

4. Responses to Comments

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15088(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the “lead agency shall evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR and shall prepare a written response. The Lead Agency shall respond to comments that were received during the noticed comment period and any extensions and may respond to late comments.” This section of the Final EIR provides a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies that commented on the Draft EIR, along with the responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.

The Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse Office of Planning and Research and circulated for public review from October 26, 2020 to December 28, 2020. Approximately 445 comments were received via mail, email, and public hearing.

4.2 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

In accordance with Section 15088(c) of CEQA, reasoned, factual responses have been provided to all comments received during the public review period, with a particular emphasis on significant environmental issues. The comments and responses are organized as follows: agencies and organizations, individuals, comments received at the Draft EIR public hearing, and comments received via social media. All comments and responses to comments are included in this Final EIR and will be considered by the Metro Board prior to certification of this EIR and in any approval of the proposed project.

Each comment letter, email, voicemail, and hearing testimony have been assigned a number. The body of each comment letter, email, social media comment or hearing testimony has been separated into individual comments, which also have been numbered. This results in a tiered numbering system, whereby the first comment in Comment Letter No. 1 is depicted as Comment No. 1-1 and so on. Copies of each comment letter, email, voicemail and public hearing testimony are provided in Appendix C. All of the comments received are listed in Table 3.1. In response to some of the comments received, the text of the EIR chapters has been revised. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, for Project revisions and Chapter 3, Corrections and Additions, for specific corrections to the Final EIR.

Table 4-1 - List of Commenters on the Draft EIR

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
AGENCIES			
1.	Miya Edmonson IGR/CEQA Branch Chief	California Department of Transportation District 7- Office of Regional Planning 100 S. Main St., Suite 100 Los Angeles, CA 90012	December 7, 2020
2.	L. Narvaez, SSM III Commander	California Highway Patrol Special Projects Section	December 7, 2020
3.	Sharon Springer Mayor Bob Frutos Vice Mayor Jess A. Talamantes Council Member Emily Gabel-Luddy Council Member Timothy M. Murphy Council Member	City of Burbank 275 E. Olive Ave. Burbank, CA 91510	December 20, 2020
4.	Erik Krause Deputy Director of Community Development	City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 E. Broadway, Suite 103 Glendale, CA 91206	December 28, 2020
5.	Edward Guerrero Jr. Senior Transportation Engineer	City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation 100 S. Main St., 10 th Fl. Los Angeles, CA 90012	December 28, 2020
6.	Kevin De León Council Member	City of Los Angeles Los Angeles City Council 14 th District	December 28, 2020
7.	Terry Tornek Mayor	City of Pasadena Office of the Mayor 100 N. Garfield Ave. Pasadena, CA 91109	December 3, 2020
8.	Jackie Goldberg Board District 5	Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education 333 S. Beaudry Ave., 24 th Fl. Los Angeles, CA 90017	December 26, 2020
9.	Todd McIntyre Chief Strategy	Metrolink Southern California Regional Rail Authority 900 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1500 Los Angeles, CA 90017	December 10, 2020
10.	Alex Boekelheide Special Assistant to the Superintendent/President	Pasadena City College 1570 E. Colorado Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91106	November 13, 2020
GROUPS/ORGANIZATIONS			
11.	Desiree Gates Valdivieso President	Dahlia Heights Elementary Parent Teacher Association	

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
12.	Emily Carlin President	Eagle Rock Elementary Parent Teacher Association 2057 Fair Park Ave. Eagle Rock, CA 90041	December 27, 2020
13.	David Diaz Executive Director Laura Raymond Director Eric Mann Director Jennifer Gill Chair, Engineering Subcommittee Kent Strumpell Chair, Planning Subcommittee Deborah Murphy Chair Jonathan Parfrey Executive Director Christy Zamani Executive Director Bryn Lindblad Steering Committee Member Felicia Garcia Steering Committee Chair Hilary Norton Executive Director Elise Kalfayan Steering Committee Member Timothy Hayes Organizer Jessica Meaney Executive Director David Levitus Executive Director Crissi Avila and Mona Field Co-Presidents Eli Akira Kaufman Executive Director Christine Louise Mills Director John Yi Executive Director Alfonso Directo Jr. Vice-Chair Denny Zane Executive Director Carter Rubin Mobility and Climate Advocate Scott Gamzon Founder	ActiveSGV Alliance for Community Transit - Los Angeles Bus Riders Union / Labor Community Strategy Center City of Los Angeles Bicycle Advisory Committee City of Los Angeles Bicycle Advisory Committee City of Los Angeles Pedestrian Advisory Committee Climate Resolve Day One EnviroMetro Equitable Eagle Rock FAST: Fixing Angelenos Stuck in Traffic FAST Link DTLA Glendale Environmental Coalition Ground Game LA Investing in Place LA Forward League of Women Voters of Los Angeles Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition Los Angeles River Communities for Environmental Equity Los Angeles Walks Metro Westside/Central Service Council Move LA Natural Resources Defence Council Neighborhoods United for Safe Streets	December 27, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
	Emily Kate Spokes Co-Founder	NELA Climate Collective	
	Colin Bogart Steering Committee Member	Pasadena Complete Streets Coalition	
	Allen Compton Co-Founder President,	Take Back the Boulevard SALT Landscape Architects	
	Darrell Clarke Conservation Chair	Sierra Club Angeles Chapter	
	Mark Strickert President	Southern California Transit Advocates	
	Michael Schneider Founder	Streets For All	
		Los Angeles Hub Sunrise Movement Los Angeles Steering Committee Walk Bike Glendale	
14.	Jared Berenholz Michael Blanchard Claire Bowin Lenore Carlson Annie Choi, Business Owner, Found Coffee Stephen Collins Angelyn de la Garza, Business Owner, Kumquat Natalie Freidberg Felicia Garcia Jessie George Laura Gonzalez David Greene Herb Gualpa, Eagle Rock Business Owner, Pub 1954 Luis Lopez Michael MacDonald Maggie Mackay, Eagle Rock Non- Profit Director, Vidiots Foundation Birgitta Martinez Robert Martinez Augustine Mukul Pat Niessen Cyndi Otteson Javier Pardini, Eagle Rock Business Owner, Malbec Market Eli Presser Monica Sigsby, Business Owner, The Fable Thom Sigsby, Business Owner, The Fable Darren Hall Eileen Hatrick Wade Harpootlian Andrew Jacobs Hans Johnson	Eagle Rock Resident	December 28, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
	Jeff Johnson, Business Owner, Walt's Ryan Johnson Lisa Kable-Blanchard John Kerr Stephen Kia, Business Owner, ROCK Coffee House Bryn Lindblad Michael Sweeney Erin Tanaka, Eagle Rock Business Owner, Acorn Adalia Vidarte Jonathan CK Williams Corey Wilton, Business Owner: Four Cafe, Penny Oven, Good Fire & Holi Michelle Wilton, Business Owner: Four Cafe, Penny Oven, Good Fire & Holi Chloé Renée Ziegler, Business Owner, globe gardens		
15.	Christine Louise Mills Chair Hans Johnson President	East Area Progressive Democrats Transit Committee	December 28, 2020
16.	Monica Campagna David Eisenberg Elise Kalfayan Kathy Kottaras Nick Martins Jennifer Pinkerton Jane Potelle Paul Rabinov Kate Unger	Glendale Environmental Coalition	December 22, 2020
17.	Javier Pardini Lucero Medrano Deybi Munez Josue Mancia Guadalupe Sigula Daniel Venencia Laura La Rosa Camila Pardini Alicia Eiben Laura Pandius-Verecio	Malbec Market Eagle Rock Employee Petition	December 28, 2020
18.	Paul Little	Pasadena Chamber of Commerce	December 10, 2020
19.	Greg Merideth President	TERA The Eagle Rock Association PO Box 41453 Eagle Rock, CA 90041	December 28, 2020
INDIVIDUALS			
20.	Aaron Dehn		December 27, 2020
21.	Adam Linder		November 8, 2020
22.	Adam Modiano		December 27, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
23.	Aisha Dixon-Peters		December 26, 2020
24.	Akiva Gottlieb		November 12, 2020
25.	Aleem Hossain		December 24, 2020
26.	Alek Bartrosouf		December 17, 2020
27.	Aleksandra Sherman		December 23, 2020
28.	Alex de Cordoba		November 12, 2020
29.	Alexander Halaby		November 11, 2020
30.	Alexander Shirley		December 28, 2020
31.	Alissa Walker		November 12, 2020
32.	Allen Hubsch		October 26, 2020
33.	Allen Natian		November 18, 2020
34.	Amanda Dobbins		November 18, 2020
35.	Amber Sealey		December 27, 2020
36.	Ana K. Davis		December 28, 2020
37.	Anastasia McGee		December 1, 2020
38.	Andrew Thomas		November 30, 2020
39.	Andy P.		December 27, 2020
40.	Annette Hill		December 27, 2020
41.	Annie Molina		December 13, 2020
42.	Anonymous		November 17, 2020
43.	Anonymous		November 21, 2020
44.	Arjun Kolachalam		November 6, 2020
45.	Barbara Kremins		December 25, 2020
46.	Barrett Cooke		December 16, 2020
47.	Ben Creed		November 7, 2020
48.	Ben Tomimatsu		December 1, 2020
49.	Bethsaida A. Castillo		December 15, 2020
50.	Betsy Medvedovsky		November 13, 2020
51.	Beverly Ashley		December 27, 2020
52.	Bhavin Shah		November 7, 2020
53.	Bin Lee		November 6, 2020
54.	Bob De Wees		October 29, 2020
55.	Bobby Babajian		December 28, 2020
56.	Brandon Yung		December 27, 2020
57.	Brendan Quinn		December 28, 2020
58.	Brian		December 18, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
59.	Brian Bruegge		November 16, 2020
60.	Brian McDaniel		December 27, 2020
61.	Byron de Arakal		December 28, 2020
62.	Byron de Arakal		December 7, 2020
63.	Cal Billy		October 31, 2020
64.	Calvin Chin		October 31, 2020
65.	Cardie Molina		December 27, 2020
66.	Carey Bennett		November 6, 2020
67.	Carl and Pamela Allender		November 2, 2020
68.	Carl Matthes		December 27, 2020
69.	Carmel Levitan		December 23, 2020
70.	Carol Allen		December 27, 2020
71.	Carter Rubin		November 25, 2020
72.	Casey Law		November 10, 2020
73.	Catherine Cameron		November 1, 2020
74.	Cherryl Weaver		December 27, 2020
75.	Chris Newman		October 29, 2020
76.	Chris Stratton		December 28, 2020
77.	Christopher Shelton		December 27, 2020
78.	Christopher Shelton		December 23, 2020
79.	Claire Bowin		November 1, 2020
80.	Coco Bunny		December 10, 2020
81.	Corey Barnes		December 8, 2020
82.	Cyndi Otteson		November 12, 2020
83.	Dan Bednarski		December 28, 2020
84.	Dan Fineman		December 27, 2020
85.	Dan Huynh		December 28, 2020
86.	Daniel and Richard Walker		November 17, 2020
87.	Daniel Goldwasser		December 16, 2020
88.	Daniel Hawkins		November 10, 2020
89.	Darlene Gonzalez-Szabo		December 28, 2020
90.	Darren Hall		December 25, 2020
91.	David Dellinger		December 28, 2020
92.	David Dellinger		December 2, 2020
93.	David Freeland		December 17, 2020
94.	David Greene		December 28, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
95.	David Ingber		November 15, 2020
96.	David Levine		December 20, 2020
97.	David Levine		December 20, 2020
98.	David Matsu		November 12, 2020
99.	David Moran		November 14, 2020
100.	David Newman		November 6, 2020
101.	David Newman		November 18, 2020
102.	Dawn Kukla (Dorinda)		November 1, 2020
103.	Debra Gerod		December 5, 2020
104.	Desiree Portillo Rabinov		December 20, 2020
105.	Dessa Kaye		November 17, 2020
106.	Dexter Chan		December 27, 2020
107.	Diane Louise		December 1, 2020
108.	Donald Sweetnam		November 12, 2020
109.	Donovan Daughtry		November 12, 2020
110.	Duncan Sinclair		December 26, 2020
111.	Dustin Perkins		December 28, 2020
112.	Edward Frontenac		December 28, 2020
113.	Elise Kalfayan		December 24, 2020
114.	Elizabeth Vitanza		December 20, 2020
115.	Ellen Stern		December 27, 2020
116.	Elliot M. Smith		November 12, 2020
117.	Emma Huang		December 2, 2020
118.	Erika Foy		November 5, 2020
119.	Esther Soliman		December 28, 2020
120.	Evan Smyth		December 20, 2020
121.	Family Naness		December 20, 2020
122.	Felicia Garcia		November 11, 2020
123.	Felicia Garcia		December 28, 2020
124.	Felipe Rojas		November 12, 2020
125.	Foster Wilson		December 23, 2020
126.	Fran Blayney		December 28, 2020
127.	Frank (Pancho) Jones		November 13, 2020
128.	Frank F. Medina		December 18, 2020
129.	Franky Lamouche		December 27, 2020
130.	Gemma Marquez		December 27, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
131.	Gene Mazzanti		December 27, 2020
132.	George Jamgochian		December 12, 2020
133.	Glenn Dresch		December 27, 2020
134.	Glenn Dresch		November 17, 2020
135.	Glenn Laird		November 16, 2020
136.	Grace Peng		December 8, 2020
137.	Grace Ramirez		October 27, 2020
138.	Hannah Gibson		November 12, 2020
139.	Hannah Globus		November 6, 2020
140.	Henry Fung		December 28, 2020
141.	Howard Naness		December 20, 2020
142.	Ignacio Piña		December 28, 2020
143.	Ikuko Remmenga		December 18, 2020
144.	Israel Jacquez		December 28, 2020
145.	J. Donnelly		November 6, 2020
146.	Jake Harrison		November 6, 2020
147.	James Henschell		December 28, 2020
148.	James Ortiz		November 20, 2020
149.	James Panozzo		December 28, 2020
150.	Jane Demian		December 28, 2020
151.	Jane Demian		December 27, 2020
152.	Jane Tsong		December 28, 2020
153.	Janet Cappellanti-Adams		November 30, 2020
154.	Janet Cappellanti-Adams		December 13, 2020
155.	Janet Cappellanti-Adams		December 27, 2020
156.	Janet Diel		December 27, 2020
157.	Janet Waldron		December 28, 2020
158.	Janette Gembitz		December 28, 2020
159.	Jean Leland		December 28, 2020
160.	Jean-Marie Martz		December 27, 2020
161.	Jeff Cannon		December 24, 2020
162.	Jeff Pott		December 10, 2020
163.	Jennifer Nelson		December 18, 2020
164.	Jenny Morataya		December 26, 2020
165.	Jesse Silva		December 28, 2020
166.	Joe Masiero		November 10, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
167.	Joey Hernandez		December 27, 2020
168.	John Colter		December 28, 2020
169.	John Kerr		December 28, 2020
170.	John Perry		November 11, 2020
171.	John Schulhof		December 21, 2020
172.	John Squire		
173.	Jon Ingalls		December 28, 2020
174.	Jon Natchez		November 6, 2020
175.	Jonah Paten		December 28, 2020
176.	Jonathan Raspa		December 28, 2020
177.	Josh Fruhlinger		November 25, 2020
178.	Josh Saunders		December 10, 2020
179.	Jovita D. Molina		December 9, 2020
180.	Juanita Davis		November 11, 2020
181.	Julian Hanes		December 28, 2020
182.	Justin Bensan		December 28, 2020
183.	K Fanslow		December 27, 2020
184.	Karen Jaques		December 15, 2020
185.	Karen Suarez		December 27, 2020
186.	Kate Eberle		December 20, 2020
187.	Kate Grodd		December 28, 2020
188.	Kathleen Aberman		December 1, 2020
189.	Kathleen Dunleavy		November 19, 2020
190.	Keegan Hartman		December 28, 2020
191.	Kelly Thompson		November 12, 2020
192.	Ken Levy		December 10, 2020
193.	Ken Perry		December 28, 2020
194.	Kerrin Tso		December 28, 2020
195.	Kevin		December 29, 2020
196.	Kevin Burton		December 24, 2020
197.	Kevin Castaing		December 28, 2020
198.	Kim and Donna Turner		November 10, 2020
199.	Kim and Warren Giancaterino		November 14, 2020
200.	Kim Martellino		November 11, 2020
201.	Kim Martellino		November 11, 2020
202.	Kim Sheehan		November 13, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
203.	Kobra Schabanpour		December 25, 2020
204.	Kris Kouri		November 20, 2020
205.	Kristen Gassner		November 14, 2020
206.	Kristina and Mark McConville		November 17, 2020
207.	Kristina McConville		November 11, 2020
208.	Kyle Remmenga		December 8, 2020
209.	Kyle Remmenga		December 18, 2020
210.	Leon Liang		November 18, 2020
211.	Leslie Lemmon		December 27, 2020
212.	Lisa Karahalios		December 25, 2020
213.	Lois Kalinsky		December 27, 2020
214.	Lorena Alamillo		December 28, 2020
215.	Iwilson2100		December 28, 2020
216.	Lydia Storie		December 28, 2020
217.	Malia Schilling		November 12, 2020
218.	Manijeh Carmichael		December 27, 2020
219.	Marc Lowenthal		December 20, 2020
220.	Mark A Rhein		December 28, 2020
221.	Mark Whitney		November 30, 2020
222.	Martha A Orozco		December 28, 2020
223.	Martha Kowal		November 21, 2020
224.	Martin LeFever		December 10, 2020
225.	Martin Rusch		December 25, 2020
226.	Mary Castaneda		December 1, 2020
227.	Mary Morano		December 28, 2020
228.	Matt Harrington		November 16, 2020
229.	Matt Harrington		December 19, 2020
230.	Matthew Robertson		December 28, 2020
231.	Maureen Perkins		December 27, 2020
232.	Melanie and Ernie Pava		December 27, 2020
233.	Michael Amoruso		December 26, 2020
234.	Michael Blanchard		December 28, 2020
235.	Michael Fishman		November 6, 2020
236.	Michael Guitar		December 1, 2020
237.	Michael Kowal Jr.		December 27, 2020
238.	Michael MacDonald		December 28, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
239.	Michael Schneider		December 28, 2020
240.	Michael Siegel		November 9, 2020
241.	Michael Tuggle		December 28, 2020
242.	Michele McKinley		December 29, 2020
243.	Michelle McKinley		December 29, 2020
244.	Miguel Nunez		November 12, 2020
245.	Mina Fried (Mona Field)		November 19, 2020
246.	Miri Hinds		December 1, 2020
247.	Morgan Night		December 10, 2020
248.	Myanna Dellinger		December 1, 2020
249.	Nadine Levyfield		November 3, 2020
250.	Nathanael Cho		December 5, 2020
251.	Nathanael Tronerud		December 1, 2020
252.	Neale Stokes		October 26, 2020
253.	Nick Richert		November 15, 2020
254.	Nilza Serrano		November 30, 2020
255.	Noah Cox		December 16, 2020
256.	Olga Lexell		November 6, 2020
257.	Olga Lexell		December 28, 2020
258.	Oscar Peña		November 12, 2020
259.	Owen Thurston		December 28, 2020
260.	Padric Gleason Gonzales		November 30, 2020
261.	Patricia Pérez		December 11, 2020
262.	Paul Rabinov		December 20, 2020
263.	Paula Grepo - Fuentes		December 27, 2020
264.	Peter Cistulli		November 13, 2020
265.	Peter Liepmann		December 27, 2020
266.	Peter Liepmann		November 11, 2020
267.	Pilar Reynaldo		December 28, 2020
268.	Pinguino Kolb		December 2, 2020
269.	Priscila Kasha		December 14, 2020
270.	Q. Sarah Ostendorf		December 23, 2020
271.	Rachel Hastings Saunders		December 28, 2020
272.	Raymond Palagano		October 28, 2020
273.	Rebecca Kalauskas		December 28, 2020
274.	Reg Willson		November 12, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
275.	Reiner Kolodinski		December 5, 2020
276.	Reiner Kolodinski		October 26, 2020
277.	Rene		December 28, 2020
278.	Rex Mayreis		November 10, 2020
279.	Richard Luczynski		December 27, 2020
280.	Richard Margulieux		December 5, 2020
281.	Richard McFarlane		December 27, 2020
282.	Rick Marquez		December 27, 2020
283.	Riker Haddon		November 6, 2020
284.	Robert A Stoughton		December 27, 2020
285.	Robert Barbosa		December 28, 2020
286.	Robert DeVelasco		December 10, 2020
287.	Robert Frampton		December 28, 2020
288.	Robert Frampton		October 29, 2020
289.	Robert Huddy		December 28, 2020
290.	Robert Inman		December 28, 2020
291.	Robert Velazquez		December 10, 2020
292.	Roberta Medford		November 4, 2020
293.	Rody Stephenson		November 7, 2020
294.	Roger Carnow		December 28, 2020
295.	Roger Carnow		November 4, 2020
296.	Ron Bergeron		November 13, 2020
297.	Ron McGill		December 23, 2020
298.	Ronda Jovanelly		December 27, 2020
299.	Ross Selvidge		December 30, 2020
300.	Roy Orecchio		November 5, 2020
301.	Ryan Gallagher		December 2, 2020
302.	Ryan Johnson		December 29, 2020
303.	Ryko Kohne		December 18, 2020
304.	Sam Erman		December 18, 2020
305.	Saman Bravo-Karimi		December 17, 2020
306.	Samuel Siegel		December 28, 2020
307.	Sandra Kay Beckley		December 27, 2020
308.	Sara Antebi		November 15, 2020
309.	Sarah Dean-Gooderham		November 20, 2020
310.	Scott Keiner		November 6, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
311.	Scott and Christina Newland		November 9, 2020
312.	Sean Shen		November 17, 2020
313.	Sergio Hernandez		November 14, 2020
314.	Sergio Padilla		November 22, 2020
315.	Severin Martinez		December 28, 2020
316.	Shannon Goss Schwartz		December 26, 2020
317.	Shant Jaltorossian		December 27, 2020
318.	Shelagh McFadden		November 30, 2020
319.	Simon Byrne		December 28, 2020
320.	Siobhán Burke		November 30, 2020
321.	Stan Yu		December 8, 2020
322.	Stephen Berens		November 20, 2020
323.	Steve Messer		December 21, 2020
324.	Susan Buchanan		December 28, 2020
325.	Susan Bull		December 25, 2020
326.	Suzanne Smith		December 28, 2020
327.	T Y		November 30, 2020
328.	Terenig Topjian		November 25, 2020
329.	Theodore Stern		December 27, 2020
330.	Thurmon Green		December 28, 2020
331.	Thurmon Green		December 27, 2020
332.	Thurmon Green		November 19, 2020
333.	Thurmon Green		November 12, 2020
334.	Tim Leetrakul		December 1, 2020
335.	Tim Mellin		November 30, 2020
336.	Tim Mellin		November 9, 2020
337.	Timothy Eckert		October 26, 2020
338.	Tom Krupal		December 27, 2020
339.	Tony Butka		December 27, 2020
340.	Tyler Bonstead		November 15, 2020
341.	Vdkbod (Null)		December 26, 2020
342.	Vdkbod (Null)		December 26, 2020
343.	Wajinc (Null)		November 5, 2020
344.	Walt Kasha		December 15, 2020
345.	Warren Brodine		December 27, 2020
346.	Will Proctor		November 16, 2020

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
347.	William Walker		November 13, 2020
348.	WM Johnson		December 10, 2020
349.	yourwhathurtsu		December 28, 2020
350.	Zachary Rynew		December 24, 2020
PUBLIC HEARING NO. 1 ON NOVEMBER 12, 2020			
PH1-1	Alex Boekelheide		
PH1-2	Oscar Pena		
PH1-3	Mona Field		
PH1-4	Mehmet Berker		
PH1-5	Lisa Payne		
PH1-6	Israel		
PH1-7	Michael McDonald		
PH1-8	Darren Hall		
PH1-9	David Newman		
PH1-10	Sebastian Reyes		
PH1-11	Cherryl Weaver		
PH1-12	Ed Stevens		
PH1-13	Anonymous		
PH1-14	Sean Nasser		
PH1-15	Natalie Freidberg		
PH1-16	Andrew Jacobs		
PH1-17	John Kerr		
PH1-18	Fred Dresch		
PH1-19	Chloe Renée Ziegler		
PH1-20	Alejandro Pardo		
PH1-21	Kim		
PH1-22	Ben Foushee		
PH1-23	Pat Niessen		
PH1-24	Zachary Rynew		
PH1-25	Joyce		
PH1-26	Felicia Garcia		
PH1-27	Marc Caraan		
PH1-28	Severin Martinez		
PH1-29	Ava V.		
PH1-30	Elliot The Colorist		
PH1-31	Michael Sweeney		

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
PH1-32	Fred Dresch		
PH1-33	Joyce		
PH1-34	Barbara Kremins		
PH1-35	Natalie Freidberg		
PH1-36	Cherryl Weaver		
PH1-37	Pat Niessen		
PUBLIC HEARING NO. 2 ON NOVEMBER 14, 2020			
PH2-1	Marcel W.		
PH2-2	Sam Lerman-Hahn		
PH2-3	Paul Dyson		
PH2-4	Sergio Hernandez		
PH2-5	Birgitta Martinez		
PH2-6	Joanne Knokomodo		
PH2-7	Niall Huffman		
PH2-8	Tim		
PH2-9	John Vu		
PH2-10	Kim		
PH2-11	Cyndi Otterson		
PH2-12	Jared Berenholz		
PH2-13	Laura Gonzalez		
PH2-14	Brandon Yung		
PH2-15	Tamala Takahashi		
PH2-16	John Gordon		
PH2-17	Jonathan Matz		
PH2-18	Aaron Stein-Chester		
PH2-19	Marcel W.		
PH2-20	Christopher Cotton		
PH2-21	Amanda Colligan		
PH2-22	Ashley Atkinsin		
PH2-23	Natalie Freidberg		
PH2-24	Felicia Garcia		
PH2-25	Ben Foushee		
PH2-26	Geoffry Nutting		
PH2-27	Don		
PH2-28	Christopher Cotton		
PH2-29	Natalie Freidberg		

No.	Name	Organization/Address	Date of Letter
PH2-30	Benjamin Phelps		
PUBLIC HEARING NO. 1 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS			
	Anonymous		
	Ben Foushee		
	Bill Lam		
	Chloe Renée Ziegler		
	Clyde B. Brown		
	Dex		
	Ellen Goldberg		
	Manuel Eduardo Hernández		
	Mona Field		
	Pat Niessen		
	Patricia Yossen		
	Sean Nasser		
	Tim Lindholm		
PUBLIC HEARING NO. 2 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS			
	Adrian		
	Adriana Quinn		
	Allen Carter		
	Anonymous		
	Ben Foushee		
	Diane Trout		
	Lynne Nishihara		
	Natalie Freidberg		
	Paul Dyson		
	Robin Gemmill		
	The Big Dog		
	Teresa G.		
	Tony		

4.3 MASTER RESPONSES

Master Response No. 1 – Design Changes in Eagle Rock

A large number of comments received during public review of the Draft EIR focus on the portion of the Proposed Project within the Eagle Rock community of the City of Los Angeles.

The Draft EIR evaluated three route options in the Eagle Rock Community of the City of Los Angeles (identified as “Section F” of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR). Route Option F1 provided a hybrid side-and-center running configuration option along Colorado Boulevard from Broadway to Linda Rosa Avenue (SR-134 Interchange). Under this option, the existing median would be converted to center-running, bus-only lanes and would maintain two vehicular lanes in each direction. Route Option F2 proposed side-running bus lanes along this same segment of Colorado Boulevard and would convert the existing buffered bicycle lanes to shared bus-and-bicycle lanes; two travel lanes would be maintained in each direction. Route Option F3 provided a mixed-flow operation, routed via SR-134, Figueroa Street and Colorado Boulevard; no changes to the existing roadway configuration would be required under this option. These three options were included in the Draft EIR based on feedback received during the completion of the Alternatives Analysis and the Draft EIR’s scoping process and to allow for continued consideration of the best route solution for Eagle Rock.

Generally, comments on the Eagle Rock segment of the Proposed Project consisted of opinions in support of or in opposition to one or several of the route options in Eagle Rock. Other comments expressed a general opposition to use of Colorado Boulevard. A handful of comments raised issue with the Proposed Project removing a travel lane along Colorado Boulevard, though none of the route options included in the Draft EIR proposed removal of a travel lane. A large segment of comments recommended implementing a community developed route option, referred to as the Beautiful Boulevard, which addresses the BRT route along Colorado Boulevard, between Eagle Rock Boulevard and Linda Rosa Avenue (SR-134 Interchange).

The Beautiful Boulevard design concept generally proposes to create new landscaped median (and retain the existing median) along Colorado Boulevard and to provide dedicated median-running bus lanes along the segment of the BRT route from Eagle Rock Boulevard to the SR-134 slip ramps near Linda Rosa Avenue. From Eagle Rock Boulevard to Mt. Helena Avenue, the Beautiful Boulevard design concept would reduce travel lanes on Colorado Boulevard to one lane in each direction; the remainder of the route would maintain two lanes in both directions. The Beautiful Boulevard design concept also proposes upgrades to existing pedestrian facilities, preservation of most on-street parking as well as upgrades to existing bicycle facilities in some areas. The Beautiful Boulevard design concept is described in Comment 13-4.

