements have been made recently. Bicycling is a very environmentally-friendly, healthy, and pleasant way to commute, however not enough efforts have been dedicated to attract sufficient numbers of riders in the city; we don't have nearly enough Class I paths (dedicated, separated bike paths that would not interfere with vehicular traffic).

Comment noted.

Comments noted. The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.

*Dan Wentzel*

*03/17/2008*

It is great that the two most important public transit improvements, the Downtown Regional Connector and the Purple Line extension to Santa Monica, are included in the LRTP.

Public transit alternatives from the San Fernando Valley to the Westside should also be included in at least the unfunded portion of the LRTP, including the implementation of the Westside Transit Corridor Extension project to extend the Purple Line and provide a one-seat ride from North Hollywood to Century City via Santa Monica Blvd.

Comments noted.

Comments noted.

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p>A Sepulveda LRT from LAX to Metrolink, providing a direct West/Central Valley connection to the Westside would be another excellent transit alternative to be included in the LRTP.</p> <p>The southern end of the 761 bus line should be extended to Pico. Another suggestion is to develop a new 961 Rapid Line that would have stops at Metrolink, the Orange Line, Ventura Blvd, Wilshire Blvd, Santa Monica Blvd, Pico Blvd (or the Expo Line), Venice and/or Washington, Jefferson and/or Fox Hills Mall, and the LAX Transit Center.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Your comment will be forwarded to the Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p>
<p><i>Susan Cunningham</i> 03/17/2008</p> <p>Hopefully, in the near future there will be more buses available for riders on the 740 line.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p>
<p><i>Jose Larios</i> 03/16/2008</p> <p>It's a go with you guys. Don't let anything stop the plans for a future free of traffic jams.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Richard Barrow</i> 03/16/2008</p> <p>Whatever happened to the study to re-direct truck traffic to non-congested times?</p>	<p>Comment noted. Metro has been working with neighboring counties through a Goods Movement Action Plan to identify promising strategies to improve goods movement.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Tommy Pedrini</i> 03/15/2008 It is disappointing that the LRTP makes no mention of the Silver Line, and generally excludes the Echo Park/Silver Lake/Glendale corridor.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Silver Line is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan List (Tier II).</p>
<p><i>Ruchira Shah</i> 03/14/2008 It is disappointing that carbon emissions are only going to be about 700 tons less if we implement the plan than if we don't.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>David Kantor</i> 03/14/2008 I believe wholeheartedly that 32 more miles of rail to be implemented within 22 years is a drastically low figure for such a long period of time. Even with the improving bus rapid transit service, this megalopolis will require a lot more rail than that.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Katharine Lisiewicz</i> 03/14/2008 The plan doesn't appear to suggest an alternative to highway travel between the San Fernando Valley and the Westside. Many people commute via the 405 freeway, and the LRTP doesn't appear to offer any plans to ease that commute. If the 405 is to be widened, is some form of rail being incorporated?</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Draft 2008 Plan identifies "strategic" unfunded priorities and programs, such as the I-405 Corridor Busway, that are regionally significant but require new revenue sources to be implemented.</p>
<p><i>P.L. Evans</i> 03/14/2008 Metro wants more money from the customer but gives very bad service to the customers. Bus drivers often close the doors even when people are standing right in front of the bus door or running alongside it. In addition, the 105 buses have been running very late in the early morning. The 740 is the slowest rapid bus there is. It is always crowded and runs late.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p>



*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Michael Schneider</i> 03/13/2008</p> <p>Los Angeles is the only major city in the world without a comprehensive subway system. Subways are the only long term fix; expanding freeways and even buses are only short term strategies. Subways should run in the middle of the 405 freeway, connecting the San Fernando Valley's existing Metro Rapid line in the north, with LAX, or even the Blue Line in Long Beach, to the south.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>James Zack</i> 03/13/2008</p> <p>More safe bikeways, that are physically segregated from auto and truck traffic, are needed in Los Angeles County. Also, Metro Rail currently has restrictions on bikes on the trains during rush hours. This is not a bike friendly system, but it needs to be so in order to make bicycling a viable option for commuters.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Sam Gold</i> 03/13/2008</p> <p>Los Angeles needs an effective rail system to move people throughout the city. In particular, rail should be used through the Sepulveda Pass instead of BRT.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Jeremy Roberson</i> 03/13/2008</p> <p>The San Fernando Valley should be connected to the Westside via a subway line. This subway (the "Pink Line"), should run from the Orange Line (west of the 405 in Reseda) all the way down to UCLA's Purple Line stop, and hopefully to the Expo Line. With this subway, major business centers, the greater Westside, and downtown could be connected to LA's important suburban neighborhoods in the San Fernando Valley.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Kevin Aguirre</i> 03/13/2008</p> <p>The I-405 corridor from the San Fernando Valley to the Westside appears to be a pretty low priority on Metro's to-do list. The 405 through the Sepulveda Pass is almost always a mess. Obviously, limited funds can only be used for the highest priority projects, but this should be one of them.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Draft 2008 Plan identifies a Bus Rapid Transit project on the 405 from the SFV to LAX in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan that could be implemented if new funds become available.</p>
<p><i>Dean Jones</i> 03/13/2008</p> <p>The budget expense to build passenger gates at Metro Rail stations would better be spent on annual fare programs to encourage more monthly pass purchases versus bars and gates. To produce more revenue from increased ridership, quality of service must be improved. The placement of uniformed employees on platforms would defer free loaders.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Richard Beaver</i> 03/13/2008</p> <p>The 405 freeway needs to be improved. The solution is to have a metrorail line running alongside the 405 from Long Beach or the South Bay area up to the San Fernando Valley. The extension of the Green Line into the South Bay would be another useful project.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Julie Zafiratos</i> 03/13/2008</p> <p>Los Angeles needs a comprehensive subway system like every other major metropolitan city in the world, and all of our transit system needs to run every ten minutes 24/7 so that people can actually use it. Please urge the Metro Board to help stop waste and global warming and build a sustainable future by making a system that can be used by everyone.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

<p><i>Eric Stevering</i> 03/13/2008</p> <p>The Tier 1 unfunded project rankings should be as follows: 1) Subway extension to La Cienega; 2) Green Line extension to connect with LAX; 3) Phase 2 of Expo Line; 4) Subway extension to the ocean.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Mooney Starr</i> 03/13/2008</p> <p>Please build any and all of the transit projects that were released in your LRTP today.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Lars Carlson</i> 03/12/2008</p> <p>Metro should be commended for creating such a comprehensive document.</p> <p>Under "Tier 2 Strategic Unfunded-Public Transportation", the I-405 corridor between the Metro Orange Line at Sepulveda and the Green Line at Aviation is designated as a "busway". The creation of a busway here may not be feasible, and a subway alternative for this corridor may be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Mark Yamarone</i> 03/12/2008</p> <p>The "State to State Flows" color key in Figure V is transposed.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into Final LRTP.</p>

*Comments from Members of the Public*

*Jeremy Jozwik*

*03/12/2008*

The Tier 1 grouping of transportation projects for the next 20 years is good. However, the placement of the Silver Line on the Tier 2 project list is unimpressive. The Silver Line should be promoted because it would bring light rail to the central San Gabriel Valley along an existing right-of-way that is served by some well used bus routes.

Along the Silver Line right-of-way from Union Station east, there are many large abandoned industrial lands that could feature TODs. Built as Metro-owned, mixed-use transit oriented developments, the rents and leases on the land could add revenue, spur new density in an already dense region, and add even greater ridership.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

ATTACHMENT G

RESPONSES TO COMMENT CARDS RECEIVED ON THE  
DRAFT 2008 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

NOTE: The Draft 2008 LRTP was distributed for review and comment on March 12, 2008. The following reflects staff responses to comment cards received on the Draft LRTP at community meetings.

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<i>Louise Oliver</i>	04/23/2008 Supports Orange Line extension.	This project is included in the Constrained Plan and is recommended for funding.
<i>Gregory Wright</i>	04/23/2008 Suggests: signs displaying time til next train; colored headsign lights to identify approaching buses; monopole shade patches at bus stops; additional seating and restroom facilities at rail stations; traffic calming measures; promotion of low-carbon attributes of public transportation; and promotion of four-day workweeks at state and federal levels.	Comments noted.
<i>Phil Pearson</i>	04/23/2008 Supports educating students about transportation options.	Comment noted.
<i>Jerry Martin-Kosis</i>	04/23/2008 Supports extending Metro line 239 to Burbank Bl/Yolanda Av and loop to Reseda Orange Line Station.	Your comments will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.
<i>Ray D. Lopez</i>	04/23/2008 Supports Westside extension to Santa Monica.	This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.
<i>Deseire Alvarez</i>	04/23/2008 Opposes the expansion of US-101.	Comment noted.