In response to public feedback received, including careful consideration of the community-developed Beautiful Boulevard design concept, and in coordination with local government and stakeholder groups, Metro has further refined the project segment through Eagle Rock, as discussed in Chapter 2, Project Description. More specifically, the Proposed Project now includes two options for the route along Colorado Boulevard, east of Eagle Rock Boulevard to

the SR-134 slip ramps near Linda Rosa Avenue. One option would maintain the two existing travel lanes on Colorado Boulevard in each direction by converting portions of the existing landscaped median and street parking to accommodate the Proposed Project's dedicated bus lanes; the other option would accommodate the Proposed Project's dedicated bus lanes by reducing the number of travel lanes on Colorado Boulevard to one lane in each direction, thereby allowing the Proposed Project to preserve more on-street parking and landscaped median/island space than the two lane option. Under the two lane option, BRT service would operate in dedicated median/center-running bus lanes from El Rio Avenue to the SR-134 slip ramps, which would be intermittently separated from vehicle lanes by raised islands. Under the one travel lane option, BRT service would also operate in dedicated median/center-running bus lanes from El Rio Avenue to the SR-134 slip ramps, intermittently separated from vehicle lanes by raised islands. As indicated, for the center-running bus lane portion of the one travel lane option, a greater length of the bus lanes would be separated from travel lanes by raised islands than under the two travel lane option. The one travel lane option would also preserve more existing parking spaces than the two travel lane option.

On May 27, 2021, the Metro Board approved moving forward with the staff recommended refined Project route and eliminated Route Options F2 and F3 from further consideration in the Final EIR. The refined Proposed Project, including the remaining options, was presented to the Eagle Rock community and stakeholders through a series of public meetings conducted between May 2021 and October 2021.

The Final EIR includes description of the two design options through Eagle Rock as well as updated impact analyses, which has not identified any new or substantially more severe significant impacts. As discussed in Chapter 3, Corrections and Additions, while the one lane option would reduce the number of travel lanes in Eagle Rock resulting in some anticipated congestion relative to existing conditions, the improvement in transit service and associated reduction in VMT would result in a less-than-significant impact on transportation. In addition, noise analyses have shown that change in configurations would not result in louder noise levels than predicted in the Draft EIR.

Both the two travel lane and one travel lane option incorporate specific concepts recommended by the Beautiful Boulevard design concept. Both options provide a new protected (continuously buffered) bicycle facility, consistent with the Beautiful Boulevard design concept's recommendation to buffer bicycle lanes by "flipping" existing parking and bicycle lanes. In contrast, Route Option F1 of the Draft EIR simply provided a new Class II bicycle lane in a similar configuration to existing conditions. Both the two travel lane and one travel lane option also incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard design concept's recommendation to include green pavement markings for the proposed buffered bicycle lane and to, maintain a similar number of the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) curb extensions than proposed under Route Option F1. Further, both route options would enhance pedestrian facilities by providing crosswalks at 20 intersections (compared to 16 intersections under existing conditions). Both options would also provide a new signal-protected school crosswalk at Dahlia Drive, upgrade the existing Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons to High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk (HAWK) pedestrian crossing signals or full traffic signals, and add a new HAWK signal at La Roda Avenue.

Metro reviewed the Beautiful Boulevard design concepts developed by the community and noted that dimensions were not provided for the various elements (e.g., sidewalks, travel lanes, bicycle lanes, etc.). The Beautiful Boulevard design concepts were presented for mid-block locations and did not address requirements at intersections and locations with BRT stations. Technical deficiencies noted with the Beautiful Boulevard design concepts include not demonstrating how left-turn pockets could be provided at intersections, not demonstrating how BRT stations could be accommodated, not providing a buffer between the bicycle lane and the adjacent travel lane between Broadway and Eagle Rock Boulevard, and medians/islands are not wide enough to accommodate the type of trees that are illustrated. Since the Beautiful Boulevard design concepts were determined to not be technically feasible for the reasons listed above, two design options were subsequently developed for Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporating elements from the Beautiful Boulevard design concepts while addressing geometric requirements (e.g. minimum lane widths) and local circulation and access needs (e.g., provides regularly-spaced median breaks to accommodate left turns and cross-street traffic).

A center median/median-running bus lane configuration along Colorado Boulevard from Eagle Rock Boulevard to the SR-134 slip ramps near Linda Rosa Avenue, as proposed by the Beautiful Boulevard design concept, is not necessary to reduce any significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project. Similar to Route Option F1 described in the Draft EIR, the two travel lane option would require the existing median and associated landscaping to be removed. However, new islands and center lane landscaping amenities would be installed for safety purposes as part of the Proposed Project, which would also offset some of the loss of visual resources. Moreover, the Proposed Project would implement Mitigation Measures **VIS-1** and **VIS-2**, which would reduce potential visual impacts on Colorado Boulevard east of Eagle Rock Boulevard by requiring landscaping and streetscape beautification. The one travel lane option would even further reduce potential visual impacts by preserving a greater degree of the existing landscaped median than Route Option F1 and by providing raised islands with landscaping. Implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIR would also ensure that impacts related to transportation, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils and noise are reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Regarding consistency with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, both the two lane and one lane option would provide improvements to the bicycle network by providing a parking-protected bicycle facility consistent with Mobility Plan Policy 2.6. Similarly, the proposed bicycle improvements along with proposed improvements to the transit network associated with the Proposed Project would be consistent with Mobility Plan Policy 2.9 which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network.

Regarding comments opposed to any use of Colorado Boulevard, Metro has considered these comments, but has determined that routing the Proposed Project on SR-134 and bypassing Eagle Rock would deprive the community of an important transit improvement that would benefit residents and businesses in Eagle Rock. Through an extensive outreach effort, Metro

determined that the refined Proposed Project and associated options in Eagle Rock would provide a benefit to transit users while also addressing much of the local community's concerns.

The purpose of the EIR is to present detailed information regarding the Proposed Project's potential environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives. Many comments related to the route options through Eagle Rock raise issues that are important to the decision-making process but are not required to be addressed as part of the CEQA process, as they do not raise significant environmental issues. The purpose of allowing the public and agencies to comment on a Draft EIR is to allow environmental issues to be raised and for the lead agency to provide responses to those issues in the Draft EIR. Opinions concerning non-environmental issues, including general expressions of opposition or support for a project, are made a part of the administrative record and are forwarded to the decision-makers for their consideration in taking action on the Proposed Project, but they are not directly responded to in this CEQA document. Prior to certification of the EIR and deciding on the Proposed Project, the Final EIR and the full record of comments received will be presented to the Metro Board for consideration. In addition to the prospective decision on whether to approve the Proposed Project, the Metro Board will also select one of the two options through Eagle Rock under consideration.

Master Response No. 2 – Economic Impacts

Many comments assert that the Proposed Project will cause already struggling businesses to go out of business due to the removal of on-street parking spaces, restrictions on curbside loading, and general disruptions to business from construction. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project.

Regarding loading/unloading zones, dedicated bus lanes are not a restriction on access to any given property and it is common for dedicated bus lanes to be used for temporary loading/unloading activities. For example, this is a regular occurrence for the Grand Avenue & Olive Street Bus Priority Lanes in Downtown Los Angeles. Bus operators navigate around the temporary obstacles by traveling in mixed-flow traffic. Chapter 2, Project Description, of this Final EIR includes a commitment from Metro to coordinate with local jurisdictions during final design of curb-running bus lanes to determine if existing loading zones can be relocated along side streets or off-street on adjacent properties. If necessary, consideration would be taken for accommodating existing loading zones in the curb bus lane. It is therefore not anticipated that bus loading/unloading would result in adverse economic effects that could lead to physical

changes to the environment, such as long-term vacancies that lead to deterioration of buildings and encourage graffiti or other unsightly conditions.

Regarding the loss of parking, the Proposed Project would result in the removal of on-street parking throughout the Project route depending on the configuration of proposed bus lanes, stations, and associated street markings. Chapter 2, Project Description, of this Final EIR describes the anticipated parking loss for each segment of the Proposed Project. Metro will work with local jurisdictions to quantify potential parking impacts of the final design. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route as per the Project Commitments identified in the Chapter 2, Project Description, of this Final EIR. Metro understands that many businesses along the corridor require available parking for their customers; it is not anticipated, however, that the number of spaces displaced by the Proposed Project would burden any one business or set of businesses along the Project route to the extent that indirect environmental effects would result. Access to all businesses along the Project Route would be maintained and the Proposed Project's mobility benefits are anticipated to improve or at least greatly offset any effects on business resulting from the loss of parking associated with the Proposed Project.

Accordingly, the Proposed Project is not likely to result in business closures, and even in the unlikely event that it did, the closure of a small number of businesses would not cause "urban decay"— e.g., the physical deterioration of properties or structures that is so prevalent, substantial, and lasting a significant period of time that it impairs the proper utilization of the properties and structures, and the health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding community.

4.4 RESPONSES TO PUBLIC AGENCIES

Letter No. 1

Miya Edmonson

State of California

Department of Transportation

District 7 - Office of Regional Planning

100 South Main Street, Suite 100

Los Angeles, CA 90012

- 1-1. The comment summarizes the Proposed Project. Further response is not required.
- 1-2. The comment expresses support for the primary alignment defined as the Proposed Project.
- 1-3. The comment expresses support for maintaining the existing Class 2 bicycle lanes on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation

of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Eagle Rock stations would utilize curb extensions to accommodate station elements, and curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would generally be retained with minor modifications.

- 1-4. The comment states encouragement for high quality transportation alternatives and summarizes State goals related to sustainable transportation. Further response is not required.
- 1-5. The comment states that coordination with Caltrans will be needed for any changes to Caltrans right-of-way or SR-134 ramps. Metro will obtain approvals from Caltrans for ramp modifications as applicable and will obtain all required permits including for oversized vehicles, if used for construction. Metro will consider limiting oversized construction trucks to off-peak hours.
- 1-6. The comment expresses a desire to continue coordination related to the Proposed Project. Metro will coordinate with Caltrans as the Proposed Project advances into design and engineering.

Letter No. 2

L. Narvaez

State of California

Department of California Highway Patrol

Special Projects Section

- 2-1. The Department of California Highway Patrol acknowledges receiving the Notice of Completion from the State Clearinghouse. The comment references an attached checklist for assessing the potential impact to local operations and public safety. It further states that comments must be provided to Metro by December 10, 2020 if input is advisable. This is clearly an internal comment that was not meant to be submitted to Metro. No comments were provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 3

Sharon Springer, Mayor
Bob Frutos, Vice Mayor
Jess A. Talamantes, Council Member
Emily Gabel-Luddy, Council Member
Timothy M. Murphy, Council Member
City of Burbank
275 East Olive Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91510

- 3-1. The comment introduces the letter. Further response is not required.
- 3-2. The comment mischaracterizes the definition of project alternatives. While the comment characterizes the Proposed Project as implementing dedicated BRT lanes along “virtually the entire corridor,” the Proposed Project has been planned and designed with the local context in mind. There are multiple instances along the proposed route where the Project has foregone proposing dedicated bus lanes and other BRT features based on local considerations and contexts. For example, the Proposed Project would operate in mixed-flow traffic for a portion of the route on Central Avenue between Glenoaks Boulevard and Doran Street and for the entirety of the route in Pasadena. The Alternatives Analysis prepared as a predecessor to the Draft EIR evaluated multiple route alignments and street configurations, and the Proposed Project is the outcome of a multi-year planning process taking into account local considerations and contexts.

The alternatives to the Proposed Project are the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) and the Improved Existing Bus Service Alternative (Alternative 2). The comment asserts that the Draft EIR must include an alternative that includes targeted BRT elements to satisfy legal requirements for a reasonable range of alternatives. As stated on page 6-8 of Chapter 6, Alternatives to the Project, Alternative 2 would be a local express service with some BRT characteristics. The service may be as frequent as that proposed for BRT with buses that would operate in mixed-flow traffic with transit signal priority systems (i.e., queue jumps as mentioned in the comment). Stops would be more frequent than the BRT line but less frequent than local bus lines (typically every 0.6 miles on average). Travel times would be faster than for local service but slower than the travel times expected from the BRT project. Stops would occur at existing bus stations and there would be no median-running, center-running, or side-running configuration. Alternative 2 includes the targeted BRT elements requested in the comment. In accordance with Section 15126 of the CEQA Guidelines, Consideration and Discussion of Alternatives to the Proposed Project, an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. This requirement has been satisfied in the Draft EIR.

- 3-3. The 2020 CEQA Guidelines do not require traffic congestion analyses. Metro is not required to consider traffic congestion in the CEQA process, although it may be considered by the Board of Directors during the decision-making process. Traffic analysis information has been provided to the City of Burbank outside of the CEQA process. Based upon the traffic analysis, signalized intersections along Olive Avenue are projected to operate at LOS D or better with the exception of the intersections at Buena Vista Street, Verdugo Avenue/Sparks Street, and Victory Boulevard, which are forecast to operate at LOS E or F in 2042 for No Project and/or Proposed Project Scenarios. Signalized intersections along Glenoaks Boulevard are projected to operate at LOS D or better under the No Build and With Project Scenarios. These results are generally consistent between the No Project and Proposed Project Scenarios.
- 3-4. The comment identifies several concerns regarding the Olive Avenue bridge including pedestrian safety, structural integrity, and geometric concerns with a suggestion to study widening the bridge to accommodate bus lanes and a station with a connection to Metrolink station below. Metro has revised the design of the Proposed Project to eliminate the proposed station on the Olive Avenue bridge and is no longer considering implementing dedicated bus lanes in this location. The location of the station has instead been shifted to Olive Avenue at Lake Street. The shifted station location would not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIR regarding the potentially significant impacts of the Proposed Project or result in any new significant environmental impact.
- 3-5. The comment misinterprets the purpose of identifying the environmentally superior alternative in a Draft EIR. The comment suggests that the Proposed Project could be the environmentally superior alternative, which is not accurate. As stated on page 6-17 of Chapter 6, Alternatives to the Project, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be identified among the alternatives that are evaluated in the Draft EIR to foster informed decision-making. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the fewest adverse impacts when compared to the Proposed Project while attaining most of the basic objectives of the Project. For the North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Project, the No Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative because there would be no physical changes to the existing environment resulting in construction or operational impacts. If the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires identification of the environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative from among the Proposed Project and the other alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives because, as compared to the Proposed Project, it avoids or reduces all construction impacts related to transportation, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and tribal cultural resources. It also avoids or reduces operational impacts related to transportation, aesthetics, cultural resources, and geology and soils. CEQA does not require that the alternatives analysis in the EIR address how the

Project or its alternatives meet the stated Project Objectives, simply that a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, be identified for decision-making purposes. The comment does not take issue with the ability of either the Proposed Project or Alternative 2 to meet the Project Objectives. CEQA does not require the feasibility determination (including discussion of the degree to which the alternatives meet the objectives) to be included in the EIR (*Flanders Foundation v. City of Carmel-by-the-Sea* (2012) 202 Cal.App.4th 603.). The decision to approve the Project will require a finding on the feasibility of the alternatives to the project weighing the desirability of the project “based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors against the benefits of the Environmentally Superior Alternative. This decision is left to the Metro Board of Directors as the decision-making body for the Proposed Project.

- 3-6. The comment introduces what the City views as inconsistencies between the Proposed Project and the Burbank Mobility Element. Specific inconsistencies are addressed in the following comments.
- 3-7. The comment incorrectly states that the Draft EIR must disclose and mitigate significant congestion impacts related to reducing travel lanes on Olive Avenue. The 2020 CEQA Guidelines do not require traffic congestion analyses. Metro is not required to consider traffic congestion in the CEQA process, although it may be considered by the Board of Directors during the decision-making process.

Regarding the reduction of travel lanes on the Olive Avenue bridge and conflicts with the Mobility Element, Metro has revised the design of the Proposed Project to eliminate the proposed station on the Olive Avenue bridge and is no longer considering implementing dedicated bus lanes in this location thereby maintaining the existing lane configuration through the Olive Avenue Bridge. The side-running bus lanes configuration would result in a reduction of travel lanes on Olive Avenue between Buena Vista Street and Lake Street. Review of the City’s Mobility Element and street classification system did not identify a requirement for Major Arterials to provide and maintain two travel lanes in each direction but rather a requirement for Major Arterials to maintain a 76-foot Traveled Way and a 100-foot Right of Way (Mobility Element on page 4-11). Regardless of the lane configuration of Olive Avenue, the existing width of right-of-way would be maintained by the Project. Further, the City’s Mobility Element street classification system identifies several priorities and requirements for Major Arterials. In order, the priorities are (1) Where transit conflicts with cars, design streets to maximize person versus vehicle throughput, (2) On-street parking may be removed to accommodate transit stops or turn lanes. Maximize traffic signal coordination; consider transit signal priority, and (3) Property dedication may be required to maximize sidewalk widths or to provide intersection capacity enhancements. To the extent that the Project presents a conflict between transit and cars due to the conversion of a travel lane to a side-running bus lane, the Project

maximizes person versus vehicle throughput by providing a premium transit service along Olive Avenue, consistent with the street classification list of priorities.

- 3-8. The comment mischaracterizes the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project does not include street widening (i.e., narrowing of the sidewalk).
- 3-9. The comment mischaracterizes the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project does not include street widening (i.e., narrowing of the sidewalk). The Proposed Project has been designed to avoid widening and acquisitions as feasible. This is consistent with Policy 3.4 which states, "Consider street widening and right-of-way acquisitions as methods of last resort." Details of the size and location of any potential acquisitions have not been identified at this stage in the design process.
- 3-10. Where proposed, the curb-running bus lanes configuration is not anticipated to result in spillover traffic into residential neighborhoods, since the curb-running bus lanes configuration maintains the existing number of travel lanes throughout most of Burbank. The side-running bus lanes configuration, which reduces the number of travel lanes on Olive Avenue between Buena Vista Street and Lake Street, is expected to result in a shift of traffic to parallel streets including Alameda Avenue and Burbank Boulevard. Not much traffic is expected to divert to local residential roadways, since out-of-direction travel would be required resulting in longer travel distances and longer travel times, especially considering the speed impediments along the local residential roadways (e.g., stops signs, speed bumps).

Although level of service impacts are not impacts required to be analyzed in an environmental document prepared under CEQA, Metro will work with the City of Burbank during the Project's engineering phase to install transit signal priority functions to expedite buses through signalized intersections and improve transit travel times.

- 3-11. The Proposed Project follows the Alameda Avenue and Buena Vista Street alignment suggested in the comment and includes a station in proximity to the Alameda Avenue and Naomi Street intersection.
- 3-12. The Proposed Project would not acquire land in Burbank that would potentially be used for a transit center in the Media District. The Proposed Project would improve, and not interfere, with the City's ability to create a new transit center in the Media District, as set forth in Policy 4-3 of the Burbank2035 General Plan Mobility Element.
- 3-13. Metro has revised the design of the Proposed Project to eliminate the proposed station on the Olive Avenue bridge. The location of the station has been shifted to Olive Avenue at Lake Street.

- 3-14. The alignment of the Proposed Project overlaps with the BurbankBus Pink Route between Hollywood Way/Riverside Drive/Olive Avenue in the Media District and the Downtown Burbank Metrolink Station. The Proposed Project's limited-stop service will complement the local service provided by the BurbankBus Pink Route. In addition, the BurbankBus Pink Route will obtain travel time and reliability benefits from the dedicated bus lanes implemented for the Proposed Project.
- 3-15. The comment mischaracterizes the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project does not include street widening (i.e., narrowing of the sidewalk).
- 3-16. The Proposed Project would operate in mixed-flow traffic on Glenoaks Boulevard between Olive Avenue and Providencia Avenue; thus the Project would not impact the City of Burbank's ability to address a gap in the bicycle network on Glenoaks Boulevard between Verdugo Avenue and Providencia Avenue.
- 3-17. Metro has revised the design of the Proposed Project to eliminate the proposed station on the Olive Avenue bridge.
- 3-18. Metro has revised the design of the Proposed Project to eliminate the proposed station on the Olive Avenue bridge.
- 3-19. The Proposed Project will operate in mixed-flow traffic on Glenoaks Boulevard on the approach to Olive Avenue; thus, the proposed BRT will execute a left-turn to westbound Olive Avenue from the left-turn lane shared with automobile traffic.
- 3-20. The Proposed Project would be designed in the engineering phase to confirm that left-turn movements can be executed in a safe manner at the Glenoaks Boulevard intersections with Providencia Avenue and Alameda Avenue. The eastbound-westbound left turns would operate under a protected signal phase. If geometric analysis demonstrates a conflict between the routing of the eastbound and westbound left turns if they operate concurrently, lead-lag signal phasing can be implemented so the eastbound and westbound left turns occur during separate protected signal phases.
- 3-21. The curb-running bus lanes configuration along Olive Avenue and the BRT stations along the sidewalks are not expected to create a hazardous geometric condition. Likewise, the side-running bus lanes configuration along Olive Avenue with the BRT stations provided along curb extensions are not expected to create a hazardous geometric condition. Right turns are allowed to be made from dedicated bus lanes across many BRT systems, including along Wilshire Boulevard locally. Metro will work with the City of Burbank during the Project's engineering phase to confirm that the Proposed Project does not create hazardous geometric conditions.

- 3-22. The Proposed Project's BRT will abide by traffic regulations when operating in the street right-of-way. Lane widths and traffic control measures will meet the applicable design standards. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to create hazardous geometric design features.
- 3-23. The comment states that the cumulative project list is missing several projects within the City of Burbank that should be included in the Cumulative Impact Analysis. Please see Chapter 3, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR for the updated cumulative projects list based on information provided by the City of Burbank on May 3, 2021. The updated cumulative projects list clarifies and amplifies the information provided in the Draft EIR. No new or substantially more severe cumulative impacts have been identified based on the updated list. The additions to the cumulative list do not directly or indirectly affect the environmental resource analyses included in Chapter 5, Cumulative Impacts, of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no revisions to the cumulative impact analysis are necessary.
- 3-24. Both the Burbank Media District and the Burbank Center Specific Plans were included in the analysis of population and housing and land use impacts, as discussed in Appendices Q and L, respectively. Conflicts and compliance with these planning documents were assessed individually in these technical analyses rather than cumulatively. The Proposed Project would be compatible with the land use plans, goals, and policies adopted by the regional and local jurisdictions within the Project Area. While it is anticipated that land uses in the Project Area will change over time to address growing population and regional demands for infrastructure and services, individual City jurisdictions and metropolitan planning organizations such as SCAG are responsible for planning such development. Land uses surrounding the Proposed Project stations may intensify due to transit oriented development (TOD) pressures and zoning initiatives that have been planned and encouraged by the Project Area cities including the Cities of Los Angeles, Glendale, Burbank, and Pasadena. This growth pattern would be consistent with regional planning efforts to focus future growth in areas served by transit to address environmental concerns related to climate change and availability of services and infrastructure to meet future demand. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would be consistent with regional and local plans aimed at improving regional mobility and focusing growth in areas well served by transit. As described in Chapter 4, Other Environmental Considerations, of the Draft EIR, no significant impacts related to land use or population and housing were identified.
- 3-25. The comment states that the EIR omitted analysis of Metro's Antelope Valley Line (AVL) Capacity and Service Improvements Project in the cumulative projects list and therefore omits necessary analysis of the need for the Project to have additional improvements to the Burbank Metrolink station connection. The AVL Capacity and Service Improvements Project has been added to the analysis in the EIR. Please see Chapter 3, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. Adding AVL to the cumulative list does not directly or indirectly affect the environmental resource analyses included

in Chapter 5, Cumulative Impacts, of the Draft EIR. The AVL Capacity and Service Improvements Project does not propose any improvements to the Burbank Metrolink station or tracks in the vicinity of the Proposed Project and simply proposes increased frequency of service to the station. The Proposed Project no longer proposes any improvements to the Olive Avenue bridge where the Burbank Metrolink Station is located. Thus, there is no potential conflict between the Proposed Project, the existing Burbank Metrolink Station, or existing and future Metrolink service.

- 3-26. The Draft EIR acknowledged proposed spot widening to add a curb-running bus lane through the Olive Avenue/Sparks Street/Verdugo Avenue intersection and potential overlap of the two projects' construction activities. The Project now includes a side-running bus lane instead of a curb-running bus lane and Metro no longer proposes widening at this location. Metro is committed to working with the City of Burbank during engineering to confirm that improvements are not in conflict with the City's planned improvements at the Olive/Verdugo/Sparks intersection. It should be noted that at the time of this Final EIR, the City of Burbank has not prepared publicly-available design plans for the improvements nor programmed funds for the improvements.
- 3-27. Metro has revised the design of the Proposed Project to eliminate the proposed station on the Olive Avenue bridge as well as dedicated bus lanes across the bridge.
- 3-28. At this stage of the Conceptual Design, it is anticipated that a majority of the street trees along Olive Avenue would remain unaffected by the Project and further design refinement would be needed to identify the precise number and location of affected trees. Side-running bus lane configurations of the Proposed Project are anticipated to have fewer impacts on trees than the no longer considered curb-running configuration. The removal of street trees was not considered a significant impact alone unless those street trees have been identified by stakeholders as important aesthetic resources through scoping comments or in a planning document. In absence of a clear identification of a given resource's importance, impacts to aesthetic resources were assessed based on the context to the aesthetic environment and input from stakeholders, local jurisdictions, and the public. The Draft EIR acknowledges that tree removals could occur at various locations but notes that further design refinement during the Preliminary Engineering phase would avoid most conflicts with existing street trees located within sidewalks. Further, Mitigation Measure **VIS-1** would reduce any impacts to streetscape vegetation to a less-than-significant level by requiring replacement landscaping in accordance with local streetscape requirements and design criteria.
- 3-29. Contrary to the comment's assertion, the Draft EIR does not state that the Project would have no effect on police service calls or service ratios, but rather states that no police facilities would be affected and no changes in population would result requiring new or expanded police service or facilities. As stated in the Draft EIR, police response may improve as the dedicated bus lanes would be available to emergency vehicles in the event of an emergency, avoiding typical roadway congestion. Metro acknowledges

that its transit policing strategy generally only applies to Metro facilities such as stations and that some local police service would be required to respond to service calls along the Project corridor; however, there are existing Metro bus services and facilities within the City of Burbank and it is anticipated that no significant change in the frequency, nature, or magnitude of police service requirements would be posed by the Project. As described in the Draft EIR, new BRT stations would be designed using Metro's Design Criteria which maximize lighting, visibility, and overall user safety which may improve safety along the Project route. Regarding enforcement of bus lane restrictions, Metro would coordinate with the City and local police service agencies to develop appropriate enforcement strategies. Per newly enacted legislation under Assembly Bill (AB) 917, operations of the Proposed Project may incorporate camera enforcement on the buses.

- 3-30. As discussed in Chapter 4, Other Environmental Considerations, of the Draft EIR there is no plan to locate electric bus charging infrastructure in the City of Burbank and the infrastructure required to charge vehicles for the Proposed Project and the Metro fleet generally would be located where adequate capacity is available. The Draft EIR does identify the North Hollywood Metro B/G (Red/Orange) Line Station as a likely location for charging infrastructure and another location at Pasadena City College is under consideration. Currently and for the purposes of the EIR, it has been assumed that overnight electric charging infrastructure for the Proposed Project would be located at one of Metro's existing bus depots. No aspect of the planning or design for the Proposed Project has considered electric vehicle charging infrastructure within the City of Burbank.
- 3-31. The comment identifies a recycled water interconnect with the City of Glendale located within the Glenoaks Boulevard median south of Alameda Avenue and states that the Proposed Project would result in impacts to the interconnect. Potential impacts to the referenced interconnect have not been identified during the Project's early phase of conceptual design. If impacts to the interconnect are identified in the Proposed Project's engineering and design phase, the design and engineering process will confirm the functionality of the interconnect.
- 3-32. The comment states that the Draft EIR does not adequately address potential utility impacts related to proposed street widening. As discussed in Chapter 4, Other Environmental Considerations, of the Draft EIR, construction of the Proposed Project is not anticipated to require or result in the construction or relocation of utilities which could cause a significant environmental impact because utility relocations would be coordinated with utility providers.

At this stage in the conceptual design, utility facilities have not been identified as designs are not advanced enough to determine potential conflicts. As discussed in Appendix S Utilities and Service Systems of the Draft EIR a utility composite base map would be developed to outline the utilities within the Project boundary. The base map would be used to identify conflict locations with Proposed Project work and existing

utility facilities. Each utility company would need to be contacted on a periodic basis to determine if there are any new plans for their facilities. The utility composite base map would be updated as new information becomes available. Utility coordination meetings would be set up with each utility company with potentially affected facilities to help determine if relocation would be required or the facility could be protected-in-place. The utility coordination meetings would help to confirm the utility companies are engaged early during project development. Preliminary relocation concepts would be developed and presented to each utility owner with affected facilities. In addition, the resource analyses factored in utility relocations, as necessary. For example, the air quality analysis is premised on a regional analysis that accounts for a conservative projection of the maximum daily equipment and vehicle activity that could be occurring along the entire Project corridor in a given day. Analyzing such a worst-case scenario ensures that all other construction activities would not produce air quality impacts that exceed those analyzed in this document.

- 3-33. The comment states that the Draft EIR fails to address long-term effects of frequent bus travel on City pavement requiring increased maintenance cost and activities. As discussed in Chapter 2, Project Description, the Proposed Project's BRT service would operate with 10-minute frequency throughout most of the day on weekdays tapering to 15 to 20 minutes frequency during the evenings, and with 15-minute frequency during most of the day on weekends tapering to 30 minutes in the evenings. Substantial deterioration of the pavement is not anticipated because the Proposed Project's BRT service would provide only six buses per hour per direction (or approximately 200 buses per day) and would operate in travel lanes on Olive Avenue that already accommodate between approximately 22,000 and 28,000 vehicles per day, including automobiles, trucks, and buses. In addition, concrete bus pads would be installed at the Proposed Project's BRT stations. A joint maintenance agreement for Project elements will be developed during final design and prior to the opening of Project operations.
- 3-34. Metro acknowledges that parking is a concern for the affected community and associated businesses; however, as the commenter states, parking loss and economic or social effects are not considered environmental effects for the purposes of CEQA. The side-running bus lanes configuration retains most of the existing on-street parking.
- 3-35. The Proposed Project's BRT system is not anticipated to induce parking demand, as the BRT stations are spaced more frequently (i.e., closer together) than light rail transit stations. In general, BRT stations are spaced at one-mile intervals, resulting in no greater than a 10-minute walk to access a station.
- 3-36. The comment concludes the letter with contact information for City staff. Metro acknowledges the preceding comments and looks forward to continued coordination with the City of Burbank. No further response is required.
- 3-37. The comment introduces the Memorandum. Further response is not required.

- 3-38. Any impacts to the pavement on these segments of Olive Avenue would have to be repaired per the City of Burbank Standards. Metro acknowledges the comment and will include related language in the construction specifications.
- 3-39. The Proposed Project's BRT stations would include concrete bus pads, as is the standard practice for Metro.
- 3-40. Metro has revised the design of the Proposed Project to eliminate the proposed station on the Olive Avenue bridge. In addition, two travel lanes would be maintained in each direction across the Olive Avenue bridge, as the BRT will operate in mixed-flow traffic across the bridge.
- 3-41. The comment provides contact information for Anthony Roman, Civil Engineer Associate, for additional information or questions.
- 3-42. The Proposed Project's BRT stations will include trash receptacles, as is the standard practice for Metro.
- 3-43. Metro acknowledges that altering storm drain infrastructure requires approval and permits from the City of Burbank and/or the County of Los Angeles.
- 3-44. The Water Resources and Hydrology Technical Report (Appendix T) acknowledges that the Cities of Los Angeles, Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena are all co-permittees to the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit (NPDES No. CAS004001, Board Order No. 01-182), and they each have incorporated requirements of the County of Los Angeles LID Guidelines into their City Codes. Refer to page 20 of the Technical Report.
- 3-45. Metro acknowledges the Best Management Practices in Burbank Municipal Code Section 9-3-407. The Code states:

Best Management Practices shall apply to all construction projects and shall be required from the time of land clearing, demolition or commencement of construction until receipt of a certificate of occupancy. The Best Management Practices selected for each development construction project, not otherwise designated as a project subject to the General Construction Permit, or an Exempt Project, shall be as set forth in the City's Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Discharges Manual.

Construction Priority Project Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan shall include, at a minimum, the following BMPs:

- A. Sediment Control:
1. At site perimeters,
 2. Below significant slopes (1 vertical to 5 horizontal or greater)
 3. At interior storm drain inlets
- B. Erosion Control (soil stabilization) on completed disturbed surfaces

C. General Site Management, and Materials and Waste Management BMPs for all applicable specific construction operations

- 3-46. No construction or re-construction has been identified on private property in Burbank at this stage in the Conceptual Engineering. If construction on private property is necessary, Metro will comply with applicable BMPs.
- 3-47. The City's Green Street Policy, referenced in the comment, "is intended to demonstrate compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Storm Sewer Separate System (MS4) permit for the Los Angeles Region (Order No. R4-2012-0175)." Metro projects comply with NPDES regulations. As stated in the LAMC, all development and redevelopment projects within the City must "comply with the Land Development requirements of the MS4 permit though integrating LID practices and standards for stormwater pollution mitigation" (Section 64.72).
- 3-48. The comment provides contact information for Eden Lopez for additional information or questions.
- 3-49. The side-running bus lanes configuration would reduce Olive Avenue to one travel lane per direction between Buena Vista Street and Lake Street. Based upon traffic analysis, signalized intersections along Olive Avenue are projected to operate at LOS D or better with the side-running bus lanes configuration with the exception of the intersections at Buena Vista Street and Verdugo Avenue/Sparks Street, which are forecasted to operate at LOS E or F in 2042. Please note that these same intersections are forecasted to operate at LOS E or F in 2042 for the No-Build Scenario. If the side-running bus lanes configuration is advanced for the Project, Metro will work with the City of Burbank during the Project's engineering phase to implement adjustments to traffic signal timing considering traffic flow implications.
- 3-50. Metro has revised the design of the Proposed Project to eliminate the proposed station on the Olive Avenue bridge. In addition, four travel lanes will be maintained across the bridge and the BRT will operate in mixed-flow traffic across the bridge.
- 3-51. Refer to Response 3-49.
- 3-52. Refer to Response 3-32 regarding utility impacts and 3-28 regarding tree removal. The side-running bus lanes configuration does not require street widening along Olive Avenue.
- 3-53. Metro has revised the design of the Proposed Project to eliminate the proposed station on the Olive Avenue bridge. In addition, four travel lanes would be maintained across the bridge and the BRT would operate in mixed-flow traffic across the bridge.
- 3-54. At the location (eastbound direction turning from Riverside Drive to Olive Avenue) where the Proposed Project's BRT buses would make a non-standard traffic

movement (e.g., left turn from the far most right lane), the bus movement would be controlled by transit signal (vertical white bar) and would operate in an exclusive queue jump phase.

- 3-55. The curb running bus lanes proposed along Olive Avenue and the BRT stations along the sidewalks are not expected to create a hazardous geometric condition. Likewise, the side-running bus lanes configuration along Olive Avenue with the BRT stations provided along curb extensions are not expected to create a hazardous geometric condition. Right turns are allowed to be made from dedicated bus lanes across many BRT systems, including along Wilshire Boulevard locally Metro would work with the City of Burbank during the Project's engineering phase to confirm that the Proposed Project does not create hazardous geometric conditions.
- 3-56. The preliminary design concepts for the Project do not anticipate narrowing lane widths at the station locations.
- 3-57. The comment provides contact information for Vikki Davtian, Principal Engineer - Traffic, for additional information or questions.
- 3-58. See Response 3-30.
- 3-59. The Proposed Project does not include roadway widening in Burbank. Therefore, impacts to the City's storm drainage facilities are not anticipated. Minor drainage/storm water improvements may be necessary at the Project's proposed BRT stations which, if necessary, would be addressed in the Project's engineering/design phase.
- 3-60. As discussed in Chapter 2, Project Description, the Proposed Project's BRT service would operate with 10-minute frequency throughout most of the day on weekdays tapering to 15 to 20 minutes frequency during the evenings, and with 15-minute frequency during most of the day on weekends tapering to 30 minutes in the evenings. Substantial deterioration of the pavement is not anticipated because the Proposed Project's BRT service would provide only six buses per hour per direction (or approximately 200 buses per day) and would operate in travel lanes on Olive Avenue that already accommodate between approximately 22,000 and 28,000 vehicles per day, including automobiles, trucks, and buses. In addition, concrete bus pads would be installed at the Proposed Project's BRT stations. A joint maintenance agreement for Project elements would be developed during final design and prior to the opening of Project operations.

A need for land acquisition in Burbank has not been identified for BRT stations or roadway widening. The need for easements within the City's right-of-way during construction would be identified in the engineering phase.

- 3-61. The comment refers to an attached letter related to Transportation Impacts. No additional letter has been provided to Metro.

- 3-62. The comment provides contact information for the Public Works Field Services for additional information or questions.

Letter No. 4

Erik Krause

City of Glendale
Community Development
633 East Broadway, Suite 103
Glendale, CA 91206

- 4-1 The comment provides an introduction to the letter. Further response is not required.
- 4-2 This comment notes that the following comments are related to loss of travel lanes and median modifications on Glenoaks Boulevard, which are identified in the Draft EIR as Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved. Specific comments related to loss of travel lanes and median modifications are addressed in the following responses.
- 4-3 The City requests that the Grandview Station, which is noted as an optional station in the Draft EIR, be included as part of the Proposed Project. The Grandview Station is part of the Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR.
- 4-4 The City requests protected bicycle lanes on Glenoaks Boulevard. The Proposed Project maintains the existing Class II bicycle facilities on Glenoaks Boulevard. Metro will work with the City of Glendale during subsequent design phases to evaluate options to enhance the bicycle lanes along Glenoaks Boulevard in conjunction with refining the design of the Proposed Project.
- 4-5 Comment noted.
- 4-6 Metro notes that the curb adjacent or parking protected bike lane option may be considered during the Project's design phase. Metro expresses concern regarding safety associated with the median adjacent or center-running bike lane concept because there is a possibility that cyclists could cut across the bus and vehicular traffic lanes to enter or leave the bike lanes, unless physical barriers are constructed to control access into and out of the bike lanes. The median adjacent or center-running bike lanes also may be considered during the Project's design phase. Metro acknowledges that implementation of protected bike lanes would not conflict with the dedicated bus lanes included in the Proposed Project.
- 4-7 The comment requests that Metro include protected intersection bike lane options at major intersections, including where BRT stations are planned at Alameda Avenue, Western Avenue, Grandview Avenue, and Pacific Avenue. Regarding pedestrian timing issues, the City requests that Metro maintain two-stage crossing and pedestrian push buttons in the median. The Concept Plans in Appendix Z of the Draft EIR indicate that a station or median would be included at each major intersection and will continue

to provide a pedestrian-refuge to allow for the two-stage crossing movement. Protected intersections for bike facilities were not included in the Draft EIR Concept Plans; however, as the design of the Proposed Project is advanced, Metro will work with the City of Glendale to delineate bus lane improvements which do not preclude the City from providing a protected bicycle facility.

Regarding left-turn phasing issues, the City requests that Metro confirm operations of left-turn phasing to address potential conflicting eastbound/westbound left-turn movements on Glenoaks Boulevard. Metro notes that lead-lag left-turn phasing could address the left-turn interlock concern noted by the City, at locations where there are conflicts between eastbound/westbound left-turn movements.

- 4-8 Metro intends to maintain existing pedestrian crossings. Metro will work with the City of Glendale during subsequent design phases to accommodate new or modified pedestrian-only crossings identified by the City.
- 4-9 The comment provides a conclusion to the prior comments. Metro will continue to consider the City's recommended design concepts in subsequent phases and no potentially significant impacts associated with VMT reduction or geometric safety concerns have been identified for the Proposed Project. Further response is not required.
- 4-10 The comment notes that the Proposed Project would not conflict with the proposed Glendale Streetcar project. However, further study and coordination would be needed if the BRT was to operate on Colorado Street (Route Option E2) rather than on Broadway (Route Option E1). The comment is no longer relevant as the Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR would operate on Broadway.
- 4-11 The comment requests coordination between Metro and the Glendale Streetcar project team regarding the location and design of stops on Central Avenue to facilitate passenger transfers, particularly taking into consideration the major trip generator of the Americana shopping mall located between Broadway and Colorado Street. Metro is committed to coordinating with the City of Glendale throughout the design and construction of the Proposed Project.
- 4-12 The comment requests clarification regarding the intent and difference between Mitigation Measures **TRA-2**, **TRA-3**, and **TRA-4**, and requests that the project include a Traffic Management Plan and associated Temporary Traffic Control Plans.

Mitigation Measure **TRA-2** addresses impacts to traffic circulation and access. Mitigation Measure **TRA-3** addresses impacts to pedestrian circulation and access. **TRA-4** addresses impacts to bicycle circulation and access. Metro would develop a Traffic Management Plan prior to construction which would incorporate best practices similar to those indicated in the Caltrans Transportation Management Guidelines. Prior to construction, specific Temporary Traffic Control Plans consistent with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices would be developed.

- 4-13 The comment notes that the reduction to one travel lane in each direction along Broadway may require development of additional left-turn pockets at minor intersections which could impact on-street parking. Metro will work with the City of Glendale in subsequent design phases to analyze design options for intersections at minor roadways, including left-turn restrictions and/or traffic signal phasing and timing changes along with adding left-turn pockets at selected locations.
- 4-14 The comment notes that the Proposed Project should continue bus operations in mixed-flow travel lanes on Central Avenue south to Doran Street due to existing traffic congestion at the SR-134 interchange. Metro will evaluate extending mixed-flow bus operations on Central Avenue to Doran Street during the design phase. Based on the concept plans, the Project would operate in mixed-flow travel lanes on Central Avenue south to Pioneer Drive, which is just one block to the north of Doran Street. Shortening the dedicated bus lanes by one block and operating instead in mixed-flow traffic would not result in different environmental impacts than disclosed in the EIR.
- 4-15 The comment notes that the Proposed Project should evaluate geometric impacts for left-turn vehicles at signalized cross streets on Glenoaks Boulevard. The eastbound-westbound left turns would operate under a protected signal phase. If geometric analysis demonstrates a conflict between the routing of the eastbound and westbound left turns if they operate concurrently, lead-lag signal phasing can be implemented so the eastbound and westbound left turns occur during separate protected signal phases.
- 4-16 The Conceptual Engineering Plans (Appendix Z of the Draft EIR) indicate retention of the signalized pedestrian crossings along Glenoaks Boulevard.
- 4-17 The Proposed Project would primarily enhance bicycle facilities by providing bypass lanes for bikes around BRT stations. To accommodate far-side station platforms near Central Avenue/Lexington Drive, the Class 2 Bike Lanes would be rerouted behind the station platforms. To facilitate bicycle safety along Broadway, the current Class III bike route (sharrows) would be removed. Cyclists would share the dedicated bus lanes with a low volume of buses relative to traffic in the existing general purpose lanes marked with a sharrow. Cyclists could also use the nearby parallel Class III bike route (sharrows) along Harvard Street.
- 4-18 The Federal Highway Administration policies allow bicycles to operate in designated transit lanes and cyclists would be allowed to use the proposed bus lanes on Broadway. The sharrow lane markings would no longer be necessary. Metro will work with the City of Glendale to determine appropriate signage and pavement marking treatments during subsequent design phases.

Letter No. 5

Edward Guerrero Jr.

Senior Transportation Engineer
Department of Transportation
100 South Main Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

- 5-1 This comment provides an introduction to the letter.
- 5-2 This comment summarizes Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (LADOT) review procedure and resources.
- 5-3 This comment addresses the potential for a significant impact related to consistency with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035 with respect to the shared bus and bicycle lane in Eagle Rock under Route Option F2. A shared bus and bicycle lane is no longer under consideration for the Proposed Project in Eagle Rock. The Proposed Project would maintain the Class II buffered bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- The current design for the Proposed Project is consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes.
- 5-4 This comment states that Metro is responsible for implementing the relevant portions of the Mobility Plan 2035 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program because the Proposed Project is installing portions of the City's Transit Enhanced Network (TEN). The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is attached to the letter, although the City did not identify the relevant mitigation measures. Upon review, many of the mitigation measures were included in the Draft EIR using similar language and other mitigation measures are not applicable to the Proposed Project. Further, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which is attached to the comment letter, does not identify Metro as being responsible for implementing or enforcing any of the mitigation measures. LADOT provides no legal authority for the proposition that Metro may be obligated to implement the mitigation measures adopted by the City for the Mobility Plan 2035.

- 5-5 This comment notes that Senate Bill 288 statutorily exempts a broader class of projects from CEQA that are defined as Transit Prioritization Projects. The Proposed Project is a Transit Prioritization Project, which includes bus rapid transit.
- 5-6 This comment states that a traffic delay analysis would be required by the City in the event the Proposed Project would result in a reduction in general purpose lanes. Metro acknowledges the request.
- 5-7 This comment expresses support for Route Option A1 in North Hollywood, which was selected by the Metro Board in May 2021 as part of the Proposed Project.
- 5-8 This comment requests that design development for Option A1 and the intersection of Chandler Boulevard and Vineland Avenue be coordinated closely with LADOT to confirm that the design of the Proposed Project best integrates bicycle facility enhancements and achieves the goals of the Mobility Plan 2035. Metro acknowledges the request.
- 5-9 This comment recommends that the design working group required in Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** be convened prior to final design of the Proposed Project. Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** begins by stating, “Prior to completion of Final Design, Metro shall convene a design working group with LADOT....” No change is necessary to the existing mitigation measure to satisfy the request.
- 5-10 This comment notes that LADOT would require the preparation of a supplemental analysis, per the non-CEQA directives of the LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines, as the means to fully disclose the potential effect this alignment would have on the adjacent street system should Route Option A2 be designated as the Proposed Project. Metro acknowledges this requirement, although Route Option A2 is not being advanced for further consideration.
- 5-11 This comment is related to Route Option F2 and the shared bus and bicycle lane, which is no longer considered as the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 1.
- 5-12 This comment requests that Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** also be applied to Route Option F1. The mitigation measure as written does not limit coordination to a particular Route Option. It will be applied to the Proposed Project identified in the Final EIR at the City’s request.
- 5-13 This comment requests that the Traffic Management Plan identified in Mitigation Measures **TRA-1** through **TRA-4** be coordinated with the LADOT’s Planning and Development Review Division via the office email address at ladot.devreview.cen@lacity.org. Metro acknowledges this request.

- 5-14 This comment requests that Metro consult the appropriate City of Los Angeles Fire Department to confirm emergency access is adequately maintained at locations with restricted left turns. The Proposed Project would provide a westbound left-turn bay at Maywood Avenue immediately to the west of the Los Angeles Fire Department Station 42, which would facilitate response in either direction from the fire station driveway. Metro will evaluate options to facilitate fire department access and circulation during subsequent design phases. While center-running and median-running BRT configurations would result in some left-turn restrictions, left-turn opportunities throughout the Project Area would be provided at major signalized intersections. In addition, as discussed in Chapter 4, Other Environmental Considerations, of the Draft EIR, Project facilities would be designed in accordance with Metro Design Criteria including Fire/Life Safety Design Criteria.
- 5-15 There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. Mitigation Measure **VIS-1** on page 3.2-17 of the Draft EIR mandates a Landscape Replacement Study, tree replacement, and coordination with affected jurisdictions. A detailed tree survey is not necessary to demonstrate the potential for a significant impact and is not mandated by CEQA. The Draft EIR already discloses potential impacts associated with tree removal and identifies adequate mitigation measures to mitigate such impacts to a less-than-significant level. Metro acknowledges that trees in the public right-of-way and easements in the City of Los Angeles are regulated under the Los Angeles Municipal Code and require a permit for planting, trimming, root pruning or removal. In compliance with the coordination requirement in Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, Metro will direct the Landscape Architect to coordinate with appropriate City staff. Staff is listed in the comment letter as David Olivo (david.olivo@lacity.org) with Los Angeles City Planning and Ana Tabuena-Ruddy (ana.Tabuena-Ruddy@lacity.org) with StreetsLA.
- 5-16 This comment states that LADOT requires a parking removal analysis as part of final design process. The comment also states that Mobility Plan 2035 requires that prior to project decision, all businesses that may be directly affected by removal of on-street parking be notified of the project and the potential removal of on-street parking. Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.
- 5-17 This comment summarizes traffic control measures proposed in the City of Los Angeles. Metro acknowledges that new traffic control measures are mandated to be reviewed and approved by the appropriate LADOT District Operations staff.
- 5-18 This comment states that Metro is required to follow the applicable outreach and evaluation procedures as required by the Mobility Plan 2035 Settlement Agreement

because the project would allocate lanes to implement the Mobility Plan 2035. Refer to Response 5-4. It should also be noted that Metro is not a party to the referenced Settlement Agreement. As requested in the comments, Metro will coordinate with David Somers (david.somers@lacity.org) to identify which outreach and evaluation procedures could apply to the Project on a voluntary basis.

- 5-19 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and states that the City believes that there are access, safety, and circulation issues that need to be addressed prior to completing the final design for the Proposed Project. It is acknowledged that the Project team should engage LADOT and City staff to discuss the various comments provided in this review prior to moving forward with the development of the Final EIR. Metro looks forward to ongoing coordination related to the Project.

Letter No. 6

Kevin de León

Councilmember, 14th District

- 6-1 The comment mischaracterizes the definition of project alternatives. The Proposed Project includes options for the BRT route's alignment and street configurations. This was necessary due to public feedback during the completion of the Alternatives Analysis and Draft EIR scoping process. It was not possible to reach a consensus on one route alignment and street configuration preferred by Metro, the cities, stakeholders, and general public. Metro determined that stakeholders and the agency decision-makers would best be informed about the Proposed Project by equally evaluating the potential environmental impacts of multiple route alignments and street configurations.

The alternatives to the Proposed Project are the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) and the Improved Existing Bus Service Alternative (Alternative 2), which are evaluated in Chapter 6, Alternatives to the Project, of the Draft EIR. As stated on page 6-7 of Chapter 6, Alternatives to the Project, Alternative 1 assumes that the Proposed Project would not be implemented by Metro. As stated on page 6-8 of Chapter 6 to the Project, Alternatives, Alternative 2 would implement improved existing bus service, consisting of local express service with some BRT characteristics. The service may be as frequent as that proposed for the Proposed Project's BRT, with buses that would operate in mixed-flow traffic with transit signal priority systems. Stops would be more frequent than the Proposed Project's BRT line but less frequent than local bus lines. Travel times would be faster than for local service but slower than the travel times expected from the BRT project. Stops would occur at existing bus stop locations and there would be no median-running, center-running, or side-running dedicated bus lanes configurations. In accordance with Section 15126 of the CEQA Guidelines, Consideration and Discussion of Alternatives to the Proposed Project, an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a

reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. This requirement has been satisfied in the Draft EIR.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be identified among the alternatives that are evaluated in the Draft EIR. Refer to page 6-17 of the Draft EIR for a detailed discussion of the environmentally superior alternative. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the fewest adverse impacts. The No Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative because there would be no physical changes to the existing environment resulting in construction or operational impacts. If the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, CEQA requires identification of an environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative from among the remaining alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative because it avoids or reduces construction impacts related to transportation, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and tribal cultural resources. It also avoids or reduces operational impacts related to transportation, aesthetics, cultural resources, and geology and soils.

If the Metro Board of Directors determines to approve the Proposed Project, the Board will adopt CEQA Findings of Fact, which will address the Proposed Project, alternatives, and mitigation measures. CEQA requires that these findings made pursuant to Section 15091 be supported by substantial evidence in the record (Section 15091(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines). Under CEQA, substantial evidence means enough relevant information has been provided (and reasonable inferences from this information may be made) that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached. Substantial evidence must include facts, reasonable assumptions predicted upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts (Section 15384 of the State CEQA Guidelines). CEQA further requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its environmental effects when determining whether to approve the project.

- 6-2 Metro disagrees with the premise that there has been poor communication with the Eagle Rock community. To encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period and Draft EIR review period, legal advertisement notices were published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) notices and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/ Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the project’s database of contacts. Other noticing methods including email blasts, social media advertisements, meeting flyer distribution, and print and online media notification were also provided in the study area during the 60-day scoping period, which was extended from 45 days. In addition, in accordance with Metro’s Public Participation Plan, targeted community

outreach efforts were completed in various cities throughout the Project area to ensure participation of limited English proficiency and transit reliant populations. Specifically, special pop-up events were hosted at the North Hollywood Station to reach transit riders. Comments during the Public Scoping period for the Project were also received through a set of transit rider intercept surveys conducted at major transit stops along the corridor. As the Draft EIR was circulated during the COVID-19 pandemic, such targeted outreach to transit riders was not possible at each phase of the EIR outreach process. Due to the limited in-person outreach opportunities during COVID-19, Project car cards were printed and placed on Metro Bus lines to reach transit users.

As discussed in Response 6-1, options for the BRT route's alignment and street configurations were developed in response to community and stakeholder feedback received early in the project planning process and into scoping, and the three design options in Eagle Rock described in the Draft EIR were developed in direct response to community concerns regarding parking, medians, and safety. Regarding the TERA letter, please refer to Responses to Comment Letter 18.

- 6-3. Refer to Response 6-1 related to identification of the environmentally superior alternative. The Proposed Project, including the design options evaluated in the Draft EIR and the Final EIR, as mitigated, would not result in any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, including within the Eagle Rock community.
- 6-4. The comment expresses concern with the visual compatibility of the Proposed Project's BRT station in the vicinity of the Colorado Boulevard/Eagle Rock Boulevard intersection with the Center for the Arts building, an identified Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monument. The comment states that the proposed station would be located directly in front of the Center for the Arts building; the current conceptual design sites the station along a curb extension which would extend partly in front of the library and partly in front of a commercial structure located at 2223 Colorado Boulevard. However, the Proposed Project would not locate a station platform in front of the Center for the Arts building. Further design of the station placement will occur during a later phase of the project. The aesthetics analysis provided in Section 3.2, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR focuses the consideration of historic buildings on damage to such resources consistent with the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G impact criterion that asks whether the Proposed Project would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings. Regarding impacts to the character of historic buildings, Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR provides a detailed analysis of potential impacts associated with siting of stations and other project facilities near historic buildings. As discussed, potential impacts to historical resources would primarily be limited to changes in setting at the location of station platforms, where shade structures and other vertical features would be constructed. In the case of historical resources that are characterized by their relationship to the street, such as pedestrian-oriented street fronts sited at or near the property line, consistency with Rehabilitation Standards can be achieved by maintaining physical access to the historical resource from the sidewalk and a visual

connection between the historical resource and the street. The contemporary appearance of the “kit of parts” station design would visually differentiate the proposed station features from the Center for the Arts building consistent with Rehabilitation Standard Nine of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, which advises:

“...related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the [historic] property...new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the [historic] property and its environment.”

Further, Mitigation Measures **CUL-1** would require that a qualified architectural historian review final project designs to confirm compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and associated rehabilitation standards. Based on the analysis contained in the Draft EIR, and with implementation of Mitigation Measure **CUL-1**, the Proposed Project would not have a significant impact on the Center for the Arts Building and no further mitigation is required.

- 6-5 There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. Mitigation Measure **VIS-1** on page 3.2-17 of the Draft EIR mandates a Landscape Replacement Study, tree replacement, and coordination with affected jurisdictions. As discussed under Impact 3.4-4, the Proposed Project would include vegetation and tree removal which the Draft EIR clearly acknowledges as a potentially significant impact to nesting birds and bats. Mitigation Measure **BIO-1** on page 3.4-8 of the Draft EIR would mitigate inadvertent impacts to nesting bird and bat species.

It is acknowledged that removing mature trees would reduce shade canopy until new trees reach maturity. In Eagle Rock, a majority of the mature trees that would be potentially affected by the Proposed Project are located within the median along Colorado Boulevard. Some street trees along sidewalks would also be potentially displaced by the Proposed Project. The medians in Eagle Rock are not intended for pedestrians and thus the trees serve a decorative function rather than a shading function. While the Proposed Project would potentially result in removal of street trees, each station would include shade structures. Mitigation Measures **VIS-1** and **BIO-1** would sufficiently eliminate the potential significant impact related to tree removal and additional mitigation is not necessary.

Because the existing mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR are sufficient to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels, further response is not required. Nevertheless, the following provides an assessment of the suggested additional mitigation measures presented in this comment (responses are provided in italics).

- Metro shall provide a detailed list of all trees/shrubs scheduled for removal in the Final EIR and shall include the tree species, trunk size, estimated age, carbon storage potential, and canopy size in their report.

A detailed tree survey is not necessary to demonstrate the potential for a significant impact and is not mandated by CEQA. The Draft EIR already discloses potential impacts associated with tree removal and identifies adequate mitigation measures to mitigate such impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- Metro shall replace all trees removed in Eagle Rock with 36" box trees planted at a 4:1 tree replacement ratio.

These suggestions are not mandated by City standards nor by the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Metro will replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards. The Draft EIR already discloses potential impacts associated with tree removal and identifies adequate mitigation measures to mitigate such impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- Metro shall ensure that all replacement trees are species native to this particular region of Southern California and biologically appropriate to support the local ecosystem.

Metro standard practice is to use native, low-water vegetation landscaping.

- Metro shall conduct a nesting bird survey, much like the preemptive bat roosting habitat assessment, with a qualified biologist during the nesting season the year prior to construction to determine the reliance of the local bird population on these trees for nesting.

*Mitigation Measure **BIO-1** on page 3.4-8 of the Draft EIR would mitigate inadvertent impacts to bird and bat species.*

- Metro shall ensure that all newly planted trees provide sufficient habitat, as determined by a qualified biologist, for the current local bat and bird population, as identified by the nesting bird survey and the bat roosting habitat assessment.

*The Landscape Replacement Study identified in Mitigation Measure **VIS-1** will consider trees that provide appropriate habitat to the current bird and bat population.*

- Metro shall work with arborists or other tree experts to develop a 20-year maintenance plan to ensure that newly planted trees develop root systems that promote long life of the trees, reduce or eliminate reliance on artificial watering, and avoid any structural disruptions to the surrounding pavement and subterranean utilities.

The Landscape Replacement Study identified in Mitigation Measure VIS-1 will include low-water, drought-tolerant plantings and will consider pavement and subterranean utilities for planting locations. Metro does not agree with the necessity of a 20-year maintenance plan.

- Metro shall be responsible for carrying out active maintenance of the newly planted trees and surrounding vegetation for a minimum of five years until the replacement trees and surrounding vegetation is determined by a tree expert to be sufficiently established to transition into less active maintenance.

Any potential commitment by Metro to carry out active maintenance of newly planted trees and other landscaping during an establishment period is subject to agreement between Metro and the City of Los Angeles.

- Metro shall ensure that the maintenance plan for the newly planted trees and vegetation includes provisions for any irrigation system required and with clear guidance and funding for the repair and maintenance of any such irrigation infrastructure.

Any potential commitment by Metro to maintain any new irrigation system is subject to agreement between Metro and the City of Los Angeles.

- Metro shall permanently relocate to the extent feasible any Magnolia trees on Colorado Boulevard to a location where the trees will be able to survive.

Magnolia trees are not protected species and as such are not required to be relocated by Metro. Metro will consider relocating mature Magnolia trees to the extent feasible. This would be dependent on many variables including tree health and root systems.

- Metro shall consult with the community on the selection of new native tree species for the corridor as well as on any proposed planting location for the transplanted magnolia trees.

Mitigation Measure VIS-1 includes coordination with local jurisdictions. Metro will consider seeking input from the general community during the landscape planning process.

6-6 Mitigation Measures are not necessary to sufficiently eliminate the potential significant impact related to storm drains and groundwater recharge. As discussed on page 4-10, Chapter 4, Other Environmental Considerations, of the Draft EIR, because the Proposed Project would replace 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area

on an already developed site, per the County's Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, as part of the stormwater program, SUSMP and Site-Specific Stormwater Mitigation Plans must be incorporated into the Project. Compliance with these regulations would require the inclusion of post-construction stormwater measures and low-impact development measures designed to minimize runoff flows and water quality degradation.

Further, Mitigation Measure **VIS-1** already requires replacement landscaping as well as a Landscape Replacement Study to identify the location and type of replacement landscaping subject to local jurisdiction review and approval.

Because the Proposed Project would not result in a significant impact to hydrology and water quality, further response is not required. Nevertheless, the following provides an assessment of the suggested additional mitigation measures from this comment (responses are provided in italics).

- Metro shall replace all median landscaping removed from Colorado Boulevard with the same square footage of landscaping along the project corridor within Eagle Rock.

Metro will attempt to maintain the same amount of landscaped median to the extent feasible, subject to further evaluation in the Project's design phase.

- Metro shall create a median landscaping advisory committee made up of local stakeholders to inform the design for any new or modified medians.

*Per Mitigation Measure **VIS-1** on page 3.2-17 of the Draft EIR, a Landscape Replacement Study and tree replacement will be coordinated with affected jurisdictions.*

- Metro shall consult relevant departments to ensure that this project meets or exceeds the City of Los Angeles's goals regarding stormwater capture.

Metro standard practice is to coordinate with local jurisdictions during design, engineering, and construction.

- 6-7 As discussed under Section 2.9, Construction, page 2-33 of the Draft EIR, the construction duration of the Proposed Project is expected to last approximately 24 to 30 months. However, construction activities would shift along the corridor so that construction activities would be of a shorter duration within each segment. The contractor may build the Project in sections, extending over several contiguous blocks with multiple phases within each segment. For example, one phase of construction could be installing a raised island between the future bus lane(s) and the travel lane(s) along one side of the street, a second phase could be conducting similar construction on the opposite side of the street, and a third phase could be building the bus lanes, stations and medians in the center of the roadway. For each construction phase, within

a particular section, appropriate temporary traffic control measures would be defined in the Traffic Management Plan (TMP). The TMP would identify:

- The work zone and any required “lay-down” areas,
- The description of construction activity,
- The anticipated duration and proposed hours of work,
- Lane closures along with proposed re-routing of traffic,
- Temporary traffic control signage and construction barricades and flagging,
- Provisions to accommodate bicycle traffic during construction,
- Provisions to maintain sidewalk circulation, and,
- Provisions to maintain vehicular and pedestrian business access during construction.

The TMP would be developed with input from the City of Los Angeles and would be approved before initiation of construction activities.

6-8. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the design for the revised Proposed Project is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR’s design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes.

6-9 Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove some on-street parking. As noted by the comment, parking impacts are not considered environmental impacts under CEQA. Regarding noise, the California Department of Transportation Technical Noise Supplement states that a doubling of traffic volumes is typically needed to audibly increase mobile source noise (California Department of Transportation, *Technical Noise Supplement For New Highway Construction, Reconstruction, and Retrofit Barrier Projects*, April 2020). The Proposed Project is not expected to lead to a doubling of traffic volumes on any street. In addition, traffic noise is dependent on travel speed with lower speeds generating lower noise levels. People searching for parking typically drive slowly, generating less noise. Page 4-18 of the Technical Noise Supplement indicates that a passenger vehicle traveling at 15 miles per hour generates a noise level of 53 dBA and a passenger vehicle traveling at 30 miles per hour generates a noise level of 62 dBA. The 15 mile per hour speed reduction generates 9 dBA less noise. In addition, the 53 dBA noise level is well below the lowest existing noise levels in Eagle Rock of 61.7 dBA as shown in Table 3.9-5 in Section 3.9, Noise, on page 3.9-8 of the Draft EIR.

Metro acknowledges that there may be additional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) related to drivers searching for parking. However, the Proposed Project as a whole would result in a measurable reduction in regional VMT, much of which would accrue along the route of the Project. The daily VMT would decrease between the 2042 baseline condition and the 2042 with the Project condition by 86,659. The calculated VMT reduction is expected to be larger than any increase associated with searching for parking.

Regarding regional emissions, Table 3.3-11 in Section 3.3, Air Quality, and Table 3.8-7 in Section 3.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR demonstrate that the regional decrease in VMT would result in emission benefits. Regarding localized pollutant concentrations, page 3.3-23 of the Draft EIR in Section 3.3, Air Quality, demonstrates that the Proposed Project would not expose people to substantial pollutant concentrations at the most congested intersections and segments in the Project area.

6-10 The comment is no longer relevant as the Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR does not include Route Option F3.

6-11 This comment suggests new mitigation measures related to transportation impacts. As discussed in Section 3.1, Transportation, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant, unmitigated impact related to transportation. Accordingly, further response is not required. Nevertheless, Metro provides the following assessment of the suggested additional mitigation measures from this comment (responses are provided in italics).

- Metro shall ensure that all pedestrian detours are ADA compliant throughout the whole length of the pedestrian detour.

Detours are required by California law to be ADA compliant and this suggestion is not needed to mitigate a significant impact.

- Metro shall ensure that no full closures of either eastbound or westbound travel lanes of Colorado Boulevard will occur during the construction of the project.

*Refer to Comment 6-7. Metro does not anticipate that construction activities will require full closure of eastbound or westbound traffic on Colorado Boulevard. Should an unforeseen circumstance require a full closure, Mitigation Measure **TR-2** requires a Traffic Management Plan and/or Construction Management Plan compliant with the provisions of the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Traffic Control Handbook and local ordinances, as applicable, to be developed by Metro and the construction contractor in coordination with the City of Los Angeles. The Traffic and/or Construction Management Plan would include provisions such as: approval of work hours and lane closures, designation of construction lay-down zones, provisions to maintain roadway access to adjoining land uses, use of warning signs, temporary traffic*

control devices and/or flagging to manage traffic conflicts, and designation of detour routes where appropriate.

- Metro shall provide off-site replacement parking within walking distance during construction at a 1:1 ratio for parking loss during construction.

Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations during construction activities. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

Regarding the potential temporary loss of parking spaces during project construction, a Traffic Management Plan and/or Construction Management Plan will be developed as previously noted. Metro will coordinate with the City of Los Angeles to develop this Plan, which could include provisions to minimize any parking loss associated with construction.

- Metro shall create a community traffic advisory committee to provide recommendations on proposed detours and implement suggested mitigations on adjacent streets to prevent cut-through traffic.

*Mitigation Measure **TR-2** requires coordination with the City of Los Angeles to address construction activities and transportation effects.*

- Metro shall incorporate Class II bicycle facilities on Colorado Boulevard in the proposed project, regardless of which option is selected.

The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

- Metro shall coordinate with the Bureau of Street Services on any redesign of the Take Back the Boulevard ATP project and shall fully reimburse the bureau for any costs incurred due to changes made to accommodate the project such as redesign or increased construction costs.

The scope and duration of any such commitment is outside the purview of CEQA. Since the initial phase of project design, Metro has been coordinating with the Bureau of Street Services to minimize anticipated re-design of the Take Back the Boulevard ATP project associated with this Project. However, any modifications to ATP improvements in place at the time of construction would be incorporated as part of the Project.

- Metro shall accommodate the Colorado Boulevard Metro Call for Projects application and provide the same amount of funding to the city even if the BRT will conflict with elements from the Call for Projects application.

Please refer to the response provided immediately above with respect to the Take Back the Boulevard ATP improvements.

- Metro shall provide permanent replacement parking within walking distance of any parking lost permanently. This replacement parking shall include redesigning or expanding LADOT Lot #686 and the Eagle Rock Library parking lot to provide adequate parking for local businesses.

Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove on-street parking in some locations. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much on-street parking as possible in Eagle Rock. Expanding city-owned parking lots is not needed to mitigate a significant impact and is not under consideration as part of the Proposed Project.

- Metro shall ensure that electric vehicle parking is installed on every block along the project corridor where any changes are made to street parking.

Expanding public electric vehicle infrastructure is not needed to mitigate a significant impact associated with the Proposed Project.

6-12 Refer to Master Response 1. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Although not required by CEQA, Metro provides the following assessment of the suggested additional mitigation measures.

- Metro shall create an Eat Shop Play program, similar to what is used for the Regional Connector, to provide free marketing and resources for businesses impacted by construction.

Metro's Eat Shop Play program can be made available in conjunction with Metro transit projects under construction on a project-by-project basis. The potential

availability of this program for the Project is at Metro's discretion and will be determined during a later Project phase.

- Metro shall establish a Business Interruption Fund (BIF) to offset the negative financial impacts of construction on local businesses. For impacted businesses, the BIF will provide financial assistance to cover the costs of loss business during construction.

Recognizing the importance of supporting small businesses during construction as vital to ensure economic stability of communities, in 2019, Metro's Board of Directors authorized the expansion of the Metro Business Solution Center (BSC) to the NoHo to Pasadena BRT project. Metro's BSC will provide small businesses with immediate, hands-on business development and technical services. Additionally, Metro, in coordination with the City of Los Angeles, would develop a Traffic Management Plan and/or Construction management plan to minimize potential impacts during construction.

- Metro shall have a public relations team, specifically dedicated to the Eagle Rock portion of the Proposed Project, who will work to address community concerns and facilitate assistance with the BIF and other Metro programs.

Metro staff will be dedicated to all of the communities along the Project corridor, including Eagle Rock, to conduct outreach during construction.

6-13 The Draft EIR acknowledges that the operation of CNG buses may be a temporary condition and that electric buses are the long-term condition. GHG emissions from both conditions are presented on pages 3.8-15 and 3.8-16 of Section 3.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR. The operation of 20 CNG buses would emit 3,068 lbs/day of CO₂e. When considering overall fleet emissions reductions associated with mode shift from passenger vehicles to public transit, initial BRT service would result in a reduction of approximately 9,418 lbs/day of CO₂e. This represents a benefit to regional GHG emissions and there is no potential for the Proposed Project to result in an impact. Regarding Metro's plan to reduce fleet emissions by 79 percent by 2030, electric buses will be added to the fleet on an incremental basis rather than a one-time replacement of all buses. This replacement plan has been finalized by Metro. While Metro anticipates that the Project buses will be among the first buses to be electric, it is possible that they may be deployed after the Proposed Project begins operations. Regardless, the Proposed Project operating CNG buses in a temporary condition would not result in failure of Metro to meet the systemwide goal. The suggested mitigation measure made in this comment is not necessary to reduce a potential significant impact.

6-14 After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to

Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Metro has continued to meet with stakeholders as the Proposed Project presented in the Final EIR was refined. Metro held additional virtual outreach meetings with community stakeholders in Eagle Rock. There were two virtual roundtables on March 16, 2021, as well as a business roundtable on March 26, 2021. A corridor-wide virtual community meeting was held April 1, 2021, for over four hours with over 350 in attendance. On September 23, 2021, Metro held two virtual question and answer sessions related to the updated Project design in Eagle Rock. Additionally, Metro staff has been having technical meetings with Los Angeles Council District 14 and LADOT staff.

- 6-15 This comment expresses support for design refinements and continued community outreach.

Letter No. 7

Terry Tornek, Mayor
Steve Mermell, City Manager
Laura Cornejo, Director of Transportation
City of Pasadena
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91109

- 7-1 The comment provides an introduction to the letter. Further response is not required.
- 7-2 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and appreciation for ongoing coordination between Metro and the City. The City supports the route exiting the eastbound SR-134 at Fair Oaks Avenue, traveling south on Fair Oaks Avenue and Raymond Avenue, and then traveling east on Colorado Boulevard to Hill Street as the preferred alignment within Pasadena (Route Options G1 and H1). These route options were selected as the Proposed Project and are assessed in the Final EIR.
- 7-3 The comment expresses support for the route options along the SR-134 on/off ramps at Colorado Boulevard and/or using the Union Street and Green Street one-way couplet (Route Options G2 and H2) but notes that this alignment would require design modifications. The comment is no longer relevant as the Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR does not include these route options.
- 7-4 The comment summarizes the City's review process and provides contact information for questions and continued coordination with the City.
- 7-5 The comment expresses support for the route exiting the eastbound SR-134 at Fair Oaks Avenue, traveling south on Fair Oaks Avenue and Raymond Avenue, and then traveling east on Colorado Boulevard to Hill Street as the preferred alignment within Pasadena (Route Options G1 and H1). The comment also expresses support for

- utilizing the SR-134 on/off ramps at Colorado Boulevard and/or using the Union Street and Green Street one-way couplet (Route Options G2 and H2) should it be selected. The Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR includes Route Options G1 and H1 and not G2 or H2.
- 7-6 The comment notes that on-street dining may be semi-permanent on Colorado Boulevard, Union Street, and Green Street. Colorado Boulevard has been reduced to one lane in each direction, although Union and Green Streets maintain two and three lanes per direction. The City requests continued coordination during the design of station layouts so that the station location does not interfere with outdoor dining. The City also notes that these public right-of-way changes will increase the operating and capital costs of this project due to the impact to travel time speeds and conflicts with station locations along or near both the project and option alignments in Pasadena. Metro acknowledges the existing and future conditions on City streets and is committed to ongoing coordination with City staff.
- 7-7 The City notes that there is an annual moratorium for construction activities on Colorado Boulevard from November 15 until the second Monday in January. Metro acknowledges the moratorium and will include this information in the construction schedule and construction bid document.
- 7-8 The comment notes that special consideration will be needed for the roadway condition of Green Street to accommodate this level of transit vehicles. The comment is no longer relevant as the Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR does not travel on Green Street.
- 7-9 This comment acknowledges that parking is not a CEQA resource. The comment states that parking is a high priority for the City, especially the replacement of lost metered parking. Within Pasadena, the Proposed Project would operate as mixed-flow BRT and would not impact parking except potentially at station locations. At these locations, Metro will work with the City to quantify potential parking impacts. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.
- 7-10 This comment expresses support for the electrified bus fleet and notes that Pasadena Water and Power (PWP) will work with Metro to build electric infrastructure and provide the electric capacity. The comment also notes that PWP will provide competitive rates to Metro similar to the Metro L Line (Gold) and that PWP offers a Green-e certified Green Power Program. Comment noted.
- 7-11 The comment states that Metro would need to develop a "kit of parts" for Colorado Boulevard stations that can be removed annually for the Rose Parade. The City would consider the use of removable bus bulbs extending beyond concrete bus bulbs, which could be constructed to the blue "honor line." If used, removable bus bulbs could extend beyond the blue "honor line" and would be required to be removed by Metro

before New Year's Day and reinstalled following the Rose Parade. Metro will coordinate with the City during final design to evaluate the feasibility of removable BRT station bulbouts to facilitate bus movements and provide additional station area while maintaining the space needed for the Rose Parade.

- 7-12 This comment expresses a strong desire for public art at the stations along Proposed Project Route Option H1. Site-specific public art may be integrated into station design, consistent with the LACMTA Metro Art Program Policy. As stated in Chapter 2, Project Description, a kit-of-parts is under development by Metro which will establish parameters for amenities for stations. The precise dollars set aside for public art have not been determined at this time as the construction budget has not yet been established. This has been corrected in Section 2.4 of the Final EIR.
- 7-13 As stated in Chapter 2, Project Description, a kit-of-parts is under development by Metro which will establish requirements of amenities for platforms. Stations will include lighting consistent with standards developed for Metro's BRT stations.
- 7-14 The comment notes that modifications may be required related to station design, sidewalk, curb ramp condition and accessibility. The comment also notes that the City will continue to work with Metro to coordinate design details. Comment noted.
- 7-15 The comment notes that concrete street bus pads would be required for the length of the station platform and along the approach/departure area as needed. Metro would construct concrete bus pads at BRT station platforms. Use of concrete pads would reduce the impact of bus operations on the pavement quality; maintenance requirements/responsibilities associated with the concrete pads and other BRT components will be addressed in a maintenance and operations agreement with the City of Pasadena.
- 7-16 The comment states that vertical clearance of the existing Ficus tree canopy along Green Street should be evaluated to ensure adequate clearance for transit vehicles. The comment is no longer relevant as the Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR does not travel on Green Street.
- 7-17 The comment notes three items to be considered during final design. Metro acknowledges the comment and is aware of the special considerations that should be taken into account during the Project's design phase. The considerations include:
- Raymond Avenue/Holly Street station – A unique sidewalk treatment currently exists on the west side of Raymond Avenue, and any new sidewalk would be required to match this sidewalk treatment.
 - Colorado Boulevard/Arroyo Parkway station – This station is no longer under consideration as part of the Proposed Project.

- Colorado Boulevard/Lake Avenue, Green Street/Lake Avenue and Union Street/Lake Avenue stations – Coordination required with the current South Lake Avenue Pedestrian Enhancement Project currently in design.
- 7-18 The comment notes that the Project Description describes a 40-foot bus but imagery used for public meetings shows a 60-foot bus. This image was used to help residents and stakeholders associate the Proposed Project with articulated buses which are often used for BRT services. At the time the service is commissioned, Metro will deploy buses which best address peak- and off-peak demand patterns considering the planned headways. Although project planning is proceeding with the assumption that the demand can be satisfied with 40-foot buses, there is also potential for 60-foot buses to be utilized along the route. Stations have been designed to accommodate 60-foot buses. There would be no change to the resource analyses in the EIR regardless if the Project operates 40-foot or 60-foot buses.
- 7-19 The comment incorrectly references Section 3.3, Air Quality, noting that the Draft EIR does not reference the City's Climate Action Plan. Please refer to Section 3.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, for reference to the Climate Action Plan.
- 7-20 The comment notes the proposed supplemental charging station at Pasadena City College and requests accommodations for Pasadena Transit zero emission electric vehicles. Further design enhancements and refinements must be advanced prior to the determination of whether the Proposed Project could accommodate other bus networks. As indicated in the Draft EIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Table 2-2 for the Route Options H1/H2, the terminus station will potentially include charging facilities. Metro will continue to work with the City of Pasadena and PCC to identify a terminus location and the ability for other buses to utilize this station. Metro fleet and charging infrastructure will be purchased in accordance with Metro's "Moving Beyond Sustainability Plan" and other guidelines.
- 7-21 The comment notes that the Proposed Project includes a charging and layover facility on the east side of Hill Avenue, north of Green Street. The City looks forward to working with Metro and PCC in developing a terminus station that addresses the goals and priorities of all agencies, including traffic on Hill Avenue. Comment noted. The current design plans propose retaining existing travel lanes along Hill Avenue to minimize the impact of the layover station.
- 7-22 The comment notes that Pasadena currently uses transit signal priority. It also indicates that related upgrades may be needed to traffic signals and hardware. Metro will work with the City during subsequent design phases to identify and implement improvements to provide transit priority for the BRT service.
- 7-23 The comment describes impacts to signal mast arms along Colorado Boulevard in the weeks leading up to the Rose Parade. Metro acknowledges that potential BRT operations (i.e., transit signal priority) would need to be adjusted during this time.

Metro understands that protected left-turns are not provided during the Rose Bowl parade period when traffic signal mast arms are removed from some intersections along Colorado Boulevard. However, the Proposed Project would not require buses to make left-turns from Colorado Boulevard, as buses would continue to operate in mixed-flow in the through lane(s) should buses operate via Colorado during this time.

7-24 This comment clarifies two items.

- The comment cites Draft EIR Appendix B Section 4.3.5 to state that Class 2 bicycle facilities were incorrectly identified on Fair Oaks Avenue. The Final EIR acknowledges this correction.
- The comment clarifies that although some on-street parking would be removed as part of the Union Street Protected Bike Lane Project, a majority of the on-street parking will remain. The comment is no longer relevant as the Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR does not travel on Green Street.

7-25 This comment request considerations of the following City of Pasadena Objectives from their General Plan into the Impact Analysis discussion:

- Policy 1.2 - Promote greater linkages between land uses and transit, as well as non-vehicular modes of transportation to reduce vehicular trip related emissions.
- Policy 1.9 - Support local and regional air quality, sustainability, and GHG emission reduction goals through management of the City's transportation network.
- Policy 1.11 - Design streets to reflect the mobility needs of the adjacent land use context to support healthy activities such as walking and bicycling.
- Policy 1.24 - Ensure predictable transit travel times by providing traffic signal system priority measures.
- Policy 1.31 - Emphasize transportation projects and programs that will contribute to a reduction in vehicles miles traveled per capita, while maintaining economic vitality and sustainability.
- Policy 2.1 - Continue to support the construction of the Gold Line Foothill Extension transit service and the expansion and use of regional and local bus transit service.
- Policy 2.3 - Provide convenient, safe and accessible transit stops.
- Policy 2.4 - Facilitate coordination between transit providers to improve seamless transit service.

These policies are consistent with Metro's goals and objectives for the Proposed Project and have been added to the Final EIR under Chapter 3, Corrections and Additions, Section 3.1 - Transportation.

7-26 The comment states that the Draft EIR Appendix Z Concept Plans incorrectly show the Union Street Protected Bike Lane extending west of Arroyo Parkway to Fair Oaks

- Avenue. The comment is no longer relevant as the Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR does not travel on Union Street.
- 7-27 The comment states that current plans for the South Lake Pedestrian Enhancement Project will eliminate the pork chop island at the intersection of Union Street and Lake Avenue as shown in Appendix Z Concept Plans Sheet 59. The comment is no longer relevant as the Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR does not travel on Union Street.
- 7-28 The comment expresses City support for the use of Hill Street as a layover and charging facility. It also states that the City will continue to work with Metro and PCC on the Project. Comment noted.

Letter No. 8

Jackie Goldberg

LAUSD School Board Member
Board District 5

- 8-1 This comment introduces the comment letter and does not address the contents of the Draft EIR.
- 8-2 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard design concept in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 8-3 This comment expresses multiple safety concerns related to the side-running treatment in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). Route Option F2 has been eliminated from further consideration in this Final EIR. The Proposed Project identified in the Final EIR is a center-running treatment in Eagle Rock to the east of Ellenwood Drive. Regarding pedestrian safety, Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR includes a detailed impact analysis in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines. Safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization and barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. No change to posted speed limits are proposed as part of the Project and bus operators would adhere to posted speed limits. The Proposed Project, which is a refined version of Route Option F1 presented in the Draft EIR, will add a new signal-protected crosswalk at Dahlia Drive, which will improve pedestrian safety proximate to Dahlia Heights Elementary School compared to the existing condition.

- 8-4 This comment expresses opposition to removing the existing landscaped medians on Colorado Boulevard in Route Option F1 because they provide speed calming. The Proposed Project would remove portions of the existing medians along Colorado Boulevard east of Eagle Rock Boulevard; however, the Proposed Project would also provide new medians and separator islands, increasing the total linear feet of medians along the Project route.
- 8-5 This comment expresses opposition to Route Option F3 on SR-134 in Eagle Rock due to the concern that it would reduce transit service to Eagle Rock schools. Route Option F3 has been eliminated from consideration.
- 8-6 This comment reiterates support for the Beautiful Boulevard design concept in Eagle Rock. Refer to Response 8-1.

Letter No. 9

Todd McIntyre

Metrolink
Southern California Regional Rail Authority
900 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, CA 90017

- 9-1 The comment introduces the letter and acknowledges the two Metrolink lines that intersect the Proposed Project. Further response is not required.
- 9-2 The comment notes that the following comments are intended to encourage deeper integration and connectivity between the Metro and Metrolink systems, particularly at the Metrolink Burbank Downtown Station. Further response is not required.
- 9-3 The comment expresses support for projects in the region that provide connectivity between Metrolink rail lines and other modes of transportation. Further response is not required.
- 9-4 The comment requests several design accommodations at the BRT station on the Olive Avenue bridge connecting to the Downtown Burbank Metrolink Station to enhance pedestrian safety and convenience. The location of the BRT station connecting to the Downtown Burbank Metrolink Station has been shifted to the Olive Avenue/Lake Street intersection, where there are existing bus stops for local service.
- 9-5 The comment requests a new mid-block signalized crosswalk to connect platforms on both sides of the bridge to the existing elevator on the north side of the bridge and the ramps and stairs on the south side of the bridge. Due to the infeasibility of constructing a fully signalized crosswalk on the bridge, the location of the BRT station connecting to the Burbank Downtown Metrolink Station has been shifted to the Olive Avenue/Lake Street intersection, where there are existing bus stops for local service.

- 9-6 The comment requests upgrades to the station and sidewalk to confirm that the station platforms and the signalized crosswalk are ADA compliant. The location of the BRT station connecting to the Burbank Downtown Metrolink Station has been shifted to the Olive Avenue/Lake Street intersection, where there are existing bus stops for local service. Metro is required by California law to make improvements that are ADA compliant.
- 9-7 The comment requests wayfinding and signage to guide pedestrians to their destinations as they transfer between systems. These provisions are consistent with Metro first/last mile policies that will be implemented with the Proposed Project.
- 9-8 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and continued coordination with Metro.

Letter No. 10

Alex Boekelheide

Pasadena City College
1570 East Colorado Boulevard
Pasadena, CA 91106

- 10-1 The comment introduces the letter. Further response is not required.
- 10-2 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, including the terminus at the Pasadena City College Colorado campus. Further response is not required.
- 10-3 The comment acknowledges the proposed charging station and layover facility and states a goal for the design to reduce adverse effects on traffic on Hill Avenue and to limit the removal of college property. Please note that bus layover and charging will take place on Hill Avenue and not within Parking Lot 1, and the existing number of travel lanes will be maintained on Hill Avenue. A limited number of parking spaces may be needed for electric vehicle charging infrastructure. In addition, the sidewalk may need to be shifted to a grass strip on Pasadena City College property adjacent to the existing sidewalk. Metro is committed to continued consultation with the relevant stakeholders.
- 10-4 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR. The comment encourages Metro to enhance system access for community college students that report difficulty in non-tuition costs of college, including transportation. Further response is not required.
- 10-5 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR or raise environmental issues. The comment expresses a desire for Metro to revise the cost-sharing agreement for the UPass program and to expand the discounted pass program for community college students. Metro will continue to work with PCC regarding the Proposed Project and cost sharing.

- 10-6 This comment states Pasadena City College is glad to participate in the planning process and expresses a desire to continue to collaborate with Metro. Comment noted. Further response is not required.

4.5 RESPONSES TO GROUPS/ORGANIZATIONS

Letter No. 11

Desiree Gates Valdivieso

President

Dahlia Heights Elementary School PTA

- 11-1 This comment introduces the comment letter. No further response is necessary.
- 11-2 This comment states that safety should be a priority for the Proposed Project. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization and barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. The Proposed Project would add a new signal-protected crosswalk at Dahlia Drive, which would improve pedestrian safety proximate to the Dahlia Heights Elementary School compared to the existing condition.
- 11-3 This comment states the existing 35 miles per hour speed limit should be maintained on Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would not change existing speed limits.
- 11-4 This comment states that the Proposed Project must be consistent with the City's Mobility Plan. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes.
- 11-5 This comment opposes the removal of existing buffered bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project

- Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 11-6 This comment opposes the introduction of a third vehicular lane in each direction which the comment asserts will make drivers perceive the street as a wider, high-speed thoroughfare and thus drive up traffic speed. The speed limit on Colorado Boulevard would be maintained at the existing 35 miles per hour speed limit should a dedicated bus lane be added to Colorado Boulevard. The bus lane will not make the street appear any wider than the existing bike lane. The curb-to-curb width of the street is not changing. In addition, placing the bike lanes against the sidewalk and the on-street parking between the sidewalk and the outside travel lane will narrow the perception of the corridor for drivers. In addition, the one-travel lane design option in combination with flipping the on-street parking and the bike lanes would further narrow the perception of the width of the corridor.
- 11-7 This comment states that the side-running treatment is a “traffic-first” approach which makes no effort to modify or eliminate existing unsafe conditions (such as uncontrolled left-turns) even in stretches of Colorado Boulevard that do not have raised medians. The Proposed Project includes side-running bus lanes on Colorado Boulevard west of Ellenwood Drive. Within the side-running bus lanes segment on Colorado Boulevard, raised medians would be added and left-turns would be directed to intersections with dedicated left-turn lanes. These improvements are anticipated to enhance the safety of left-turn movements.
- 11-8 This comment states that the Proposed Project does not include additional or extended dividing medians or protected crossing pockets for crosswalks, which would make crossing Colorado Boulevard dangerous. The Project includes curb extensions to reduce pedestrian crossing distances, upgrades unsignalized crosswalks with rectangular rapid flashing beacons to pedestrian actuated signalized crossings, and adds a new traffic signal at Dahlia Drive to improve pedestrian access to Dahlia Heights Elementary School.
- 11-9 This comment states that the Proposed Project does not include crosswalk enhancements or comprehensive traffic calming measures. Refer to Response 11-2 related to safety enhancements and Response 11-8 regarding crosswalk enhancements.
- 11-10 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to

Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

- 11-11 This comment summarizes the letter by stating that the Dahlia community and the larger neighborhood expect that the Proposed Project would fulfil its functional specification and also enhance neighborhood livability.

Letter No. 12

Emily Carlin

President

Eagle Rock Elementary School PTA

- 12-1 This comment introduces the comment letter, expresses support for public transit, and describes pedestrian conditions along Colorado Boulevard. No further response is required.
- 12-2 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 12-3 This comment expresses multiple safety concerns related to the side-running treatment in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). Route Option F2 has been eliminated from further consideration and a refined version of Route Option F1 is being proposed. Regarding pedestrian safety, Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR includes a detailed impact analysis in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization and barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. The Proposed Project, which is a refined version of Route Option F1 presented in the Draft EIR, would add a new signal-protected crosswalk at Dahlia Drive, which would improve pedestrian safety proximate to the Dahlia Heights Elementary School compared to the existing condition.
- 12-4 This comment expresses opposition to removing the existing landscaped medians on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock because they provide speed calming. The Proposed Project would remove portions of the existing medians along Colorado Boulevard east of Eagle Rock Boulevard; however, the Proposed Project would also

provide new medians and separator islands. The comment also expresses opposition to Route Option F3 on SR-134 in Eagle Rock, which is no longer under consideration for the Proposed Project.

- 12-5 This comment reiterates support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. Refer to Master Response 1.

Letter No. 13

Letter of Support for Eagle Rock Beautiful Boulevard No 1

- 13-1. This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 13-2. This comment expresses support for a Proposed Project that sets efficient transit and access as a primary goal. Section 2.3.1 of the Draft EIR provides the Project Objectives and identifies improved accessibility for disadvantaged communities, improved transit access, enhanced connectivity to other regional transit services, and passenger comfort and convenience, among others, as objectives for the Proposed Project.
- 13-3. This comment expresses concerns with Route Options F1, F2, and F3 in Eagle Rock related to ensuring quality transit service and inconsistencies with roadway classification objectives in the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan. Route Options F2 and F3 are no longer under consideration for the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project on Colorado Boulevard would provide a premium BRT service in Eagle Rock and would maintain as much curbside parking as possible while improving safety by implementing left-turn restrictions at several intersections and other safety measures such as signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. The revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities, which are included as part of the Proposed Project. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling

- facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes.
- 13-4 This comment summarizes components of the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. Refer to Master Response 1.
- 13-5 This comment expresses concern with the outreach process. To encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period and Draft EIR review period, legal advertisement notices were published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants and property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) notices and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts. Other noticing methods including email blasts, social media advertisements, meeting flyer distribution, and print and online media notification were provided in the study area during the 60-day scoping period. In addition, in accordance with Metro's Public Participation Plan, targeted community outreach efforts were completed in various cities throughout the Project area to ensure participation of limited English proficiency and transit reliant populations. Specifically, special pop-up events were hosted at the North Hollywood Station to reach transit riders. Comments during the Public Scoping period for the Project were also received through a set of transit rider intercept surveys conducted at major transit stops along the corridor. As the Draft EIR was circulated during the COVID-19 pandemic, such targeted outreach to transit riders was not possible at each phase of the EIR outreach process. Due to the limited in-person outreach opportunities during COVID-19, Project car cards were printed and placed on Metro Bus lines to reach transit users.
- 13-6 Metro agrees with the comment that traffic congestion is not an environmental impact under CEQA. Refer to page 3.1-28 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR for a detailed analysis related to the vehicle miles traveled and the potential for impacts. The analysis determined that the Proposed Project would reduce regional VMT and would not result in a significant impact.
- 13-7 The comment requests for Metro to consider left-door boarding buses for their fleet. Metro studied the use of buses that allow for two-sided boarding outside of this study. This style of bus is not part of the existing fleet.
- 13-8 Metro BRT stations are designed to create a comfortable, accessible, and safe environment for all passengers, fulfilling both a functional and aesthetic need. The stations are distinguishable from competing street elements, yet complementary to the surrounding environments. Station amenities associated with the Proposed Project would be designed using a kit of parts approach, similar to Metro rail stations. The BRT kit of parts approach is under development by Metro, although station elements

would be utilized to establish a minimum requirement of baseline amenities for platforms. At locations with higher ridership or where space allows, additional enhanced amenities would be provided to support the Proposed Project. Station siting would allow for safe and accessible paths of travel for transit riders including those accessing stations on foot, bike, and other rolling modes.

Regarding safety, Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR includes a detailed impact analysis in accordance with CEQA Guidelines. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization and barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

- 13-9 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 in Eagle Rock (Route Option F3) because this route would bypass businesses on Colorado Boulevard. Route Option F3 is no longer under consideration for the Proposed Project.
- 13-10 The refined Proposed Project will limit left-turns across the bus lanes to signalized intersections and will be placed to accommodate access to businesses and local residences. Left turns will be made from designated left-turn lanes and left turns will operate under a protected signal phase separate from the center-running bus lanes. Left turns will no longer be allowed at intersections without dedicated left-turns lanes. Restricting left turns to intersections with dedicated left-turn lanes will improve safety by providing space for vehicles to decelerate and by providing storage for left-turning vehicles outside of the through travel lanes.
- 13-11 Metro does not expect the Proposed Project will generate much cut-through traffic largely because of the lack of time-competitive parallel routes. Analysis performed with the travel demand model indicates that traffic which diverts from Colorado Boulevard will primarily switch to the freeway system rather than local streets. Traffic bound to-and-from local destinations may re-route to nearby intersections with median openings that provide opportunities for cross-traffic movements and left-turns. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.
- 13-12 To assess the Proposed Project impacts on transit service, future transit ridership was estimated through a forecasting analysis utilizing the Metro's Corridors Based Model 18. The model considers current travel patterns and applies future transit service changes to the network resulting from the Proposed Project, to forecast trips by mode and estimate transit boardings. As discussed in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project is anticipated to reduce regional VMT. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines, transportation projects that reduce VMT should be presumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact. In addition, Metro

anticipates COVID restrictions will be lifted by the time the Project is expected to open in 2024 and that regional ridership will return to pre-COVID level prior to that date. Please note that many commuters are not able to work remotely due to job requirements (e.g., essential services).

- 13-13 Refer to Response 13-1 related to the current design in Eagle Rock and Response 13-3 related to the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan.

The Proposed Project uses the existing street alignment and right-of-way and would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, as the Proposed Project would be designed per applicable State, Metro, and City design criteria and standards. For segments with median-running bus lanes, stations are usually provided on islands at intersections and are accessible from the signalized crosswalk. The safety measures include signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Further, the BRT service would include queue jumps at selected locations at which a traffic signal with special bus indications would display a bus-only phase, which would allow buses to enter an intersection before a green indication is given to other traffic in order to allow the bus to maneuver across mixed-flow lanes ahead of conflicting traffic. Since other traffic would be observing a red signal during the bus phase, adverse safety impacts would be minimal. Refer to the response to comment 13-3 for additional discussion of specific features intended to improve road user safety.

- 13-14 This comment expresses support for transit in the Proposed Project corridor and reiterates support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal. No further response is required.

Letter No. 14

Letter of Support for Eagle Rock Beautiful Boulevard No 2

- 14-1 This comment expresses opposition to the design options presented in the Draft EIR based on the opinion that it would sacrifice quality transit service, landscaped medians, bike lanes, and/or curbside parking within Downtown Eagle Rock. Metro disagrees with the assertion that the Proposed Project requires an either/or choice between quality transit, safety, a vibrant and green street, or convenient access to local small businesses.
- 14-2 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to

Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

- 14-3 This comment expresses concerns with Route Options F1, F2, and F3 in Eagle Rock and lists five needs and goals important to the Eagle Rock community. Metro acknowledges the five community needs and goals listed in this comment. Route Options F2 and F3 are no longer under consideration for the Proposed Project (See Response to Comment 12-3). The selected route on Colorado Boulevard would provide a premium BRT service in Eagle Rock and would maintain as much curbside parking as possible. The Proposed Project would improve safety by implementing left-turn restrictions at several intersections and other safety measures such as signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.
- 14-4 The comment expresses opposition to Route Option F1 due to the removal of medians, the removal of parking, and the expansion of Colorado Boulevard into six lanes while expressing support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. Refer to Response to Comment 14-2 related to the current design options on Colorado Boulevard.
- 14-5 The comment expresses opposition to Route Option F2 due to safety concerns, the proposed removal of dedicated bicycle facilities, and inconsistency with Mobility Plan 2035. Route Option F2 is no longer under consideration for the Proposed Project. All Metro BRT buses shall adhere to applicable roadway speed limits and regulations. The Proposed Project includes design elements which would improve safety conditions for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. In no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. The Proposed Project would also include crosswalk improvements designed to enhance pedestrian safety. See Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR for further discussion of project design and safety enhancement features. The current design is consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes.
- 14-6 The comment expresses opposition to Route Option F3 as it would not provide transit benefits to the Eagle Rock community. Route Option F3 is no longer under consideration for the Proposed Project.

- 14-7 This comment addresses why the commentors believe that the Beautiful Boulevard proposal would be better for Eagle Rock than Route Options F1, F2, and F3. Refer to Response 14-2 related to the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard.
- 14-8 The comment requests Metro consider left-door boarding buses be integrated into their fleet. Metro studied the use of buses that allow for two-sided boarding outside of this study. This style of bus is not part of the existing fleet.
- 14-9 There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are non-native and are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of each of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.
- 14-10 Metro does not expect the Proposed Project will generate much cut-through traffic largely because of the lack of time-competitive parallel routes. Analysis performed with the travel demand model indicates that traffic which diverts from Colorado Boulevard will primarily switch to the freeway system rather than local streets. Traffic bound to-and-from local destinations may re-route to nearby intersections with median openings that provide opportunities for cross-traffic movements and left-turns. Please see Appendix D for more detailed information.
- 14-11. As stated on page 2-19 in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, site-specific public art will be considered during the final design phase to promote a sense of place for surrounding neighborhoods.
- 14-12 The Proposed Project uses the existing street alignment and right-of-way and would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, as the Proposed Project would be designed per applicable State, Metro, and City criteria and design standards. For segments with median-running bus lanes, stations are usually provided on islands at intersections and are accessible from the signalized crosswalk. The safety measures include signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Further, the BRT service would include queue jumps at selected locations at which a traffic signal with special bus indications would display a bus-only phase, which would allow buses to enter an intersection before a green indication is given to other traffic in order to allow the bus to maneuver across mixed-flow lanes ahead of conflicting traffic. Since other traffic would be observing a red signal during the bus phase, adverse safety impacts would be minimal.

The refined Proposed Project includes numerous features which are intended improve safety such as:

- Removing the striped two-way center left-turn lane between Sierra Villa Drive and Eagle Rock Boulevard and replacing it with medians and designated left-turn lanes.
- Removing the wide median with open breaks (lacking formal left-turn lanes) between Eagle Rock Boulevard and Townsend Avenue and replacing it with center-running bus lanes and medians, and either adding designated left-turn lanes or extending existing left-turn lanes.
- Replacing the flashing beacon at Hermosa Avenue with a traffic signal to increase the protection of the crosswalk.
- Providing additional signal-protected crosswalks including one at Dahlia Drive adjacent to Dahlia Heights Elementary School.
- Retaining the existing buffered bicycle lanes; moving the bicycle lane to a curb-adjacent location where it would be protected from the traffic lanes by on-street parking spaces.
- Reducing the number of mixed-flow traffic lanes from two to one in each direction between Eagle Rock Boulevard and the SR-134 slip ramps, which would reduce average operating speeds under the one lane design option.

14-13 Refer to Master Response No. 2. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that “Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes.” As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project’s social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Regarding the expansion of the Business Interruption Fund, as discussed in Response to Comment 6-12, Metro’s Business Solution Center will provide small businesses with immediate, hands-on business development and technical services.

14-14 This comment expresses support for transit in the Proposed Project corridor and reiterates support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal. Refer to Response 14-2.

Letter No. 15

Christine Louise Mills, Chair

Hans Johnson, President

East Area Progressive Democrats Transit Committee

- 15-1 This comment states that the attached letter was previously submitted as an email and is now being submitted as a PDF with signatures. No further response is required.
- 15-2 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 15-3 This comment expresses opposition to eliminating bicycle lanes, existing medians, or bypassing Downtown Eagle Rock and reiterates support for the Beautiful Boulevard. Refer to Response 15-2. Regarding safety, Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR includes a detailed impact analysis in accordance with CEQA Guidelines. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization and barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.
- 15-4 This comment reiterates support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. Refer to Response 15-2.

Letter No. 16

Glendale Environmental Coalition Steering Committee

- 16-1 The comment expresses support for Route Options D and E1 in Glendale. The comment also expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

- 16-2 The comment reiterates support for the Eagle Rock community-generated Beautiful Boulevard proposal citing the need for accessible and comfortable transit stops including shade cover for riders, elevated platforms for quick and efficient boardings, and safe, comfortable first mile/last mile connections. Refer to Response 16-1.

Letter No. 17

Malbec Market Employee Letter

- 17-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 18

Paul Little

Pasadena Chamber of Commerce

- 18-1 Metro anticipates that regional ridership will return to pre-COVID level prior to the Proposed Project opening date of 2024. The results of the conceptual capital cost estimates for the Proposed Project indicate a range between \$263 million and \$386 million. The estimated annual cost of operating and maintaining the Proposed Project's BRT service ranges from \$16.6 million to \$18.5 million.

The North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor was identified by Metro's 2013 Countywide Bus Rapid Transit and Street Design Improvement Study as one of the region's most heavily traveled corridors without a premium bus service or other high quality transit option. Further, the Alternatives Analysis prepared for the project, provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, includes a detailed analysis that discusses connectivity to the regional transit network, connectivity to major activity centers in the region, and socioeconomic/demographic factors benefited by the Proposed Project. Furthermore, in addition to advancing the goals of Metro's Vision 2028 Strategic Plan, objectives of the Proposed Project include:

- Advance a premium transit service that is more competitive with auto travel;
- Improve accessibility for disadvantaged communities;
- Improve transit access to major activity and employment centers;
- Enhance connectivity to Metro and other regional transit services;
- Provide improved passenger comfort and convenience; and
- Support community plans and transit-oriented community goals.

The comment accurately states that there will not be dedicated bus lanes in Pasadena. Analysis of traffic data collected in Pasadena indicates that the addition of up to approximately six buses per hour in each direction will not materially increase traffic congestion. The comment opposes the Proposed Project operating on surface streets in Pasadena and suggests ending the route at the Memorial Park Light Rail Station and shuttling passengers east on the Metro L Line (Gold). The BRT terminus at Pasadena City College provides a transit option for students and staff with a direct direction to the college that is not provided by the Metro L Line (Gold).

Letter No. 19

Greg Merideth, President

The Eagle Rock Association (TERA)

- 19-1 This comment summarizes The Eagle Rock Association (TERA) priorities related to the Proposed Project. Priorities include quality transit service for Eagle Rock, consistency with the Take Back the Boulevard Initiative, maintain or enhance existing bicycle infrastructure, maintain landscaped medians, and maintain street parking. Detailed responses are provided below in response to specific comments.
- 19-2 This comment expresses disappointment that neither the Proposed Project nor the proposed route options meet all TERA priorities simultaneously. The comment suggests Metro study and adopt an alternative that meets all of Eagle Rock's priorities and needs per their statement, rather than a choice between the recommended options. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 19-3 This comment lists reasons why Route Option F1 is unacceptable to TERA. Route Option F1 as presented in the Draft EIR has since been refined as the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to design refinements in Eagle Rock associated with the Proposed Project including bicycle lanes. The refined design of the Proposed Project promotes multi-modal travel by preserving buffered bicycle lanes and adding bus lanes. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization and barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Importantly, the Take Back The Boulevard vision is a community initiative that has not been formally adopted by the City of Los Angeles. Metro acknowledges TERA's

- priorities, although it is important to note that the EIR is not required to demonstrate consistency with the vision as it is not formal City policy.
- 19-4 The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. The refined Proposed Project is consistent with the applicable Mobility Plan policies as per the previous Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for information related to design refinements in Eagle Rock associated with the Proposed Project including bicycle lanes.
- 19-5 The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. There is no conflict with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035 Bicycle Enhanced Network designation of Colorado Boulevard for Class IV protected bike lanes.
- 19-6 The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. The Proposed Project would not conflict with the Take Back The Boulevard vision of reducing the safety and accessibility of multi-modal travel on Colorado Boulevard.
- 19-7 Refer to Response 19-4.
- 19-8 Route Option F2 is no longer being considered for the Proposed Project and is not discussed in the Final EIR. The Proposed Project no longer includes a design that removes the existing bicycle lane. The refined design of the Proposed Project promotes multi-modal travel by preserving buffered bicycle lanes and adding bus lanes. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization and barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. These safety measures are consistent with 2025 Vision Zero goals for eliminating traffic deaths.
- 19-9 This comment urges Metro to abandon Route Option F2 as presented in the Draft EIR. Route Option F2 is no longer being considered for the Proposed Project and is not discussed in the Final EIR.
- 19-10 This comment lists reasons why Route Option F3 is unacceptable to TERA. Route Option F3 is no longer being considered for the Proposed Project and is not discussed in the Final EIR.
- 19-11 This comment expresses concerns related to emergency vehicle access and emergency response times. Metro confirms that there is no law or regulation preventing emergency vehicles from using dedicated bus lanes. The dedicated bus lanes would improve emergency vehicle response times on Colorado Boulevard as these vehicles would no longer need to operate in mixed-flow traffic conditions.

- 19-12 The Proposed Project would improve pedestrian safety by adding signalized crosswalks to Colorado Boulevard at Dahlia Drive serving Dahlia Heights Elementary School and adding High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk) signals at several other locations. The comment requests specific information regarding crosswalks along Colorado Blvd. Concept Plans are presented in Appendix F of the Final EIR. The crosswalk placements shown in the Concept Plans were developed considering site-specific opportunities and constraints, as well as safety, bus operations, and pedestrian access. Crosswalks will be finalized during the design phase after the Proposed Project is approved by the Metro Board.
- 19-13 This comment expresses concern with potential left-turn movement restrictions. Most of the left-turns which would be eliminated are at minor intersections where such turns are currently made with “permissive” (unprotected) movements, which have the potential to result in a collision with the opposing through traffic. Per the Proposed Project, left-turn movements would generally be made at locations where “protected” left-turns will be provided, resulting in improved safety. Right-turns would be retained so that local residents could utilize the designated left-turn locations to make U-turns in combination with right-turns to continue to access adjoining neighborhoods. As the design is advanced during the preliminary engineering phase, there will be opportunities for further refinements in the number of left-turn locations.
- 19-14 Route Option F2 is no longer being considered for the Proposed Project and is not discussed in the Final EIR. Refer to Response 19-4.
- 19-15 This comment expresses concern related to the Proposed Project affecting small businesses. Recognizing the importance of supporting small businesses during construction as vital to ensure economic stability of communities, in 2019, Metro’s Board authorized the expansion of the Metro Business Solution Center (BSC) to the NoHo to Pasadena BRT project. Metro’s BSC will provide small businesses with immediate, hands-on business development and technical services. Additionally, Metro, in coordination with the City of Los Angeles, would develop a Traffic Management Plan and/or Construction management plan to minimize potential impacts during construction.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, refer to Master Response No. 2. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that “Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes.” As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project’s social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual

resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project.

- 19-16 This comment expresses concern over the Metro bus fleet, specifically regarding left-door boarding. Metro studied the use of buses that allow for two-sided boarding outside of this Project. This style of bus is not part of the existing zero-emission bus fleet. Metro intends to utilize buses from its fleet which is shared across multiple bus lines and the type of buses in the Metro bus fleet would be the same with or without the Proposed Project. The Project will be designed to provide full compliance with ADA requirements with respect to the station-bus interface. The travel time estimates include dwell times which reflect loading and unloading of passengers, including those with disabilities and bicycles.
- 19-17 Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, it is not necessary for Metro to provide completed designs for bicycle parking facilities to address CEQA requirements. Bike racks could be provided at stations; the details will be addressed in the final design.
- 19-18 Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, it is not necessary for Metro to identify how the Proposed Project would interface with bicycle and scooter share services to address CEQA requirements. Potential impacts related to existing and planned bicycle facilities are discussed in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Riders of the Proposed BRT service would be permitted to transport bicycles and scooters along guidelines consistent with existing Metro policy regarding personal transport items on Metro buses. Additional information is available at <https://www.metro.net/riding/bike-transit/>.
- 19-19 Transit ridership was forecast through a travel demand model, Metro's Corridors Based Model 18. The model was calibrated for the Proposed Project. The model considers current travel patterns and applies future transit service changes to the network resulting from the Proposed Project to forecast trips by mode and estimated boardings. Metro anticipates that regional ridership will return to pre-COVID level prior to the Proposed Project opening date of 2024. Please note that many commuters are not able to work remotely due to job requirements (e.g., essential services).
- 19-20 This comment identifies the Eagle Rock Music Festival as an important special event that takes place on Colorado Boulevard and asks that Metro disclose how the Project accommodates special events such as the Eagle Rock Music Festival. Implementation of the Project would not preclude use of Colorado Boulevard for special events and BRT service would be coordinated with such special events similar to existing Metro bus services along Colorado Boulevard (e.g., the Rose Parade in Pasadena). All special events that use street right-of-way within the City of Los Angeles are required to obtain special event permits from the Department of Public Works and the Special Events Permit Office notifies agencies, including Metro, prior to processing street closure requests.

- 19-21 This comment summarizes the Beautiful Boulevard proposal. Refer to Master Response No. 1. Specific recommendations are addressed in the following comments.
- 19-22 The comment urges Metro to incorporate innovative design elements. Metro asserts that the Proposed Project incorporates innovative design concepts. Elements such as parking protected bike lanes will be further evaluated for incorporation in the final design phase.
- 19-23 The comment describes 10.5-foot BRT lanes for the Van Ness Boulevard project in San Francisco, as a comparison to Colorado Boulevard. Preliminary lane widths are defined in the Concept Plans presented in Appendix F of the Final EIR. The Proposed Project generally includes 11- or 12-foot bus lanes, as Metro has experienced problems with “mirror strikes” in bus lanes less than 11 feet in width. The lane widths for roadway elements, including medians, travel lanes, turn lanes, bike lanes, and parking/loading lanes will be refined considering local jurisdiction standards during future, more detailed design phases.
- 19-24 This comment expresses a desire for driver-side (left-side) boarding. Refer to Response 19-15.
- 19-25 The comment expresses a desire to use narrow travel lane widths (9.5-foot to 10.5-foot) along Colorado Boulevard. Minimum travel lane widths and use of narrow travel lanes will be established in consultation with each of the involved jurisdictions during the Project’s design phase considering the trade-off between maneuverability, safety and accommodating all required cross-section elements. Refer also to the Response 19-22.
- 19-26 This comment expresses support for regional transit and notes that TERA believes that more collaboration could lead to a project that would be supported by the group. Metro is committed to working with community groups to meet a variety of transit goals. Metro looks forward to continued collaboration with TERA.

4.6 RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUALS

Letter No. 20

Aaron Dehn

- 20-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Vineland (Route Option A1) and suggests a roundabout infrastructure for the Lankershim/Vineland/ Camarillo intersection. A roundabout is not being considered for the Proposed Project at this intersection, although Route Option A1 was selected by the Metro Board as part of the Proposed Project. Metro suggests directing the roundabout comment to the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

- 20-2 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1 and F2). After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board eliminated Route Options F2 and F3 from further consideration and has proposed two design options along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Refer to Master Response 1.

Letter No. 21

Adam Linder

- 21-1 The route alignment along Lankershim Boulevard south of the Lankershim Boulevard/Vineland Avenue/Camarillo Street intersection is recommended as it will allow the buses to make right turns to access the SR-134 freeway ramp.
- 21-2 The project does not propose a station at the Lankershim Boulevard/Vineland Avenue/Camarillo Street intersection and will not generate additional pedestrian activity at this intersection; a station at Hesby Street would provide convenient access to the NoHo Arts District. The Proposed Project is only proposing improvements within the existing street right-of-way. With center-running bus lanes, the subject intersection would operate similar to existing conditions with buses operating in the bus lanes concurrent with non-conflicting vehicular movements. During the Project's design phase, appropriate signage and pavement markings along with traffic signal modifications would be developed.
- 21-3 During the Alternatives Analysis of the Project, historic ridership counts and projected ridership were analyzed. The ridership forecast was low for a potential station on Riverside Drive and concerns were received from residents and stakeholders regarding the Project operating along Riverside Drive. In addition, the utilization of SR-134 provides travel time-savings.
- 21-4 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Glendale (Route Option E2). The Metro Board selected Route Option E1 in Glendale to carry forward for further consideration in this Final EIR.
- 21-5 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). The Metro Board eliminated Route Options F2 and F3 from further consideration and has proposed two design options along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock.
- 21-6 This comment opposes removing bike lanes when the BRT can be accommodated by removing parking or landscaped medians. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the current design options.

Letter No. 22

Adam Modiano

- 22-1 This comment expresses support for the optional station on Olive Avenue at Verdugo Avenue. This station has been incorporated into the refined Proposed Project.

Letter No. 23

Aisha Dixon-Peters

- 23-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The two design options on Colorado Boulevard incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard design concepts by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design options include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 24

Akiva Gottlieb

- 24-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle

lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. It is anticipated that the number of curb extensions would be similar to the number proposed by the City under both design options in Eagle Rock.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. The revised design options on Colorado Boulevard are consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 25

Aleem Hossain

- 25-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The design options for Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's concept designs by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of

the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 26

Alek Bartrosouf

- 26-1 This comment expresses support for dedicated bicycle lanes and a dedicated bus lane in the Eagle Rock segment of the project. The comment further expresses support for the pedestrian-oriented designs included in the Beautiful Boulevard design concept. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard, both of which incorporate elements of the Beautiful Boulevard concept. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 27

Aleksandra Sherman

- 27-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's two design options for Colorado Boulevard incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard concept's designs by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each

enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 28

Alex de Cordoba

- 28-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 29

Alexander Halaby

- 29-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) due to traffic on parallel streets and potential business impacts. The comment also expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) due to less environmental effects, less fiscal impacts, noise effects, and traffic effects.

After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The potential for traffic to use alternate streets if the Project operates on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock was analyzed with the regional travel demand model. Results of analysis indicate that the diversion of traffic to parallel streets would be minor, as the parallel streets are not continuous and would not provide time savings for motorists. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

Regarding potential business impacts, refer to Master Response No. 2. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, there the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project.

A detailed noise analysis was provided in Section 3.9, Noise, of the Draft EIR. No permanent noise impacts were identified on Colorado Boulevard based on methodology contained in the Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual.

Letter No. 30

Alexander Shirley

- 30-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular Route Options A2, E1, F1/F2, G2, and H2. The Metro Board selected Route Options A1 to B to C to D to E1 to F1 to G1 to H1. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The comment also expresses support for curb-running configurations wherever possible, median-running where applicable, and to minimize any use of mixed-flow operations in favor of dedicated bus lanes. The comment also expresses support for prioritizing protected bike lanes over vehicle parking.

- 30-2 This comment expresses a desire to prioritize protected bicycle lanes over on-street parking, citing safety concerns. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Regarding bicycle facilities in other locations, such as the City of Burbank, the Proposed Project has been designed to maintain existing bicycle facilities to the greatest extent possible with some improvements to bicycle safety such as routing bicycle circulation behind proposed bus loading areas to avoid conflicts with bus loading zones.

Letter No. 31

Alissa Walker

- 31-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project. Comment noted.

Letter No. 32

Allen Hubsch

- 32-1 This comment expresses opposition to buses circling the PCC campus and proposes new route alignments including an option providing access to the Caltech campus. Although a new concept may be developed for turning around the buses at the east end of the route at the PCC campus, a direct connection to Caltech along Cordova or Del Mar is not being considered at this time.

Letter No. 33

Allen Natian

33-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and preference for center-running non-freeway lane configurations, physical separation of dedicated bus lanes from other traffic, and signal priority. General purpose traffic will be discouraged from driving in dedicated bus lane sections through barriers that may include signage and pavement markings, raised delineators, rumble strips, and raised curbs or medians. Basic functions of signal priority are currently available in several cities, including the City of Los Angeles, and expected to be available within all the affected jurisdictions by the opening date of the Proposed Project. Potential transit signal priority functions are described below:

- Early Green: When a bus is approaching a red signal, conflicting phases may be terminated early to obtain the green indication for the bus.
- Extended Green: When a bus is approaching the end of a green signal cycle, the green may be extended to allow bus passage before the green phase terminates.
- Transit Phase: A dedicated bus-only phase is activated before or after the green for parallel traffic to allow the bus to proceed through the intersection. For example, a queue jump may be implemented in which the bus departs from a dedicated bus lane or a station ahead of other traffic, so the bus can weave across lanes or make a turn.

Letter No. 34

Amanda Dobbins

34-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits, obey traffic laws in a similar manner as automobiles, and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Letter No. 35

Amber Sealey

- 35-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) but support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

This comment is not clear as it indicates multiple times that a bus lane currently exists on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock, which is not accurate. The comment references the Proposed Project as a high-speed bus route, which is also not accurate. Buses, including those in dedicated bus lanes, would be required to comply with the posted speed limits and would obey traffic laws in a similar manner as automobiles.

Letter No. 36

Ana K. Davis

- 36-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 37

Anastasia McGee

- 37-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project. Comment noted.

Letter No. 38

Andrew Thomas

- 38-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the

Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. The Final EIR's design options are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 39

Andy P.

- 39-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project. Metro anticipates that regional ridership will return to pre-COVID level prior to the Proposed Project opening date of 2024.

Letter No. 40

Annette Hill

- 40-1 This comment expresses support for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro disagrees with the assertion that public sentiment was not considered in the design. A series of public workshops were completed consisting of a presentation, followed by several interactive activities including a virtual polling survey, priority exercise, and street design activity. Activities were tailored to each of the five communities. For example, an activity conducted in Pasadena was focused on station amenities, whereas activities conducted in other communities focused on adding bus lanes to the street. The activities' purpose was to gain feedback on the street and station design considerations and understand priorities within each community and the

importance of amenities. This information was considered in the conceptual design of the Project and the Draft EIR. In selecting the route for the Proposed Project, the Metro Board of Directors considered public comments and potential impacts to CEQA resources as disclosed in the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 41

Annie Molina

- 41-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) due to negative business effects associated with traffic, construction, and loss of pedestrian access. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding traffic congestion, although the effects of the project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Regarding construction effects, Metro standard practice is to coordinate with local jurisdictions to minimize construction effects. In addition, as shown in the Section 3.1, Transportation, Mitigation Measures **TRA-1** through **TRA-4** are designed to reduce potential for construction activities to effect traffic and transportation. As shown in Section 3.9, Noise, Mitigation Measure **NOI-1** is designed to control construction noise.

Regarding pedestrian access, the Proposed Project includes many safety measures for pedestrians, including signal-protected movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Letter No. 42

Anonymous

- 42-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project and support for improving existing transit service. Comment noted.

Letter No. 43

Anonymous

- 43-1 A map of the Proposed Project and route options is available in Chapter 2, Project Description, Figure 2-2 in Section 2.3.1.2 of the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 44

Arjun Kolachalam

- 44-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project removing the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 45

Barbara Kremins

- 45-1 Emergency evacuation is addressed in Section 4.1.2, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. As stated therein, the Proposed Project would be constructed along or near several emergency/disaster routes, including the SR-134 Freeway, Colorado Boulevard, Glenoaks Boulevard, Olive Avenue, and Lankershim Boulevard. Los Angeles County and each of the cities affected by the Proposed Project have developed emergency response plans. Temporary lane closures may be required and emergency routes may be temporarily disrupted during construction activities. The Project Area is a fully built roadway network with parallel streets in every direction. Detour routes, of which there are multiple options, would be established in consultation with emergency service providers. Although lane closures are anticipated,

full street closures are not anticipated, and roadway access would be maintained to accommodate response to emergencies. Construction activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction activities. After construction, the bus lanes would be open to emergency vehicles, which could improve response plans. During emergencies, the bus-only lanes would be open to all evacuating vehicles. Operational activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Regarding small businesses, Metro believes that the transit project would increase foot traffic near station areas, thereby supporting local businesses.

Letter No. 46

Barrett Cooke

- 46-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concepts by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, although not within the Eagle Rock segment of the Project, sidewalks may require an approximate 1 to 2 foot reduction in width to accommodate station platforms and/or widening of the roadway to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; however, the remaining sidewalk width would typically exceed 10 feet and in no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in

violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 47

Ben Creed

- 47-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project removing the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 48

Ben Tomimatsu

- 48-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, and particularly for routing the BRT along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Routes F1/F2). The comment further stresses the preservation of existing transportation infrastructure and offers suggestions on integrating landscaping into the bus lane configuration design. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 49

Bethsaida A. Castillo

- 49-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating in Glendale.
- 49-2 Regarding engagement with the City of Glendale, Metro has engaged City officials throughout the CEQA process and provided the City with multiple stakeholder briefings.

- 49-3 The comment summarizes the route options in Glendale. The comment also opposes the Proposed Project operating in Glendale on surface streets, including dedicated bus lanes, due to traffic, parking impacts, fewer car lanes, and lost medians. Comment noted.
- 49-4 The comment expresses concern over the lack of existing infrastructure, negative effects to neighborhood character, and the safety of buses. It is unclear what infrastructure is lacking for the Proposed Project as the BRT would operate on existing surface streets. Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT would affect neighborhood character. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR and no further response is required. The bus fleet would be maintained daily and Metro disagrees with the characterization that buses are dirty and unsafe.
- 49-5 The comment expresses concern related to the Proposed Project leading to increased density in Glendale. Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. The SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.
- 49-6 The comment expresses opposition to a lane reduction, or road diet, in Glendale. Under CEQA, automobile delay (e.g., reductions in levels of service) is not an environmental impact. The impacts of the Proposed Project on transit and bicycle facilities, safety, and emergency response times are addressed in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
- 49-7 The comment again expresses opposition to the Proposed Project. Comment noted.

Letter No. 50

Betsy Medvedovsky

- 50-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 51

Beverly Ashley

- 51-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project eliminating a mixed-flow traffic lane on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 54

Bhavin Shah

- 52-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on surface streets in Glendale (Route Options E1/E2) and opposes the SR-134 (Route Option

E3). The refined Proposed Project assessed in the Final EIR would operate on Broadway (Route Option E1), and Route Option E3 has been eliminated from further consideration.

52-2 The current design does not include barriers alongside the dedicated bus lanes. Options along the route may include signage and pavement markings, raised delineators, rumble strips, and raised curbs or medians.

52-3 It is possible to equip buses with cameras for security purposes. Per newly enacted legislation under Assembly Bill (AB) 917, operations of the Proposed Project may incorporate camera enforcement of bus lanes on the buses.

52-4 This comment does not relate to the contents of the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 53

Bin Lee

53-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating dedicated BRT lanes in Pasadena and on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). The Proposed Project does not include a dedicated BRT lane in Pasadena and Colorado Boulevard was selected by the Metro Board as the route in Pasadena.

Letter No. 54

Bob De Wees

54-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project using a mixed-flow lane on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock or using the existing median for a dedicated bus lane, and opposition to having only one travel lane per direction for passenger vehicles. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 55

Bobby Babajian

55-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock, specifically Route Option F1. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for

additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 56

Brandon Yung

- 56-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and support for center-running options as a way to preserve existing medians and bike lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 57

Brendan Quinn

- 57-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 58

Brian

- 58-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, although the commenter prefers a rail line over BRT.

Letter No. 59

Brian Bruegge

- 59-1 This comment expresses support for the center-running bus lanes treatment on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Option F1) and protected bicycle lanes. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 60

Brian McDaniel

- 60-1 This comment is an introduction to the following comments. No further comment is required.
- 60-2 This comment acknowledges that there is opposition to public transportation such as the Proposed Project and makes suggestions for addressing these comments. No further comment is required.
- 60-3 After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. The designs vary as they relate to lane configuration and parking. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer also to Master Response No. 1.
- Within Eagle Rock, the Proposed Project would affect the landscape median along Colorado Boulevard. New median and center lane landscaping amenities would be installed for safety and aesthetic purposes. Mitigation Measures **VIS-1** and **VIS-2** would reduce potential visual impacts by requiring landscaping and streetscape beautification.
- 60-4 This comment provides recommendations regarding resources for greener medians, new messaging regarding roadways, the number of lanes on existing roadways, and rebranding of the BRT. Comment noted.

Letter No. 61

Byron de Arakal

- 61-1 This comment summarizes the route options in Eagle Rock, although mischaracterizes the route options with least environmental impacts. As shown in Table ES-5 of the Executive Summary in the Draft EIR, Route Option F3 was identified as having the least potential for impacts in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Proposed Project refined Route Option F1 into Segment F, which includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard for this Final EIR. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 61-2 This comment questions the Proposed Project's consistency with the City's Mobility Plan 2035, in particular the goal to achieve a "transportation system that balances the needs of all road users." Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure

that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Regarding pedestrians, the Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

- 61-3 Regarding parking, Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 62

Byron de Arakal

- 62-1 For the refined Proposed Project along Segment F, there would be three stations proposed along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock in proximity to: Eagle Rock Plaza, Eagle Rock Boulevard and Townsend Avenue. The BRT would operate in a side-running configuration at the station in proximity to Eagle Rock Plaza, and in a center-running configuration at the Eagle Rock Boulevard and Townsend Avenue stations.

Letter No. 63

Cal Billy

63-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project. Comment noted.

Letter No. 64

Calvin Chin

64-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project. Comment noted.

Letter No. 65

Cardie Molina

65-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). Comment noted. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 66

Carey Bennett

66-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project removing the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 67

Carl and Pamela Allender

67-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.

67-2 Park-and-ride lots are not being considered as part of the Proposed Project. Regarding lighting, BRT stations would be designed with lighting for safety and security in

accordance with Metro guidelines and in coordination with each local jurisdiction. Design of each BRT station and development of operating plans would be coordinated with each local jurisdiction to ensure adequate emergency access and safety design.

Letter No. 68

Carl Matthes

- 68-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). Comment noted. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the refined Proposed Project route eliminated Route Options F2 and F3 from further consideration. The Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard based on refinements to Route Option F1. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR.

Letter No. 69

Carmel Levitan

- 69-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 70

Carol Allen

- 70-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and supports the SR-134 (Route Option F3). Comment noted. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the refined Proposed Project route eliminated Route Options F2 and F3 from further consideration. The Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard based on refinements to Route Option F1. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding construction effects, Metro standard practice is to coordinate with local jurisdictions to minimize construction effects. As shown in the Executive Summary

Chapter of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measures **TRA-1** through **TRA-4** are designed to reduce potential for construction activities to effect traffic and transportation. Mitigation Measure **NOI-1** is designed to control construction noise.

Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth in housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

Letter No. 71

Carter Rubin

- 71-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating in center-running bus lanes on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Option F1). The comment also supports preserving bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 72

Casey Law

- 72-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and Pasadena (Route Option H1).

Comment noted. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the refined Proposed Project route eliminated Route Option F2 from further consideration. The Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 73

Catherine Cameron

- 73-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project. Comment noted. No further response is required.

Letter No. 74

Cherryl Weaver

- 74-1 In order of preference, this comment expresses support for the No Build Alternative, followed by Route Option F3 and Route Option F2 in Eagle Rock. The comment expresses opposition to Route Option F1 in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 74-2 This comment expresses opposition to removing mixed-flow traffic lanes, parking, and medians. Regarding historic buildings, as discussed in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR, no historic structures would be impacted in Eagle Rock. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. Regarding zoning, Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership,

and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

- 74-3 Metro anticipates that regional ridership will return to pre-COVID levels prior to the Proposed Project opening date of 2024. Please note that many commuters are not able to work remotely due to job requirements (e.g., essential services).

Letter No. 75

Chris Newman

- 75-1 The BRT service would be provided on 40-foot zero-emission electric buses with seats for approximately 40 passengers and additional space for standees. However, Metro does have load standards that attempt to limit the number of passengers on a vehicle to avoid extreme overcrowding. Metro acknowledges the request for WiFi service. It is not known at this time if buses will have WiFi.

Letter No. 76

Chris Stratton

- 76-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project. Comment noted.

Letter No. 77

Christopher Shelton

- 77-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) due to business impacts, public safety, and increased traffic on parallel streets.

Regarding business impacts, CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service) to be assessed in the Draft EIR. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed

Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Regarding public safety, the Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Regarding increased traffic on parallel streets, the potential for traffic to use alternate streets with this option was analyzed with the regional travel demand model. Results of analysis indicate that the diversion of traffic to parallel streets would be minor, as the parallel streets are not continuous and would not provide time savings for motorists. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

77-2 This comment questions the Project need and expresses preference for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 in Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). The refined Proposed Project route eliminated Route Option F3 from further consideration. The North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor was identified by Metro's 2013 Countywide Bus Rapid Transit and Street Design Improvement Study as one of the region's most heavily traveled corridors without a premium bus service. The Proposed Project would provide improved and reliable transit service to meet the mobility needs of residents, employees, and visitors who travel within the corridor. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

77-3 This comment expresses concern that the Proposed Project is being constructed for real estate interests. Land use regulations are controlled by each city and Metro cannot change existing zoning. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals included in the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. The Proposed Project would be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

- 77-4 This comment reiterates opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2).

Letter No. 78

Christopher Shelton

- 78-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Broadway from Central Avenue to Eagle Rock Boulevard in Glendale (Route Option E1) due to traffic congestion. CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). Although the effects of a project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.

- 78-2 This comment expresses concerns related to safety and traffic on parallel streets. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. Potential safety impacts associated with geometric design features and incompatible uses are addressed in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, under Impact 3.1-3. As discussed therein, the Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact on safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Regarding increased traffic on parallel streets, the potential for traffic to use alternate streets with this option was analyzed with the regional travel demand model. Results of analysis indicate that the diversion of traffic to parallel streets would be minor, as the parallel streets are not continuous and would not provide time savings for motorists. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

- 78-3 This comment requests a station at the Harvey/Broadway intersection allowing the bus to access SR-134 and connect to DASH Lines should the Proposed Project proceed with (Route Option E1). However, there is no suitable station location to accommodate this operating scenario.
- 78-4 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) due to safety and business impacts. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The

Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Refer to the Response to Comment 72-2 related to safety.

Regarding business impacts, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

- 78-5 This comment provides various suggestions to improve travel times on SR-134 and transit connections. These suggestions are acknowledged by Metro.
- 78-6 This comment questions the ridership estimates shown in the Draft EIR. Transit ridership was established through a forecasting analysis utilizing Metro's Corridors Based Model 18 to estimate ridership. The model was developed by Metro and calibrated for the Proposed Project. The model considers current travel patterns and applies future transit service changes to the network resulting from the Proposed Project to forecast trips by mode and estimate boardings.
- 78-7 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). Refer to Response to Comment 72-4.

Letter No. 79

Claire Bowin

- 79-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock Boulevard (Route Option F2) due to the side-running option providing a safer and more comfortable rider experience. The comment expresses opposition to the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project

Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

- 79-2 This comment suggests including transit stations at both Townsend Avenue and Figueroa Street. A station is currently proposed at Townsend Avenue for the refined Proposed Project. A station was proposed at Figueroa Street for Route Option F3, however, based on public input on the Proposed Project, Route Option F3 has been eliminated from further consideration. The refined Proposed Project no longer includes a station at Figueroa Street.

Letter No. 80

Coco Bunny

- 80-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) due to traffic congestion, business impacts, ridership, and cost.). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the refined Proposed Project route eliminated Route Options F2 and F3 from further consideration. The Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard based on a refinement of Route Option F1. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding traffic congestion and business impacts, CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service) in the Draft EIR. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Regarding ridership, the Proposed Project is forecast to attract 34,950 boardings in 2042. This ridership volume supports regional BRT service and would be greater than the ridership on existing local service.

CEQA does not require an EIR to include information regarding a proposed project's cost. Metro notes, however, the Proposed Project is funded by Measure M and Senate Bill 1, which provide a total of \$317 million in funding. The results of the conceptual capital cost estimates for the Proposed Project indicate a range between approximately \$263 million and \$386 million. The estimated annual cost of operating and maintaining the Proposed Project's BRT service ranges from \$16.6 million to \$18.5 million.

- 80-2 This comment expresses opposition to altering the medians and associated trees on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Visual impacts to existing medians and vegetation on Colorado Boulevard are discussed in section 3.2, Aesthetics. As discussed therein, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to cause a significant impact to visual resources. There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Letter No. 81

Corey Barnes

- 81-1 This comment provides route suggestions not studied in the Draft EIR. Refer to Section 2.2, Project History, of the Chapter 2, Project Description for a detailed discussion of the selection of routes assessed in the Draft EIR. Section 2.2 also discusses routes eliminated from further consideration by Metro. The comment also indicates a preference for center-running bus lanes versus curb and side-running configurations, including replacement of the median along Glenoaks Boulevard with a center-running option. Regarding enforcement of bus lane restrictions, Metro would coordinate with the City and local police service agencies to develop appropriate enforcement strategies.
- 81-2 This comment states that the commenter is likely to use the BRT service.
- 81-3 The dedicated bus lanes will be available to transit operators other than Metro.
- 81-4 This comment expresses support for modifying the median on Glenoaks Boulevard to support a center-running treatment.

- 81-5 Refer to Project Description in the Final EIR for the refined design, including transitions between dedicated bus lanes and mixed-traffic operations.
- 81-6 This comment expresses support for maintaining bicycle lanes on Central Avenue in Glendale, center-running treatment on Broadway in Glendale, and center-running treatment in Eagle Rock.
- 81-7 This comment expresses concerns related to BRT operations on SR-134 due to congestion. CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service) in the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 82

Cyndi Otteson

- 82-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the refined Proposed Project route eliminated Route Options F2 and F3 from further consideration. The Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard based on a refinement of Route Option F1. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 83

Dan Bednarski

- 83-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project (Route Options E1 and F1), but opposition to BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 84

Dan Fineman

- 84-1 Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 85

Dan Huynh

- 85-1 This comment expresses appreciation for the extended comment period.

- 85-2 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 85-3 This comment expresses the desire for well-lit streets and stops and local bus service for first mile/last mile connections. BRT system riders would be subject to Metro guidelines and requirements pertaining to safety and crime prevention and all Metro facilities (e.g., bus stops and stations) would be designed in accordance with Metro Design Criteria including Fire/Life Safety Design Criteria including security lighting. Regarding local bus service for first mile/last mile connections, Metro First/Last Mile Policy (Motion 14.1) (May 2016) calls for the integration of first/last mile planning and delivery integration with new transit capital projects. First/last mile improvements for transit stations are generally focused on walk and bike access and safety and defined through a station-location specific planning process. The process for integrating first/last mile with this project along with other Bus Rapid Transit corridors will be defined in pending First/Last Mile Program Guidelines to be completed by early 2021 (Draft EIR Appendix B Transportation Technical Report Section 3.3.2).
- 85-4 This comment expresses support for separate bus and bicycle lanes on Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock.
- 85-5 This comment suggests a Colorado Blvd/ Union Street couplet in Pasadena, which is no longer being considered by Metro.
- 85-6 This comment suggests a stop light at Hill and Union Streets in Pasadena. This is no longer relevant as Route Option H2 is no longer under consideration.

Letter No. 86

Daniel and Richard Walker

- 86-1 This comment expresses support for the development of the Proposed Project's route along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock, but skepticism towards the Proposed Project's efficiency. The comment recognizes the Proposed Project's competing goals of efficiency and faster commute times, and usefulness and accessibility. It states that there are too many closely-spaced stations in Glendale and Burbank. Additionally, the comment states that the Proposed Project must significantly improve average route speed to justify the cost. Appendix A, Alternatives Analysis, included in the Draft EIR, determined that alternatives with more stations attracted higher ridership despite slower travel times.

Direct connections to Occidental College, Glendale Community College, and Glendale Metrolink Station are not being considered as part of the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 87

Daniel Goldwasser

- 87-1 This comment expresses concern related to the cost and benefit of the Proposed Project. CEQA does not require an EIR to include information regarding a proposed project's cost. To clarify, however, Metro notes that the Proposed Project is forecast to attract 34,950 boardings per day in 2042, not annually. The results of the conceptual capital cost estimates for the Proposed Project indicate a range between approximately \$263 million and \$386 million; capital costs are contingent on the level of estimating detail, which would increase in refinement as the Project design and engineering advances. Operations and Maintenance costs, estimated as ranging from \$16.6 million to \$18.5 million, represent the sum of the annual total of costs directly related to the provision of transit service (e.g., bus operators and mechanics), and an allocation of administrative functions to each mode of service that is related to the provision of transit service (e.g., customer service, finance and accounting).

Metro anticipates that regional ridership will return to a pre-COVID level prior to the Proposed Project opening date of 2024. Please note that many commuters are not able to work remotely due to job requirements (e.g., essential workers).

Letter No. 88

Daniel Hawkins

- 88-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the refined Proposed Project route eliminated Route Options F2 and F3 from further consideration. The Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard based on a refinement of Route Option F1. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro disagrees with the assertion that the ridership data suggests that the BRT will not make a meaningful impact on traffic reduction. As discussed in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would reduce regional daily vehicle miles traveled by 86,659 compared to the baseline condition.

- 88-2 This comment expresses opposition to the removal of median trees and greenspace to support the Proposed Project. There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within

the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

- 88-3 This comment questions the need for the Proposed Project. The North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor was identified by Metro's 2013 Countywide Bus Rapid Transit and Street Design Improvement Study as one of the region's most heavily traveled corridors without a premium bus service. The Proposed Project would provide improved and reliable transit service to meet the mobility needs of residents, employees, and visitors who travel within the corridor. Although CEQA does not require an EIR to discuss Project costs, to clarify, Metro notes that the City is not paying for the Proposed Project through transportation funds. The Project is funded by Measure M, which was approved in a countywide vote, and Senate Bill 1, which provide a total of \$317 million in funding. The results of the conceptual capital cost estimates for the Proposed Project indicate a range between approximately \$263 million and \$386 million. The estimated annual cost of operating and maintaining the Proposed Project's BRT service ranges from \$16.6 million to \$18.5 million.
- 88-4 This comment states that the Proposed Project, if it moved forward, should use SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro.
- 88-5 The Proposed Project is a regional transit project designed to appeal not only to riders in Eagle Rock but to transit users in surrounding communities.

Letter No. 89

Darlene Gonzalez-Szabo

- 89-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, and for utilizing Colorado Blvd in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. Sidewalk width would typically exceed 10 feet and in no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation

would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic and, where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would generally enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 90

Darren Hall

- 90-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's two design options on Colorado Boulevard incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard concept's designs by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the Project design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 91

David Dellinger

- 91-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's two design options on Colorado Boulevard incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard concept's designs by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the Project design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 92

David Dellinger

- 92-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 93

David Freeland

- 93-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concepts by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, although not within the Eagle Rock segment of the Project, sidewalks may require an approximate 1 to 2 foot reduction in width to accommodate station platforms and/or widening of the roadway to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; however, the remaining sidewalk width would typically exceed 10 feet and in no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 94

David Greene

- 94-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro

Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 95

David Ingber

- 95-1 This comment expresses concerns related to increased traffic on Yosemite Drive due to removing mixed-flow traffic lanes on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock.

The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway system and not to local streets such as Yosemite Drive. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro.

Letter No. 96

David Levine

- 96-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 97

David Levine

- 97-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concepts by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a

result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, although not within the Eagle Rock segment of the Project, sidewalks may require an approximate 1 to 2 foot reduction in width to accommodate station platforms and/or widening of the roadway to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; however, the remaining sidewalk width would typically exceed 10 feet and in no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 98

David Matsu

- 98-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR.

Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 99

David Moran

- 99-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado St in Glendale (Route Option E2), Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and the Green Street/Union Street couplet in Pasadena (Route Option H2). The refined Proposed Project would maintain operations on Broadway in Glendale (Route Option E1) and Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena (Route Option H1). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options for Route Option F1 on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 99-2 This comment makes suggestions for creating both a local and rapid bus service along the corridor as well as connecting the Proposed Project to the Metro G Line (Orange) and the future North San Fernando Valley BRT Project. The Proposed Project would provide connection to the existing Metro B/G Line (Red/Orange) North Hollywood Station, which would also connect to the future North San Fernando Valley BRT Project.

Letter No. 100

David Newman

- 100-1 This comment expresses opposition to removing a mixed-flow traffic lane on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock due to traffic congestion. The comment also expresses opposition to prioritizing bicycle lanes over traffic lanes on Colorado Boulevard due to Hill Street and Yosemite Street being better options for bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 101

David Newman

- 101-1 This comment expresses support for a direct connection to the Burbank Airport, which is not part of the Proposed Project. The comment indicates opposition to removal of travel lanes along Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock. After consideration of

public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 102

Dawn Kukla (Dorinda)

- 102-1 The Notice of Preparation (NOP) provided notice to all responsible agencies (including the four cities along the corridor and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and members of the public, to transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 60 days of receipt of the NOP from the lead agency. In response, Caltrans submitted a letter dated July 17, 2019, with comments to consider during preparation of the Draft EIR. In addition, Caltrans staff attended local agency stakeholder meetings hosted by Metro. The Proposed Project would primarily be street-running and not result in any physical improvements to the SR-134. The BRT would operate in the right-lane of the freeway for very short segments to get from North Hollywood to Burbank and again from Eagle Rock to Pasadena. Please refer to Comment Letter No. 1 from Caltrans District 7 for additional details.

Letter No. 103

Debra Gerod

- 103-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). The comment also supports widening sidewalks along Colorado Boulevard. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and

effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes. " As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project to businesses throughout the Project area. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 104

Desiree Portillo Rabinov

- 104-1 This comment expresses support for the Route Option E1 in Glendale and support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 105

Dessa Kaye

- 105-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, with a preference for the Green/Union Route Option (Route Option H2) in Pasadena. After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board selected Route Option H1 in Pasadena. The comment agrees that the Proposed Project would increase the accessibility, usefulness, and efficiency for all passengers, but especially elderly and disabled passengers.

Letter No. 106

Dexter Chan

- 106-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The comment states that the Proposed Project would create more congestion, pollution and accidents. Regarding traffic congestion, although the effects of the project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Regarding pollution, refer to page 3.3-2 of the Draft EIR for the analysis demonstrating that changes to traffic would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Regarding accidents, buses would follow posted speed limits and would obey traffic laws in a similar manner as automobiles. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042. The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard.

The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

Letter No. 107

Diane Louise

- 107-1 This comment expresses opposition to a designated bus lane on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) but support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the refined Proposed Project route eliminated Route Options F2 and F3 from further consideration. The Final EIR includes two design

options on Colorado Boulevard based on a refinement of Route Option F1. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). Although the effects of the project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.

Regarding business and the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Letter No. 108

Donald Sweetnam

- 108-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Street in Glendale (Route Option E2) and Colorado Boulevard Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2), and the Green Street/Union Street route option in Pasadena (Route Option H2). After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board selected Route Options E1, F1, and H1 for further consideration in this Final EIR. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 109

Donovan Daughtry

- 109-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 110

Duncan Sinclair

- 110-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.
- 110-2 A Proposed Project station adjacent to the Metro L (Gold) Line Lake Avenue Station is not being considered at this time; however, the Proposed Project would provide a station along Raymond Avenue at Holly Street about 300 feet from the Metro L (Gold) Line Memorial Park Station.
- 110-3 The comment also expresses support for designing the BRT to reduce the trip duration. The Proposed Project includes dedicated bus lanes, transit signal priority, and other features to facilitate efficient bus movement.

Letter No. 111

Dustin Perkins

- 111-1 This comment expresses support for preserving bicycle lanes on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR. Regarding whether bikes are allowed to access bus lanes, bikes would legally be able to use the bus lanes throughout the Proposed Project route. However, it is not necessary to mark the bus lanes to indicate that bicycle access is permissible.
- 111-2 This comment expresses concern about route travel times. Along with dedicated bus lanes, the Proposed Project includes transit signal priority, which expedites buses through signalized intersections and improves transit travel times and travel time reliability. See Section 3.1, Transportation, for further information about the Proposed Project's benefits to ridership. With these improvements, it is estimated that the projected end-to-end travel time from the North Hollywood terminus to the Pasadena terminus will be approximately one hour, with an average operating speed of about 17 mph, which includes time for boarding and alighting at the transit stations. The anticipated average speed along the route is substantially faster than typical Metro buses operating on surface streets in lanes shared with vehicular traffic. Although the specific travel time savings due to implementation of bus lanes through Eagle Rock has not been evaluated, each segment where bus lanes are present contributes to the overall reduction in travel time.
- 111-3 This comment expresses concern with the design in Eagle Rock as it was proposed in the Draft EIR. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 112

Edward Frontenac

- 112-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 113

Elise Kalfayan

- 113-1 This comment expresses support for the Route Option E1 in Glendale and support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options

on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 114

Elizabeth Vitanza

- 114-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 115

Ellen Stern

- 115-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Buses would also follow posted speed limits and would obey traffic laws in a similar manner as automobiles. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for information related to design refinements in Eagle Rock associated with the Proposed Project including bicycle lanes.

Letter No. 116

Elliot M. Smith

- 116-1 The following response was provided to the commentor during the meeting: Thank you for your interest in the NoHo to Pasadena Transit Corridor Project. You can view the configuration options on our Source Post at: <https://thesource.metro.net/>

2020/11/13/public-comment-period-on-noho-to-pasadena-bus-rapid-transit-project-open-through-dec-10-virtual-meeting-this-saturday/.

Refer to Table ES-1 in the Executive Summary Chapter of the Final EIR for potential treatments on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Route Option F1 of the refined Proposed Project includes two potential design options. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 117

Emma Huang

- 117-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock with protections for bicycle lanes (Route Option F1) and opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). The comment also expresses support for the median-running bus lanes treatment and preserving bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Furthermore, the refined Project route eliminated Route Option F3 from further consideration. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 118

Erika Foy

- 118-1 This comment requests traffic data used to prepare the Draft EIR. Please note that CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). The CEQA transportation impact analysis considers vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which are computed at a regional level. The following response was provided:

Hello Ms. Foy,

Thank you for your interest in the NoHo to Pasadena BRT Project!

Appendix B of the Draft EIR is our Transportation Technical Report. This is where you will find the detailed technical analysis for our project related to transportation impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act. It can be found at this link:

http://media.metro.net/2020/NoHo-to-Pas-DEIR-Appendix+B_Transportation-Technical-Report.pdf.

Regarding traffic impacts specifically in the Pasadena area, this BRT project will not be including any bus lanes within the City of Pasadena. Therefore, traffic operations within Pasadena are anticipated to remain unchanged as a result of this project.

Thank you again,
Gary Byrne
Deputy Project Manager

Letter No. 119

Esther Soliman

- 119-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and supports the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 120

Evan Smyth

- 120-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 121

Family Naness

- 121-1 This comment expresses support for the BRT Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Options E3 and F3). The Metro Board selected the E1 Route Option in Glendale. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Furthermore, the refined Project route eliminated Route Option F3 from further consideration. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 122

Felicia Garcia

- 122-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA_5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicles) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 123

Felicia Garcia

- 123-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies

Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 124

Felipe Rojas

- 124-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project in Eagle Rock on Colorado Boulevard but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 125

Foster Wilson

- 125-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project

Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard concept's designs by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the Project design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 126

Fran Blayney

- 126-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating in dedicated bus lanes on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). Comment noted.

Letter No. 127

Frank (Pancho) Jones

- 127-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating in dedicated bus lanes on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). Comment noted.

Letter No. 128

Frank F. Medina

- 128-1 Metro disagrees with the characterization that the Draft EIR was prejudiced for a particular BRT route. The Draft EIR included an equal analysis of the environmental effects associated with each option for consideration by the Metro Board. The Proposed Project includes options for the BRT route and configurations. This was necessary due to public feedback during the completion of the Alternatives Analysis and EIR scoping. It was not possible to reach a consensus on one route preferred by Metro, the cities, stakeholders, and the general public. Metro determined that all stakeholders would be best informed about the Proposed Project by equally evaluating the potential environmental impacts of multiple routes in the four cities.
- 128-2 This comment expresses concern related to impacts to businesses due to reduced parking. Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock. Refer to Master Response No. 2.
- 128-3 The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. Metro does not expect the Proposed Project will generate much cut-through traffic largely because of the lack of time-competitive parallel routes. Some traffic bound to-and-from local destinations may re-route to adapt to the revised median and opportunities for cross-traffic movements and left turns. All Metro BRT buses shall adhere to applicable roadway speed limits and regulations. The Proposed Project includes design elements which would improve safety conditions for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. In no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. The Proposed Project would also include crosswalk improvements designed to enhance pedestrian safety. See Section

3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR for further discussion of project design and safety enhancement features. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details regarding the results of the travel demand model.

- 128-4 Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT on Colorado Boulevard would affect quality of life in Eagle Rock. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR. The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro.

This comment also expresses concern over the conversion of Colorado Boulevard into a transportation corridor. However, the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

- 128-5. This comment expresses support for public transit and for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3), but opposes the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard via street-running configuration in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). Comment noted.

Letter No. 129

Franky Lamouche

- 129-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 130

Gemma Marquez

- 130-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 131

Gene Mazzanti

- 131-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR.

Letter No. 132

George Jamgochian

- 132-1 This comment expresses a ranked preference for the route options in Glendale. The commenter prefers State Route 134 (Route Option E3), followed by Broadway (Route Option E1), followed by Colorado Street (Route Option E2). After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board selected Route Options A1 to B to C to D to E1 to F1 to G1 to H1.

The commenter expresses concern with duplication of service for local Glendale Beeline Bus service. The Proposed Project operates at a regional level, connecting communities within the valleys as well as providing connections to local activity centers within the serviced communities. Where feasible, local bus services, such as the Glendale Beeline, would be allowed to use the bus lanes along those street segments overlapping with the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 133

Glenn Dresch

- 125-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3).

Metro does not have regulatory land use control and thus does not have the authority to change zoning regulations related to density. This authority solely lies with the jurisdictions along the corridor. Regarding zoning, as discussed in Chapter 4.0, Other Environmental Considerations, Section 4.1.4, Land Use and Planning, the Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing

reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. The Proposed Project would be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

Letter No. 134

Glenn Dresch

- 134-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating in dedicated bus lanes on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). Metro values all public comments and considers all comments with equal weight. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 135

Glenn Laird

- 135-1 This comment expresses support for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) and opposes the removal of a mixed-flow traffic lane on Colorado Boulevard. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 136

Grace Peng

- 136-1 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR. This comment expresses opposition to transit operations on highway/freeway facilities due to impacted passenger comfort. The comment also expresses general support for transit and bicycle infrastructure.

Letter No. 137

Grace Ramirez

137-1 This comment does not address the Proposed Project or the contents of the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 138

Hannah Gibson

138-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to removal of bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 139

Hannah Globus

139-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project removing the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 140

Henry Fung

140-1 This comment expresses support for Route Options A2, E1, F1/F2, and H2. The comment also supports center-running dedicated bus lanes and left-side opening doors. After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board selected Route Options A1 to B to C to D to E1 to F1 to G1 to H1. The refined Proposed Project in this Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 141

Howard Naness

- 141-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) due to quality of life, community identity, property values, and safety concerns. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT on Colorado Boulevard would affect quality of life in Eagle Rock. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR. The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro. The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.
- 141-2 Metro disagrees with the characterization that the Draft EIR was prejudiced for a particular BRT route. The Draft EIR included an equal analysis of the environmental effects associated with each route option for consideration by the Metro Board. The Proposed Project includes options for the BRT route and configurations. This approach was necessary due to public feedback during the completion of the Alternatives Analysis and EIR Scoping period. It was not possible to reach a consensus on one route preferred by Metro, the cities, stakeholders, and general public. Metro determined that stakeholders would be best informed about the Proposed Project by equally evaluating the potential environmental impacts of multiple routes in the four cities.
- 141-3 This comment expresses concern related to impacts to businesses due to reduced parking. Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require lead agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, Metro intends to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the

economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT would affect quality of life in Eagle Rock. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR.

- 141-4 Metro does not expect the Proposed Project will generate much cut-through traffic largely because of the lack of time-competitive parallel routes. Some traffic bound to-and-from local destinations may re-route to adapt to the revised median and opportunities for cross-traffic movements and left-turns. All Metro BRT buses shall adhere to applicable roadway speed limits and regulations. The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway system and not to local streets such as Hill Drive or Yosemite Drive. Hill Drive and Yosemite Drive are not continuous for a long enough distance to be a viable alternative to Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. In no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. The Proposed Project would also include crosswalk improvements designed to enhance pedestrian safety. See Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR for further discussion of project design and safety enhancement features.134-5. Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT on Colorado Boulevard would affect quality of life in Eagle Rock. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR. The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro.

This comment also expresses opposition to converting Colorado Boulevard to a transportation corridor. Colorado Boulevard is already a transportation corridor serving automobiles, public transportation, cyclists, and pedestrians. The SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High

Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

- 141-6 This comment expresses support for public transit. The comment expresses support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). For this Final EIR, Route Option F3 has been eliminated from consideration.

Letter No. 142

Ignacio Piña

- 142-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project. The comment further states that Pasadena opposes the Proposed Project and the Eagle Rock community has been pushing the BRT away from Colorado Boulevard and onto SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 142-2 Metro complied with public meeting requirements consistent with the CEQA Guidelines. Public meetings related to the Draft EIR were held on November 12th and November 14th. The links for the meetings were posted on the Proposed Project website, newspaper ads, Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, and emailed to those that requested to be on the Project email list. In-person meetings during the Draft EIR review period were not legal under County of Los Angeles safety rules. Regarding outreach, to encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period and Draft EIR review period, legal advertisement notices were published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) noticing and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts. The hearings also provided simultaneous Spanish translation, and previous meetings for the Proposed Project included live Spanish and Armenian translators.
- 142-3 This comment questions the ridership estimates shown in the Draft EIR. Transit ridership was established through a forecasting analysis utilizing Metro's Corridors Based Model 18 to estimate ridership. The model was developed by Metro and calibrated for the Proposed Project. The model considers current travel patterns and applies future transit service changes to the network resulting from the Proposed

Project to forecast trips by mode and estimate boardings. Furthermore, Metro anticipates that regional ridership will return to pre-COVID levels prior to the Proposed Project opening date of 2024 and social distance requirements will be similar to pre-pandemic. Please note that many commuters are not able to work remotely due to job requirements (e.g., essential services).

142-4 This comment opposes a lane reduction on Colorado Boulevard.

142-5 A detailed energy analysis was provided in Section 3.6, Energy Resources, of the Draft EIR. Electricity to charge buses would potentially be provided by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), Southern California Edison (SCE), or Pasadena Water and Power (PWP). These utilities receive electricity from various power sources. Although the Proposed Project would traverse local utility jurisdictions of Burbank Water and Power, Glendale Water and Power, and PWP, it is assumed that the Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) buses would primarily utilize Metro facilities within the City of Los Angeles for recharging and maintenance. Additional charging may be supplemented at the North Hollywood Metro Station (charging infrastructure proposed as part of a separate project), Pasadena City College (power provided by PWP) and/or at the El Monte Maintenance and Storage Facility (provided by SCE). The amount of charging that may occur at Pasadena City College or El Monte Maintenance and Storage Facility is unknown at this time, and the proportion of electricity supplied by PWP or SCE would not change the total expenditure of energy resources associated with Proposed Project operations. Refer to the 2021 Senate Bill 100 Joint Agency Report: Achieving 100 Percent Clean Electricity in California: An Initial Assessment related to how State's electricity system can become carbon free by 2045 (<https://www.energy.ca.gov/news/2021-03/california-releases-report-charting-path-100-percent-clean-electricity>).

142-6 Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible.

142-7 This comment expresses concerns related to traffic on parallel streets. The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway system and not to local streets. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

142-8 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 143

Ikuko Remmenga

- 143-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on the SR-134 between North Hollywood and Burbank and expresses a preference for a route alignment along Magnolia Boulevard. Magnolia Boulevard was evaluated in the Alternatives Analysis and was not carried forward due to inadequate width to host bus lanes. The curb-to-curb width on Magnolia Boulevard west of Clybourn Avenue drops from 68 to 60 feet and there is only room for a single eastbound through lane.

Letter No. 144

Israel Jacquez

- 144-1 This comment expresses support for center- and median-running treatments and opposition to the Proposed Project operating in mixed-flow lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. The preferences identified by the comment are noted.

Letter No. 145

J. Donnelly

- 145-1 This comment expresses preference for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 146

Jake Harrison

- 146-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project on Colorado Boulevard, but opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 147

James Henschell

- 147-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) due to traffic concerns. CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). Although the effects of a project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.

Letter No. 148

James Ortiz

- 148-1 This comment expresses opposition to having one mixed-flow travel lane in Eagle Rock due to congestion. Although the effects of the project on traffic congestion is no longer considered under the CEQA guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to define improvements to address traffic congestion. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042. Regarding concerns for traffic spillover onto parallel streets, traffic analyses conducted for the Proposed Project indicate that the dedicated bus lanes would not result in widespread queueing at intersections or degradation in traffic flow.

Metro does not have regulatory land use control and thus does not have the authority to change zoning regulations related to density. This authority solely lies with the jurisdictions along the corridor. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, developing compact pedestrian-oriented, and mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. The Proposed Project would be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

Letter No. 149

James Panozzo

- 149-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 150

Jane Demian

- 150-1 This comment expresses general support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. The comment also expresses opposition to removing bicycle lanes, eliminating medians, and states uncertainty with removing a mixed-flow travel lane.
- 150-2 The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project

Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits, obey traffic laws in a similar manner as automobiles, and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

- 150-3 Refer to Master Response No. 1 for details related to incorporating components of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept into the Proposed Project. There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Letter No. 151

Jane Demian

- 151-1 This comment expresses opposition to removing a traffic lane on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock due to added traffic on parallel streets. The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway system and not to local streets such as Hill Drive or Yosemite Drive. Hill Drive and Yosemite Drive are not continuous for a long enough distance to be a viable alternative to Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.
- 151-2 This comment expresses preference for using medians for stations and passenger loading. It also expresses support for parking protected bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to

Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

- 151-3 This comment requests flashing lights to improve pedestrian safety. The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.
- 151-4 This comment requests that left turns be preserved for westbound traffic at Eagle Rock and Colorado Boulevards. The Proposed Project will retain westbound left turns at the intersection of Eagle Rock and Colorado Boulevard.

Letter No. 152

Jane Tsong

- 152-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project (Route Option F2) but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes, curb extensions, and trees along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained.

There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro will replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Letter No. 153

Janet Cappellanti-Adams

- 153-1 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 154

Janet Cappellanti-Adams

154-1 The following response was provided during the meeting. “Thank you for your feedback regarding the project virtual platform. We have checked the site and it is now working. Please visit nohopasbrt.com again to participate in the virtual platform.”

Letter No. 155

Janet Cappellanti-Adams

155-1 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 156

Janet Diel

156-1 This comment expresses concerns related to accessibility of the Proposed Project for all riders, especially those with disabilities. Metro BRT stations are designed to create a comfortable and safe environment for passengers, fulfilling both a functional and aesthetic need. The stations are distinguishable from competing street elements, yet complementary to the surrounding environments. Station amenities associated with the Proposed Project would be designed using a kit of parts approach, similar to Metro rail stations. The kit of parts approach is under development by Metro, although station elements as described below would be utilized to establish a minimum requirement or baseline of amenities for platforms. At locations with higher ridership or where space allows, additional enhanced amenities would be provided to support the Proposed Project. Station siting would allow for safe and accessible paths of travel for transit riders including those accessing stations on foot, bike and other rolling modes.

Metro strives to ensure that its services (including over 200 bus and rail routes) are fully accessible to all of our customers, including those with disabilities. The Accessibility team, within the Office of Civil Rights & Inclusion, works to ensure agency/systemwide compliance with federal ADA, Code of Federal Regulations Part 49 requirements, California Code of Regulation Title 24 Accessibility regulations, municipal regulations and Metro policies regarding accessibility for customers with disabilities. The Accessibility team is committed to going above and beyond by working to ensure that all vehicles, facilities, programs and services are not only compliant, but useable for Metro customers with disabilities. Metro strives to go above and beyond the minimum requirements and adopts future proofed solutions. Major initiatives include:

- Metro BRT Facilities Design Criteria;
- Reconfiguration of transit vehicle accessibility areas;
- Proof of concept testing for new and innovative digital solutions;

- ADA tactile guidance pathways (designed to assist blind/visually impaired customers and other customers while navigating Metro stations); and
 - Hands-free access to Metro station crossings, elevators, and customer information/assistance.
- 156-2 Bicycle amenities are being considered for stations but have not been finalized at this stage of conceptual design.
- 156-3 Regarding ADA access for entering and exiting buses, BRT buses will have similar design characteristics to those featured on existing buses in Metro's fleet, all of which meet or exceed ADA requirements. In addition, buses are planned to include the following ADA enhancements:
- Split Flip Seats to allow for space for walkers;
 - Variable Slope Wheelchair Ramp that provides a continuous slope for customer access;
 - Signage designating Reserved Seating in secure areas for wheelchairs/mobility scooters;
 - Signage designating Priority Seating for seniors and people with disabilities and caregivers/companions traveling with them; and
 - Tactile (e.g., Knurled) Stanchions to help blind/visually impaired customers identify the Priority Seating.
- 156-4 Regarding lighting, BRT stations will be designed with lighting for safety and security in accordance with Metro guidelines and in coordination with each local jurisdiction. Design of each BRT station and development of operating plans would be coordinated with each local jurisdiction to ensure adequate emergency access and safety design.
- 156-5 Refer to Response to Comment 156-1 related to station amenities.
- 156-6 Regarding fees for low income riders, as with other Metro lines, Metro will promote the Low Income Fare is Easy (LIFE) program, which provides assistance for low-income individuals that may be used to obtain transportation subsidies or free regional ride options. Seniors 62 years of age and older, and people with disabilities may receive up to 80 percent off regular Metro fares.
- 156-7 This comment reiterates the importance of considering the needs of height, visual, hearing, and mobility impaired patrons. Comment noted.

Letter No. 157

Janet Waldron

- 157-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project, in particular in Pasadena, due to safety and traffic concerns. The comment expresses support for using the 210 Freeway. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT

system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits, would obey traffic laws in a similar manner as automobiles, and Metro drivers will receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, along with signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Letter No. 158

Janette Gembitz

- 158-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 159

Jean Leland

- 159-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). The comment expresses a secondary preference for shared bus/bike lanes (Route Option F2) or mixed-flow operation if a route is chosen on Colorado Boulevard. The comment also expresses opposition to removing a mixed-flow travel lane for the Proposed Project. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require lead agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, Metro intends to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 160

Jean-Marie Martz

- 160-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and

further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR.

The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway system and not to local streets, as the local streets are not continuous for a long enough distance to be a viable alternative to Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

Letter No. 161

Jeff Cannon

- 161-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard concept's designs by providing a new protected bicycle facility that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. The Proposed Project would provide improvements to the bicycle network by providing a parking-protected bicycle facility consistent with Mobility Plan Policy 2.6. Similarly, the proposed bicycle improvements along with proposed improvements to the transit network associated with the Proposed Project would be consistent with Mobility Plan Policy 2.9 which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, of this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk

in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 162

Jeff Pott

- 162-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project to businesses throughout the Project area.

Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require lead agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

Letter No. 163

Jennifer Nelson

- 163-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro

Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concept by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, although not within the Eagle Rock segment of the Project, sidewalks may require an approximate 1 to 2 foot reduction in width to accommodate station platforms and/or widening of the roadway to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; however, the remaining sidewalk width would typically exceed 10 feet and in no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 164

Jenny Morataya

- 164-1 This comment expresses support for maintaining existing bicycle lanes and for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The refined Proposed Project incorporates the Beautiful Boulevard concept's designs by providing a new protected bicycle facility that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed

bicycle facility. The Proposed Project would provide improvements to the bicycle network by providing a parking-protected bicycle facility consistent with Mobility Plan Policy 2.6. Similarly, the proposed bicycle improvements along with proposed improvements to the transit network associated with the Proposed Project would be consistent with Mobility Plan Policy 2.9 which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 165

Jesse Silva

- 165-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 166

Joe Masiero

- 166-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating in Burbank. The comment supports a curb-running alignment and the optional station at Olive Avenue and Verdugo Avenue. The Proposed Project has been further refined in Burbank as described in Chapter 2, Project Description of the Final EIR. As described, The BRT route accesses Olive Avenue via the Pass Avenue exit from eastbound SR-134 and returns to SR-134 via Hollywood Way, with a pair of stations in the Riverside Drive/Hollywood Way/Olive Avenue triangle in the Media District. Curb-running bus lanes would be provided by removing some on-street parking along Riverside Drive east of Kenwood Street and along Olive Avenue approaching Alameda Avenue. The route turns from Olive Avenue to Alameda Avenue and proceeds to Buena Vista Street

along Alameda Avenue in mixed-flow operations approaching a station near Naomi Street. Dedicated bus lanes would be provided in the curb lane on Alameda Avenue in the block of the station. The route then returns to Olive Avenue via Buena Vista Street, with dedicated bus lanes on Buena Vista Street in the northbound direction approaching Olive Avenue and in the southbound direction approaching Alameda Avenue. Between Buena Vista Street and Downtown Burbank, Olive Avenue would be reconfigured to provide dedicated side-running bus lanes accomplished by conversion of the outside travel lane. Mixed-flow BRT operations would occur at constrained locations including across the Olive Avenue bridge. The Olive Avenue/Verdugo Avenue station is no longer an optional station and has been included in the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 167

Joey Hernandez

- 167-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the Proposed Project operating on SR 134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 168

John Colter

- 168-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project (Route Option F2) but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes, curb extensions, and trees along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

There is potential for the Proposed Project to remove trees and vegetation within the City of Los Angeles. Trees that could be removed within the City of Los Angeles are non-native and are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-

of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Letter No. 169

John Kerr

- 169-1 After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the revised design is consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 170

John Perry

- 170-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 171

John Schulhof

- 171-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concept by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, although not within the Eagle Rock segment of the Project, sidewalks may require an approximate 1 to 2 foot reduction in width to accommodate station platforms and/or widening of the roadway to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; however, the remaining sidewalk width would typically exceed 10 feet and in no instances would

sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 172

John Squire

- 172-1 Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and motor vehicles) when designing a complete street that includes multiple transportation modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 173

Jon Ingalls

- 173-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project (Route Option F2) but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes and trees along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of

the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Letter No. 174

Jon Natchez

- 174-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project removing the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 175

Jonah Paten

- 175-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock with a median-running treatment (Route Option F1). However, the comment also expresses opposition to the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) and to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes and trees along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 175-2 Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Letter No. 176

Jonathan Raspa

- 176-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle

lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 177

Josh Fruhlinger

- 177-1 This comment expresses support for providing a close connection between the BRT service and the Metro L (Gold) Line in Pasadena. The Proposed Project would provide a station along Raymond Avenue at Holly Street about 300 feet from the Metro L (Gold) Line station at Memorial Park.

Letter No. 178

Josh Saunders

- 178-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 179

Jovita D. Molina

- 179-1 This comment expresses support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) and opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2).

After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Section 3.3, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR includes a detailed air pollution analysis. As stated on page 3.3-23, the Proposed Project would not expose people to substantial pollutant concentrations. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.

Letter No. 180

Juanita Davis

- 180-1 This Proposed Project is in the planning and environmental review phase. The Metro contact during this phase of the Proposed Project is:

Scott Hartwell, Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop: 99-22-6
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Email: nohopasbrt@metro.net

Letter No. 181

Julian Hanes

- 181-1 This comment expresses concern with the Draft EIR Concept Plans, specifically the planned routing of buses between the intersection of Olive Avenue/Lima Street and the on/off ramps for SR-134. Many of the signalized intersections through which the BRT service would operate in the referenced segment would include dedicated bus lanes to allow the BRT line to bypass congestion.
- 181-2 This comment describes the density of intersections within the referenced segment and expresses concern over the level of traffic buses would endure in mixed-flow traffic. Many of the signalized intersections through which the BRT service would operate in the referenced segment would include dedicated bus lanes to allow the BRT line to bypass congestion.

- 181-3 This comment recommends building dedicated grade separated bus-only entrance and exit ramps to and from SR-134. Construction of new grade-separated facilities is not being considered for the Proposed Project at this time.
- 181-4 This comment indicates an understanding that grade separations are not being considered as part of the Proposed Project. Additionally, it expresses concern that without a grade separation for the Proposed Project at the referenced location, the branding of the Proposed Project as premium transit service would be compromised. The Proposed Project would be a premium transit service due to the installation of dedicated bus lanes as referenced in preceding responses.

Letter No. 182

Justin Bensen

- 182-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 183

K Fanslow

- 183-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard (Route Options F1). It also expresses opposition to a shared bus and bicycle lane (Route Option F2) and opposition to the Proposed Project operating on the SR-134 (Route Option F3). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 184

Karen Jaques

- 184-1 Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use

neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

- 184-2 This comment expresses a preference for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) through Eagle Rock, followed by Route Option F2. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 185

Karen Suarez

- 185-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) due to additional pollution, loss of parking, and increased traffic on parallel streets. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Draft EIR includes a detailed analysis of construction and operational pollutant emissions. As shown in Section 3.3, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would not result in significant air quality impacts. Regarding operations, implementation of BRT service in this corridor would also reduce emissions emitted by the overall vehicle fleet traveling within the study area, as mode share shifts away from auto use to public transit. In operational year 2042, BRT service would reduce 30,070,673 VMT annually as compared to conditions without BRT service), a 0.017 percent reduction in VMT that would result in concomitant reductions in start, hot soak, and running emissions from the vehicle fleet. The Proposed Project would result in a net decrease of all criteria pollutants except PM₁₀. Daily PM₁₀ emissions would slightly increase as a result of operations, however emissions would remain significantly lower than the SCAQMD's thresholds.

The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway

system and not to local streets, as the local streets are not continuous for a long enough distance to be a viable alternative to Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

Letter No. 186

Kate Eberle

- 186-1 This comment expresses support for the Route Option E1 in Glendale and support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. The Metro Board selected Route Option E1 in Glendale to carry forward for further evaluation in the Final EIR. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 187

Kate Grodd

- 187-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard design concept in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 188

Kathleen Aberman

- 188-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3) and opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 189

Kathleen Dunleavy

- 189-1 This comment expresses support for shared bus and bicycle lanes on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 189-2 Refer to Section 2.2, Project History, for a detailed discussion on the selection of routes assessed in the Draft EIR as well as a discussion of the routes eliminated from further consideration by Metro.
- 189-3 CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). Although the effects of a project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.
- 189-4 Please direct comments for ERNC and TERA to those community groups.

Letter No. 190

Keegan Hartman

- 190-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular Route Option A1 in North Hollywood, Route Option H1 in Pasadena, and Route Options F1/F2 in Eagle Rock. This comment also expresses opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board selected Route Options A1 to B to C to D to E1 to F1 to G1 to H1. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 191

Kelly Thompson

- 191-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 192

Ken Levy

- 192-1 This comment expresses opposition to removing a mixed-flow traffic lane on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock due to traffic congestion. CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). Although the effects of a project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.
- 192-2 This comment expresses support for the No Project Alternative.

Letter No. 193

Ken Perry

- 193-1 This comment questions the need for the Proposed Project. As discussed in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor was identified by Metro's 2013 Countywide Bus Rapid Transit and Street Design Improvement Study as one of the region's most heavily traveled corridors without a premium bus service or other high quality transit option. Further, the Alternatives Analysis prepared for the project, provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, includes a detailed analysis that discusses connectivity to the regional transit network, connectivity to major activity centers in the region, and socioeconomic/demographic factors benefited by the Proposed Project.

Furthermore, in addition to advancing the goals of Metro's Vision 2028 Strategic Plan, objectives of the Proposed Project include:

- Advance a premium transit service that is more competitive with auto travel;
- Improve accessibility for disadvantaged communities;
- Improve transit access to major activity and employment centers;
- Enhance connectivity to Metro and other regional transit services;
- Provide improved passenger comfort and convenience; and
- Support community plans and transit-oriented community goals.

- 193-2 This comment poses a number of questions related to general opposition to the Proposed Project. The implementation of dedicated bus lanes would promote increased ridership by providing faster and more frequent service with increased opportunity for ridership.

Regarding traffic, CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). Regarding traffic shifting onto adjacent streets, the Proposed Project would not eliminate any travel lanes in Pasadena and would have negligible effects to traffic.

Regarding duplicate bus routes, the Line 501 is an express line, which differs from a BRT line. These differences for a BRT line can include dedicated bus lanes and signal priority, enhanced stations (not typical bus stops) with lighting and amenities, stations spaced every half-mile to a mile apart, branded buses, and frequent headways. The existing Metro Line 501 maintains connection between the North Hollywood Station and Pasadena under the Nextgen Bus Plan. NextGen weekday service frequency on Metro Line 501 Line proposed to be every 15 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods, with service every 15-30 minutes in the weekday off-peak periods.

- 193-3 Regarding a business case for the Proposed Project, the Draft EIR assesses the potential effects of the Proposed Project to the existing environment. The Draft EIR is not a vehicle for a cost-benefit analysis of the Proposed Project.

- 193-4 This comment questions why riders would utilize the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is forecast to attract approximately 34,950 boardings per day in 2042. The Proposed Project would provide improved and reliable transit service to meet the mobility needs of residents, employees, and visitors who travel within the corridor.
- 193-5 This comment asks why the Proposed Project would not operate more on SR-134 and why Pasadena has more stops than other cities. The Draft EIR assessed multiple route options located on SR-134 and surface streets. Surface street-running routes typically achieve the highest number of overall benefits, including ridership potential, connectivity, transit-orientated community opportunities, equity, and environmental benefits. The Proposed Project would operate on SR-134 for portions of the route in North Hollywood, Burbank and between Eagle Rock and Pasadena. The remainder of the route would be on surface streets. Regarding the number of stations in Pasadena, station locations were selected based on ridership potential and the desire for safe and accessible paths of travel for transit riders including those accessing stations on foot, bike and other rolling modes. Typically, BRT stations are spaced every ½-mile to one mile as compared to local bus stops which are typically spaced ¼-mile apart or less. There would be four stations in Pasadena compared to five stations in Los Angeles, five stations in Burbank, and eight stations in Glendale.

This comment also asks if Metro assessed improvements to existing bus service. Alternative 2 discussed in DEIR Chapter 6: Alternatives would implement improved bus service instead of BRT. The improved bus service would have some BRT characteristics. The service may be as frequent as that proposed for BRT, although its ability to attract as much ridership may be less due to less travel time savings and amenities, as well as less travel time reliability compared to the Proposed Project. Buses would operate in mixed-flow traffic with Traffic Signal Priority (TSP). Stops would be more frequent than the BRT line, but less frequent than local bus lines (typically every 0.6 miles on average). Travel times would be faster than for local service, but slower than the travel times expected from the BRT Project. Stops would occur at existing bus stations and there would be no modifications to the roadway configuration. Physical improvements would be limited to new signs at bus stops as well as a shelter with solar lighting, a bench, and a trash receptacle, as a minimum level of bus stop amenities. Alternative 2 would not include curb extensions, adjustments to parking, or changes to bicycle lanes. Buses would likely be maintained at existing Metro facilities. Similar to BRT buses, buses would have low-floor design to allow for faster and easier boarding and alighting. The fleet would be equipped for all-door boarding. Alternative 2, along with the Proposed Project, will be considered by the Metro Board prior to approval of the Project.

Regarding the use of “bigger buses”, the current plan for the BRT is to use 40-foot buses. This is a standard bus size currently used by Metro and many other agencies. Based on projected ridership, smaller buses would not have the passenger capacity necessary to meet the expected demand.

- 193-6 A connection to the Hollywood Burbank Airport was studied in the Alternatives Analysis, which is included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. The route was considered along Burbank Boulevard to Hollywood Way to Hollywood Burbank Airport to Interstate 5. Although this route would serve the Hollywood Burbank Airport, this alignment has several deficiencies. Burbank Boulevard in Los Angeles is too narrow to support dedicated BRT lanes. In addition, the Los Angeles segment has industrial and commercial land uses, such as auto body shops that are not anticipated to attract significant ridership. Furthermore, this route would provide out-of-direction travel to the north, would not serve the Burbank Media District or the Burbank Downtown Metrolink Station, and would pass through Downtown Burbank along Interstate 5, which does not provide good connectivity to the downtown area. Access to the Hollywood Burbank Airport is provided by several existing transit routes including Metrolink, Amtrak, Metro Micro, Metro Bus and BurbankBus.

This comment also mischaracterizes the project by claiming that the project would remove travel lanes and reduce sidewalk space in the City of Pasadena. The Proposed Project does not propose any lane removal in the City of Pasadena and would operate in mixed traffic. While proposed stations would be located within the existing sidewalk, there is adequate space throughout the Proposed Project route to accommodate the proposed stations on Colorado Boulevard. The Project has also been designed in coordination with the City of Pasadena and no conflicts with the proposed cycle track along Union Street or the Rose Parade have been identified through that coordination process.

- 193-7 This comment expresses general opposition to the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 194

Kerrin Tso

- 194-1 To encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period, legal advertisement notices were published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. Additionally, 15,000 meeting notices were canvassed to all homes and businesses in the Eagle Rock community during the extended scoping period and to solicit comments on the Draft EIR.

To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English and Spanish) noticing and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts. In response to community interest during the initial 30-day Scoping period, the Scoping period was extended an additional 30 days to allow for additional input and engagement with the community. One additional scoping open

house was added in Eagle Rock to allow for more opportunities to receive comments from the Eagle Rock community.

Metro acknowledges receipt of the Save Eagle Rock Community letter on August 14, 2019. This letter was considered during preparation of the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 195

Kevin

195-1 This comment expressed support for center-running BRT.

Letter No. 196

Kevin Burton

196-1 This comment expresses support for the Route Option E1 in Glendale and support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 197

Kevin Castaing

197-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project. The comment incorrectly states that a travel lane will be removed in Pasadena. The Proposed Project selected by the Metro Board will operate in mixed-flow travel lanes shared with automobiles in Pasadena (Segments G and H). Regarding traffic congestion, CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service) in the Draft EIR. Metro notes, however, that analysis of traffic data collected in Pasadena indicates that the addition of up to approximately six buses per hour in each direction will not materially increase traffic congestion.

Letter No. 198

Kim and Donna Turner

198-1 This comment expresses opposition to removing a mixed-flow traffic lane on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock to support a dedicated bus lane.

After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. The first option maintains the two existing travel lanes in each direction with a dedicated bus lane running down the

center of Colorado Boulevard similar to Route Option F1 described in the Draft EIR. The second option builds upon some of the concepts presented in the Beautiful Boulevard design concept and would reduce the number of travel lanes on Colorado Boulevard to one in each direction. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

- 198-2 Emergency evacuation is addressed in Section 4.1.2, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. As stated therein, the Proposed Project would be constructed along or near several emergency/disaster routes, including the SR-134 Freeway, Colorado Boulevard, Glenoaks Boulevard, Olive Avenue, and Lankershim Boulevard. Los Angeles County and each of the cities affected by the Proposed Project have developed emergency response plans. Temporary lane closures may be required and emergency routes may be temporarily disrupted during construction activities. The Project Area is a fully built roadway network with parallel streets in every direction. Detour routes, of which there are multiple options, would be established in consultation with emergency service providers. Although lane closures are anticipated, full street closures are not anticipated, and roadway access would be maintained to accommodate response to emergencies. Construction activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction activities. After construction, the bus lanes would be open to emergency vehicles, which could improve response plans. During emergencies, the bus-only lanes would be open to all evacuating vehicles. Operational activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- 198-3 Regarding left-turns at Colorado Boulevard and Townsend Avenue, the existing configuration of Colorado Boulevard at Townsend Avenue provides side-by-side left turn lanes along Colorado Boulevard which accommodate turns onto both the north and south legs of Townsend Avenue. The Proposed Project closes the existing eastbound left-turn onto northbound Townsend Avenue, and provides a left-turn pocket to accommodate westbound left-turns onto the south leg of Townsend Avenue.

DASH bus service is operated by the City of Los Angeles. It is a local service that would not meet all Project Objectives listed in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. Project Objectives include enhancing connectivity to Metro and other regional transit services.

- 198-4 This comment notes perceived general opposition to the Proposed Project. Metro has engaged with the Eagle Rock community throughout the project planning and design process to solicit feedback and to build towards a consensus on a design acceptable

to the community and stakeholders. All comments received during public scoping and review of the Draft EIR will be provided to the Metro Board for their consideration prior to approving the Proposed Project. Regarding Project approval and cost, the Project is funded by Measure M, which was approved in a countywide vote, and Senate Bill 1, which provide a total of \$317 million in funding. The results of the conceptual capital cost estimates for the Proposed Project indicate a range between \$263 million and \$386 million. The estimated annual cost of operating and maintaining the Proposed Project's BRT service ranges from \$16.6 million to \$18.5 million.

- 198-5 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 in Eagle Rock (Route Option F3).

Letter No. 199

Kim and Warren Giancaterino

- 199-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 in Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Emergency evacuation is addressed in Section 4.1.2, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. As stated therein, construction of the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to emergency evacuation. Operational activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Letter No. 200

Kim Martellino

- 200-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). If this option is not selected, the comment expresses support for the side-running option on Colorado Boulevard (Route Option F2) as opposed to the center-running option (Route Option F1). The comment opposes removal of parking, trees, medians, or mixed-flow travel lanes. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Refer also to Response 190-1.

Letter No. 201

Kim Martellino

- 201-1 This comment expresses general opposition to center-running bus lanes on Colorado Boulevard (Route Option F1) in Eagle Rock and preference for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3), with a secondary preference for side-running bus lanes on Colorado Boulevard (Route Option F2). The comment identifies several concerns with Route Option F1 including cost, effects on local businesses due to parking loss, and removal of the existing median. The comment also expresses concern related to traffic along Colorado Boulevard during both construction and operation of the Project.

After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. As part of the refined Proposed Project, shared bus and bicycle lanes are no longer proposed in Eagle Rock. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, Metro intends to preserve as much parking as possible along the route. Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and

shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro will replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Letter No. 202

Kim Sheehan

202-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). If this option is not selected, the comment expresses support for the side-running option on Colorado Boulevard (Route Option F2) as opposed to the center-running option (Route Option F1). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 203

Kobra Schabanpour

203-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 204

Kris Kouri

- 204-1 The comment expresses opposition to removal of medians along Colorado Boulevard. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro will replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Letter No. 205

Kristen Gassner

- 205-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3) and opposition to the BRT operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). Between Route Options F1/F2, this comment expresses a preference for Route Option F2. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 205-2 Although the effects of the project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042. Refer to page 3.3-2 of the Draft EIR for the analysis demonstrating that changes to traffic would not result in a significant impact to air quality.

- 205-3 This comment expresses opposition to stations being located in Colorado Boulevard due to construction and traffic effects. Metro standard practice is to coordinate with local jurisdictions to minimize construction effects. In addition, as shown in the Executive Summary, Mitigation Measures **TRA-1** through **TRA-4** are designed to reduce potential for construction activities to effect traffic and transportation. Mitigation Measure **NOI-1** is designed to control construction noise.
- 205-4 Regarding businesses and parking, Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require lead agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking to alleviate effects and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 206

Kristina and Mark McConville

- 206-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the SR-134 Route Option (F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. The refined Project route eliminated Route Option F2 from further consideration. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR.

There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation

and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro will replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Regarding business access, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in the corridor. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 207

Kristina McConville

207-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard (Route Options F1/F2).

After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. The refined Project route eliminated Route Option F2 from further consideration. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR.

The CEQA transportation impact analysis considers vehicle miles traveled, which are computed at a regional level. Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's

social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 208

Kyle Remmenga

- 208-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on the SR-134 between North Hollywood and Burbank and expresses a preference for a route alignment along Magnolia Boulevard. Magnolia Boulevard was evaluated in the Alternatives Analysis and was not carried forward due to a greater likelihood of impacting travel lanes, parking, and sidewalks compared to Olive Avenue. The curb-to-curb width on Magnolia Boulevard west of Clybourn Avenue drops from 68 to 60 feet and there is only room for a single eastbound through lane.

Letter No. 209

Kyle Remmenga

- 209-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). For this Final EIR, Route Option F3 has been eliminated from consideration.

Letter No. 210

Leon Liang

- 210-1 The Proposed Project does not include dedicated bus lanes at freeway on and off-ramps. During the alternatives analysis phase it was determined that very small travel time advantages would be gained by adding HOV by-pass lanes to freeway on-ramps compared to the cost of reconstructing freeway facilities. The Proposed Project includes transit signal priority, which expedites buses through signalized intersections, and improves transit travel times. Transit signal priority is available areawide within several cities, as well as the City of Los Angeles, and is expected to be available in all the affected jurisdictions served by the time the Proposed Project is in service. Potential transit signal priority functions are described below:
- Early Green: When a bus is approaching a red signal, conflicting phases may be terminated early to obtain the green indication for the bus.
 - Extended Green: When a bus is approaching the end of a green signal cycle, the green may be extended to allow bus passage before the green phase terminates.
 - Transit Phase: A dedicated bus-only phase is activated before or after the green for parallel traffic to allow the bus to proceed through the intersection. For example, a queue jump may be implemented in which the bus departs from a dedicated bus lane or a station ahead of other traffic, so the bus can weave across lanes or make a turn.

Letter No. 211

Leslie Lemmon

- 211-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular Route Options E1 and F1/F2. The comment expresses opposition to the freeway-running Route Options E3 and F3. The Metro Board selected the Route Option E1 in Glendale. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 212

Lisa Karahalios

- 212-1 This comment expresses preference for maintaining the median in Eagle Rock along with the mixed-flow traffic lanes. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding business access, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project to businesses throughout the Project area. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

The potential for traffic to use alternate streets with this option was analyzed with the regional travel demand model. Results of analysis indicate that the diversion of traffic to parallel streets would be minor, as the parallel streets are not continuous and would

not provide time savings for motorists. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

Letter No. 213

Lois Kalinsky

213-1 This comment expresses opposition to a travel lane being removed on Olive Avenue.

Letter No. 214

Lorena Alamillo

214-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) due to quality of life, community identity, property values, and safety concerns. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT would affect quality of life in Eagle Rock; no specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR. The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro. The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

214-2 Metro disagrees with the characterization that the Draft EIR was prejudiced for a particular BRT route. The Draft EIR included an equal analysis of the environmental effects associated with each alternative for consideration by the Metro Board. The Proposed Project includes options for the BRT route and configurations. This approach was necessary due to public feedback during the completion of the Alternatives Analysis and EIR Scoping Period. It was not possible to reach a consensus on one route preferred by Metro, the cities, stakeholders, and general public. Metro determined that stakeholders would be best informed about the Proposed Project by equally evaluating the potential environmental impacts of multiple routes in the four cities.

214-3 This comment expresses concern related to impacts to businesses due to reduced parking. Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the

Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT would affect quality of life in Eagle Rock. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR.

- 214-4 Metro does not expect the Proposed Project will generate much cut-through traffic largely because of the lack of time-competitive parallel routes. Some traffic bound to-and-from local destinations may re-route to adapt to the revised median and opportunities for cross-traffic movements and left-turns. All Metro BRT buses shall adhere to applicable roadway speed limits and regulations. The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway system and not to local streets such as Hill Drive or Yosemite Drive. Hill Drive and Yosemite Drive are not continuous for a long enough distance to be a viable alternative to Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. In no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. The Proposed Project would also include crosswalk improvements designed to enhance pedestrian safety. See Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR for further discussion of project

design and safety enhancement features. The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro.

214-5 This comment expresses opposition to converting Colorado Boulevard to a transportation corridor. Colorado Boulevard is already a transportation corridor serving automobiles, public transportation, cyclists, and pedestrians. The SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

214-6 Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT on Colorado Boulevard would affect quality of life in Eagle Rock. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR. The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro.

This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 in Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). For this Final EIR, Route Option F3 has been eliminated from consideration.

Letter No. 215

Iwilson2100

215-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2).

Letter No. 216

Lydia Storie

216-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock and opposition to the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding bus fares, Metro is currently operating the GoPass Fareless Pass pilot program which provides free rides on Metro for low-income riders and K-12 students.

Letter No. 217

Malia Schilling

- 217-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 218

Manijeh Carmichael

- 218-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 in Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project includes three stops in Eagle Rock. They would be located in proximity to Colorado Boulevard/Eagle Rock Plaza, Colorado Boulevard/Eagle Rock Boulevard, and Colorado Boulevard/Townsend Avenue. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 219

Marc Lowenthal

- 219-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 220

Mark A Rhein

- 220-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The public review period began on October 26, 2020, and was initially scheduled to end on December 10, 2020. The comment period was extended to December 28, 2020, to accommodate community requests for additional time to review the Draft EIR. CEQA requires a 45-day review period for draft EIRs submitted to the State Clearinghouse. Metro extended the review period to approximately 60 days, allowing ample time for public comment. Regarding outreach, to encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period and Draft EIR review period, legal advertisement notices were published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) notices and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts. The hearings also provided simultaneous Spanish translation, and previous meetings for the Proposed Project included live Spanish and Armenian translators.

- 220-2 Metro anticipates that regional ridership will return to pre-COVID level prior to the Proposed Project's opening date of 2024. Please note that many commuters are not able to work remotely due to job requirements (e.g., essential services).
- 220-3 Metro acknowledges the commentor's concern related to the Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council. Please direct specific concerns directly to that community group.

Letter No. 221

Mark Whitney

- 221-1 This comment expresses preference for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation

of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. The Proposed Project requires some left-turn restrictions, as left turns would be directed to signalized intersections with dedicated left-turn lanes for safety.

Regarding parking, Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require lead agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities, although Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 222

Martha A Orozco

222-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) due to quality of life, community identity, property values, and safety concerns. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT would affect quality of life in Eagle Rock; no specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR. The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro. The Proposed Project includes many safety

measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

222-2 Metro disagrees with the characterization that the Draft EIR was prejudiced for a particular BRT route. The Draft EIR included an equal analysis of the environmental effects associated with each alternative for consideration by the Metro Board. The Proposed Project includes options for the BRT route and configurations. This approach was necessary due to public feedback during the completion of the Alternatives Analysis and EIR Scoping Period. It was not possible to reach a consensus on one route preferred by Metro, the cities, stakeholders, and general public. Metro determined that stakeholders would be best informed about the Proposed Project by equally evaluating the potential environmental impacts of multiple routes in the four cities.

222-3 This comment expresses concern related to impacts to businesses due to reduced parking. Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

222-4 Metro does not expect the Proposed Project will generate much cut-through traffic largely because of the lack of time-competitive parallel routes. Some traffic bound to-and-from local destinations may re-route to adapt to the revised median and opportunities for cross-traffic movements and left-turns. All Metro BRT buses shall adhere to applicable roadway speed limits and regulations. The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway system and not to local

streets such as Hill Drive or Yosemite Drive. Hill Drive and Yosemite Drive are not continuous for a long enough distance to be a viable alternative to Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. In no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. The Proposed Project would also include crosswalk improvements designed to enhance pedestrian safety. See Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR for further discussion of project design and safety enhancement features.

- 222-5 Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT on Colorado Boulevard would affect quality of life in Eagle Rock. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR. The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro.

This comment also expresses opposition to converting Colorado Boulevard to a transportation corridor. Colorado Boulevard is already a transportation corridor serving automobiles, public transportation, cyclists, and pedestrians. The SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

- 222-6 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 in Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). For this Final EIR, Route Option F3 has been eliminated from consideration.

Letter No. 223

Martha Kowal

- 223-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3) and opposition to the Project operating on Colorado Boulevard (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after

considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Section 3.3, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR includes a detailed air pollution analysis. As stated on page 3.3-23, the Proposed Project would not expose people to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Letter No. 224

Martin LeFever

224-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 225

Martin Rusch

225-1 This comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The refined Proposed Project incorporates the Beautiful Boulevard concept's designs by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 226

Mary Castaneda

- 226-1 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR. The comment incorrectly asserts the Proposed Project passes through West Hollywood.

Letter No. 227

Mary Morano

- 227-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 228

Matt Harrington

- 228-1 This comment expresses support for the center-running bus lanes treatment on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Option F1) for a variety of reasons, including preserving sidewalk adjacent land for business use. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding noise, the potential for impacts was studied in detail in Section 3.9, Noise, of the Draft EIR. No impacts were identified for any operating scenario. Regarding pedestrian safety, Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits, would obey traffic laws in a similar manner as automobiles, and Metro drivers will receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, along with signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Letter No. 229

Matt Harrington

- 229-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concept by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, although not within the Eagle Rock segment of the Project, sidewalks may require an approximate 1 to 2 foot reduction in width to accommodate station platforms and/or widening of the roadway to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; however, the remaining sidewalk width would typically exceed 10 feet and in no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 230

Matthew Robertson

- 230-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 231

Maureen Perkins

231-1 The comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating within dedicated bus lanes on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) but supports the Proposed Project operating on the SR-134 (Route Option F3) or within mix-flow configurations. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

231-2 The comment questions whether the Proposed Project can accommodate a dedicated bus lane in Eagle Rock without narrowing sidewalks. None of the route options under consideration in Eagle Rock stations would narrow the sidewalk width.

There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro will replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

231-3 Regarding businesses, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 232

Melanie and Ernie Pava

- 232-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require lead agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods with

accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 233

Michael Amoruso

- 233-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's designs by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to

result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, sidewalks may require a one- or two- foot reduction in width to accommodate station platforms and/or widening of the roadway to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; however, the remaining sidewalk width would typically exceed ten feet and in no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 234

Michael Blanchard

- 234-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 235

Michael Fishman

- 235-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock but opposition to removing the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 236

Michael Guitar

- 236-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock with protected bicycle lanes (Route Options F1). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 237

Michael Kowal Jr.

- 237-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Regarding businesses and parking, Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, Metro intends to preserve as much parking as possible along the route. Metro

values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project.

Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, developing compact pedestrian-oriented, and mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

- 237-2 Emergency evacuation is addressed in Section 4.1.2, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. As stated therein, the Proposed Project would be constructed along or near several emergency/disaster routes, including the SR-134 Freeway, Colorado Boulevard, Glenoaks Boulevard, Olive Avenue, and Lankershim Boulevard. Los Angeles County and each of the cities affected by the Proposed Project have developed emergency response plans. Temporary lane closures may be required and emergency routes may be temporarily disrupted during construction activities. The Project Area is a fully built roadway network with parallel streets in every direction. Detour routes, of which there are multiple options, would be established in consultation with emergency service providers. Although lane closures are anticipated, full street closures are not anticipated, and roadway access would be maintained to accommodate response to emergencies. Construction activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction activities. After construction, the bus lanes would be open to emergency vehicles, which could improve response plans. During emergencies, the bus-only lanes would be open to all evacuating vehicles. Operational activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Letter No. 238

Michael MacDonald

- 238-1 The comment expresses opposition to Route Options F1, F2, and F3 as presented in the Draft EIR. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 238-2 To encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period and Draft EIR review period, legal advertisement notices were published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) notice and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts. Other noticing methods, including email blasts, social media advertisements, meeting flyer distribution, and print and online media notification, were provided in the study area during the 60-day scoping period. In addition, in accordance with Metro's Public Participation Plan, targeted community outreach efforts were completed in various cities throughout the Project area to facilitate participation of limited English proficiency and transit reliant populations. Specifically, special pop-up events were hosted at the North Hollywood Station to reach transit riders. Comments during the Public Scoping period for the Project were also received through a set of transit rider intercept surveys conducted at major transit stops along the corridor. As the Draft EIR was circulated during the COVID-19 pandemic, such targeted outreach to transit riders was not possible at each phase of the EIR outreach process.
- 238-3 This comment expresses opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 in Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). Refer to Response 222-1.
- 238-4 This comment expresses opposition to Route Option F2 in Eagle Rock, specifically as it relates to shared bus and bike lane. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR.
- 238-5 This comment states that, related to Route Option F1 in Eagle Rock, the Draft EIR provides insufficient analysis of impacts to roadway safety, City of LA Vision Zero goals, stormwater management, air quality, curbside parking, and pedestrian access. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description of the Final EIR for further details regarding curbside parking along the Project corridor.

Regarding stormwater management, the Proposed Project must incorporate the County's Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and Site-Specific Stormwater Mitigation Plans. Compliance with these regulations would require the inclusion of post-construction stormwater measures and low-impact development measures designed to minimize runoff flows and water quality degradation. The Proposed Project would not result in a significant impact to hydrology and water quality.

Regarding roadway safety and City of LA Vision Zero goals, as stated in the Draft EIR (in regard to Impact 3.1-3), the Proposed Project uses the existing street alignment and right-of-way and would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, as the Proposed Project would be designed per applicable State, Metro, and City(ies') design criteria and standards. For segments with median-running bus lanes, stations are usually provided on islands at intersections and are accessible from the signalized crosswalk. The safety measures include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, and ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Further, the BRT service would include queue jumps at selected locations at which a traffic signal with special bus indications would display a bus-only phase, which would allow buses to enter an intersection before a green indication is given to other traffic in order to allow the bus to maneuver across mixed-flow lanes ahead of conflicting traffic. Since other traffic would be observing a red signal during the bus phase, adverse safety impacts would be minimal. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to operational activities.

Regarding air quality, Section 3.3, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR includes a detailed impact analysis in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The analysis assessed consistency with air quality plans, the significance of construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions, exposure of sensitive populations to substantial pollutant concentrations, and exposure to other emissions such as odors. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042. The air quality analysis therefore concluded that the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts.

Regarding pedestrian safety, Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR includes an impact analysis in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines. The Project includes curb extensions to reduce pedestrian crossing distances, upgrades unsignalized crosswalks with rectangular rapid flashing beacons to pedestrian actuated signalized crossings, and adds a new traffic signal at Dahlia Drive to improve pedestrian access to Dahlia Heights Elementary School. Considering the safety measures included above, the transportation analysis concluded that the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to pedestrian safety.

- 238-6 The comment requests Metro to consider integrating left-door boarding buses into their fleet. This style of bus is not part of the existing fleet. Metro studied the use of buses that allow for two-sided boarding separately from this Project.
- 238-7 This comment discusses coordination with local community groups. Metro staff has met with community groups, organizations and elected official offices within the Eagle Rock community through the project's process. Options for the BRT route's alignment and street configurations were developed in response to community and stakeholder feedback received early in the project planning process and into scoping, and the three design options in Eagle Rock described in the Draft EIR were developed in direct response to community concerns regarding parking, medians, and safety. Regarding the TERA letter, please refer to Responses to Comment Letter 18. Meetings and coordination meetings have also occurred with City of Los Angeles Transportation and Planning staff.
- 238-8 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard concept in Eagle Rock. Refer to Response 222-1.

Letter No. 239

Michael Schneider

- 239-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concepts by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR. Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed

onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 240

Michael Siegel

- 240-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project removing the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 241

Michael Tuggle

- 241-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). This comment expresses opposition to the removal of center medians and parking on Colorado Boulevard. The comment infers that the Proposed Project would exit SR-134 eastbound to enter Eagle Rock under Route Options F1/F2. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

A new crosswalk would be added on the east leg of the West Broadway/Colorado Boulevard intersection along with curb extensions to accommodate access to the station platforms and pedestrian circulation. At many locations where crosswalks are present new medians proposed in conjunction with the bus lanes would provide refuge for pedestrians crossing Colorado Boulevard.

Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 242

Michele McKinley

- 242-1 This comment expresses opposition to a dedicated bus lane on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock.
- 242-2 The existing bus services in Eagle Rock do not share the same purpose of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would be a regional line connecting North Hollywood to Pasadena, including connections to the regional Metro rail and bus network. The existing services in Eagle Rock generally support local riders. It is not accurate to compare existing local ridership to projected ridership for a regional route.
- 242-3 The results of the traffic modeling indicate that a lane reduction on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock would add seven minutes of delay in the AM peak hour and nine minutes of delay in the PM peak hour in operational year 2024. Refer to Appendix E for additional details. Regarding traffic congestion and business impacts, CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service) in the Draft EIR. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

- 242-4 This comment reiterates opposition to a dedicated bus lane on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock and expresses support for the SR 134 Route Option (F3).

Letter No. 243

Michele McKinley

- 243-1 This comment expresses opposition to dedicated bus lanes for the Proposed Project on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). The comment suggests operating the Project in mixed-flow lanes on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR.

Letter No. 244

Miguel Nunez

- 244-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes, curb extensions, and trees along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced

network (transit, bicycle, and motor vehicles) when designing a street that includes multiple transportation modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 245

Mina Fried (Mona Field)

- 245-1 This comment expresses support for maintaining Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock with the existing configuration, including two mixed-flow traffic lanes in each direction due to concerns over increased pollution from car idling. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding increased localized air pollutant emissions, the South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Analysis Handbook recommends the evaluation of potential carbon monoxide hot spots that may occur from traffic congestion resulting from implementation of projects with substantial trip generation or modifications to roadway networks. Local carbon monoxide concentrations are a function of (1) intersection traffic volumes, (2) peak-hour intersection LOS, (3) carbon monoxide emissions factors [idle and grams per mile], and (4) the ambient carbon monoxide background concentration. Therefore, it is possible to identify if any intersection locations or roadway segments have the potential to violate carbon monoxide standards. As stated in Section 3.3, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the maximum CO background concentrations in 2020 at Pasadena – South Wilson, Los Angeles – North Main Street, and Reseda are 0.9 parts per million (ppm), 1.3 ppm, and 1.4 ppm, respectively. These background concentrations are significantly lower than the 8-hour carbon monoxide ambient air standard of 9.0 ppm as well as the predicted 8-hour background concentration of 7.8 ppm used for the 2003 attainment demonstration analysis. In addition, maximum intersection approach volumes under the Proposed Project would be over 40 percent less than the maximum intersection approach volume used for the 2003 AQMP attainment demonstration. As such, there would be no potential for CO emissions at any intersection location to result in an exceedance of either the CAAQS or NAAQS for CO.

This comment expresses support to maintain the existing median configuration due to tree loss that will increase carbon emissions and effects to air quality. There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected

jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

245-2 This comment expresses support for using synchronized traffic signals to improve existing bus speeds and pedestrian safety. The Proposed Project would provide improved and reliable transit service to meet the mobility needs of residents, employees, and visitors who travel within the corridor. Solely utilizing synchronized traffic signals to improve existing bus speeds and pedestrian safety would not meet the stated objective of advancing a premium transit service that is more competitive with auto travel. The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

245-3 This comment expresses support for shared bicycle and bus lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR for more information related to the current design options in Eagle Rock.

Letter No. 246

Miri Hindes

246-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project. Metro regrets the difficulty experienced in providing comment, although Metro is not aware of a technical issue affecting other commentors.

Letter No. 247

Morgan Night

247-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2).

Letter No. 248

Myanna Dellinger

248-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2).

Letter No. 249

Nadine Levyfield

- 249-1 This comment expresses opposition to the BRT operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and supports the SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding construction effects, Metro standard practice is to coordinate with local jurisdictions to minimize construction effects. As shown in the Executive Summary Chapter of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measures **TRA-1** through **TRA-4** are designed to reduce potential for construction activities to affect traffic and transportation. Mitigation Measure **NOI-1** is designed to control construction noise. Regarding traffic congestion, although the effects of the project on traffic congestion is no longer considered under the CEQA guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.

Regarding local businesses, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 250

Nathanael Cho

- 250-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and requests that the route be branded with a letter and color similar to other Metro rail lines and the Metro G (Orange) Line BRT service. As approved by the Metro Board on December 6, 2018,

Metro has renamed all existing BRT and rail lines with this convention for the sake of consistency and accessibility for its users. This naming convention will continue as future lines are added.

Letter No. 251

Nathanael Tronerud

- 251-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 252

Neale Stokes

- 252-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 253

Nick Richert

- 253-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a

manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 254

Nilza Serrano

254-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 255

Noah Cox

255-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate Beautiful Boulevard's design concepts by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR. Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed

onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 256

Olga Lexell

- 256-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock, but opposes the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 257

Olga Lexell

- 257-1 The Proposed Project does not include any stops on the SR-134.

Letter No. 258

Oscar Peña

- 258-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating in center running bus lanes through Eagle Rock (Route Option F1) and raises concerns regarding the Central Avenue and Broadway (Route Option E1) segment through Glendale due to concerns over bicycle safety. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 259

Owen Thurston

- 259-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 260

Padric Gleason Gonzales

- 260-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). The comment also expresses support for center-running bus lanes and electric buses. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 261

Patricia Pérez

- 261-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) due to quality of life, property values, and safety concerns. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 261-2 Metro disagrees with the characterization that the Draft EIR was prejudiced for a particular BRT route. The Draft EIR included an equal analysis of the environmental effects associated with each alternative for consideration by the Metro Board. The Proposed Project includes options for the BRT route and configurations. This was necessary due to public feedback during the completion of the Alternatives Analysis and EIR Scoping Period. It was not possible to reach a consensus on one route preferred by Metro, the cities, stakeholders, and general public. Metro determined that all stakeholders would best be informed about the Proposed Project by equally evaluating the potential environmental impacts of multiple routes in the four cities.
- 261-3 This comment expresses concern related to impacts to businesses due to reduced parking. Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

- 261-4 Metro does not expect the Proposed Project will generate much cut-through traffic largely because of the lack of time-competitive parallel routes. Some traffic bound to-and-from local destinations may re-route to adapt to the revised median and opportunities for cross-traffic movements and left-turns. All Metro BRT buses shall adhere to applicable roadway speed limits and regulations. The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. In no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. The Proposed Project would also include crosswalk improvements designed to enhance pedestrian safety. See Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR for further discussion of project design and safety enhancement features.

The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway system and not to local streets such as Hill Drive or Yosemite Drive. Hill Drive and Yosemite Drive are not continuous for a long enough distance to be a viable alternative to Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

- 261-5 Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT on Colorado Boulevard would affect quality of life in Eagle Rock. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR. The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro.

This comment also expresses opposition to converting Colorado Boulevard to a transportation corridor. Colorado Boulevard is already a transportation corridor serving automobiles, public transportation, cyclists, and pedestrians. The SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

- 261-6 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 in Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). For this Final EIR, Route Option F3 has been eliminated from consideration.

Letter No. 262

Paul Rabinov

- 262-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 263

Paula Grepo - Fuentes

- 263-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2), and a preference for stations at Broadway/Harvey Drive and Figueroa Street. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Letter No. 264

Peter Cistulli

- 264-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 265

Peter Liepmann

- 265-1 The comment expresses support for paying the fare prior to boarding the bus. Metro intends to reduce dwell times at stations by providing “all door” boarding with on-board fare collection

Letter No. 266

Peter Liepmann

- 266-1 This comment expresses support for having fare collection at stations and opening service in 2021. Regarding opening in 2021, the soonest the Proposed Project can open is 2024 due to the environmental approval, design and permitting processes, and construction activities.

Letter No. 267

Pilar Reynaldo

- 267-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 267-2 The comment also states the importance of first/last mile improvements to provide safe and convenient access to this transit line for transit users who access bus service on foot, in wheelchairs, transferring from other transit lines, and by bicycle. Metro’s First/Last Mile Policy calls for the integration of first/last mile planning and delivery integration with new transit capital projects and first/last mile improvements are being considered as part of this project. First/last mile improvements for accessing transit

stations are generally focused on walk and bike access and safety and are defined through a station-location specific planning process.

Letter No. 268

Pinguino Kolb

268-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating in Pasadena.

Letter No. 269

Priscila Kasha

269-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on any surface street in Glendale due to traffic congestion. The comment also summarizes the route options in Glendale and notes that the SR-134 route through Glendale (Route Option E3) would be the cheapest option. After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board selected the Route Option E1 in Glendale.

269-2 This comment expresses opposition to dedicated bus lanes in Glendale. Although the Proposed Project proposes to remove travel lanes on Glenoaks Boulevard, Central Avenue, and Broadway, traffic analysis indicates that the Proposed Project will result in an overall reduction in VMT. Although congestion (e.g., Level of Service) is no longer an environmental impact under CEQA, it should be noted that only minor effects to traffic operations are expected, and most intersections are expected to operate at Level of Service D or better. Regarding medians, the Proposed Project does not require extensive removal of the median on Glenoaks Boulevard. Modifications to the median would only be necessary in proximity to the BRT stations and at major intersections to allow left turns. Regarding on-street parking, the Proposed Project in Glendale would have minor effects to on-street parking limited to the immediate proximity to the BRT stations on Central Avenue and Broadway.

269-3 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project due to lack of existing infrastructure, negative effects to neighborhood character, and the “dirty and unsafe” nature of buses due to an increasing homeless population. It is unclear what infrastructure is lacking for the Proposed Project as the BRT would operate on existing surface streets. Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT would affect neighborhood character. The bus fleet would be maintained daily and Metro disagrees with the characterization that buses are dirty and unsafe. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR and no further response is required.

269-4 This comment expresses concern related to the Proposed Project leading to increased density in Glendale. For a discussion of the Proposed Project’s potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project’s population and housing impacts, refer to

Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth in housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the Project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

269-5 This comment expresses opposition to a lane reduction, or “road diet,” in Glendale. The Proposed Project would convert travel lanes to bus-only on