<i>Glen Wilson</i>	<i>04/23/2008</i>	Comments noted.
Opposes new sales tax. Suggests publicizing park-and-ride lot at Orange Line Sepulveda Station but discourages housing at that location. Suggests moving jobs to where people live, discouraging overbuilding, and discouraging in-migration to Los Angeles area.		
<i>Ron and Vivien Wynn</i>	<i>04/23/2008</i>	Comment noted.
Opposes the expansion of US-101.		
<i>Clarke Miranda</i>	<i>04/23/2008</i>	Comments noted.
Suggests adding bike racks like those on the Orange Line to all buses, a revised fare structure, and more frequent late-night bus service.		
<i>Marietta Grimaud</i>	<i>04/23/2008</i>	Comment noted.
Opposes the expansion of US-101.		
<i>Elaine Macdonald</i> <i>Antelope Valley High Desert Cyclists</i>	<i>04/22/08</i>	The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.
Presented plan for expanded bicycle route system in Antelope Valley. Suggested the need for more bike lanes with striping, more routes on commercial streets, connections to bike routes, increased curb lane widths, and signs indicating bike routes.		
<i>Steve Chisolm</i>	<i>04/22/2008</i>	Comment noted.
Suggests express stop service on Metrolink.		
<i>Linda Pluss</i>	<i>04/22/2008</i>	The Plan supports Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements as part of a balanced transportation system.
Suggests increased bike lanes on County roads.		

<p><i>Citrus College</i></p> <p>04/08/2008</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa, Claremont, and the Ontario Airport in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Hilda L. Solis Congresswoman</i></p> <p>04/08/2008</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa, Claremont, and the Ontario Airport in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Alan K. Weeks</i></p> <p>04/08/2008</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa, Claremont, and the Ontario Airport in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Harold Leacock</i></p> <p>04/08/2008</p> <p>Urge the Metro Board to include the extension of the Gold Line light rail transit system from the current terminus at Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa, Claremont, and the Ontario Airport in the 2008 Long Range Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Gold Line Foothill extension (from Pasadena to Montclair) is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p>
<p><i>Kathy Edwards</i></p> <p>04/03/2008</p> <p>Expressed concern with personal safety on trains, especially at Hawthorne Station where she was mugged.</p>	<p>Your comment will be forwarded to Metro Customer Relations staff.</p>

<p><i>Rudyard Clark</i></p> <p>Supports extension of Red Line from Lankershim/Chandler station to Burbank Airport and Green Line north to Santa Monica via LAX.</p> <p>Suggests improving Blue Line by increasing grade separations and adding a Wilmington-San Pedro spur. Supports extension of Green Line east to Fullerton. Supports extension of Red Line to Alhambra, El Monte, Hacienda Heights, Puente Hills Mall, Walnut, Diamond Bar, and Pomona.</p>	<p>04/03/2008</p>	<p>These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Dennis Alabaso</i></p> <p>Suggests modifications to routes 450X, 740, 745, and 754. Also suggests adding Metroliner service between Artesia Transit Center and El Monte Bus station and Rapid service between Green Line Aviation Station and downtown Long Beach transit mall.</p>	<p>04/03/2008</p>	<p>Your comments will be forwarded to Metro Transit Service Planning staff.</p>
<p><i>Ruben Valdez</i></p> <p>Supports Gold Line Eastside Extension to Whittier.</p> <p>Also suggests extending it to Huntington Beach as well as a transportation center in Whittier.</p>	<p>03/27/2008</p>	<p>This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Larry Geller</i></p> <p>Supports the Purple extension to Santa Monica.</p> <p>Would like to see uniformed sheriff's department employees on buses, not just rail lines.</p>	<p>03/27/2008</p>	<p>This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Chris Moner</i></p> <p>Supports monorail.</p>	<p>03/27/2008</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>



<i>Tony Chavira</i>	03/27/2008	Evaluate investing in Neighborhood Development Councils, local development non-profits, and creating investment organizations.	Comment noted.
<i>Sylvia Heustis</i>	03/26/2008	Supports subways and more frequent service on them, but acknowledges the need for buses as well.	Comment noted.
<i>Joan E. Stern</i>	03/26/2008	As a long-term solution, buses and carpool lanes are not viable solutions. Instead suggests high-capacity light rail and more subways. Also encourages innovative funding sources such as auto/vehicle additional sales taxes, congestion tax, and congestion pricing.	Comments noted.
<i>James Radzik</i>	03/26/2008	Supports monorail.	Comment noted.
<i>Rick Hyman</i>	03/26/2008	Supports subway and light rail rather than buses and additional highway capacity. Extension of Green Line to LAX should be the first priority. Supports subways along Wilshire and Santa Monica Boulevard to the sea.	Comment noted. These projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Plan and could be implemented if new funding sources become available.
<i>Madeleine Rackley</i>	03/26/2008	Supports Metro Line from West Hollywood to downtown LA as well as to Westwood and Santa Monica.	Comment noted.
<i>Irek Galliamov</i>	03/26/2008	Supports String Transport.	Comment noted.

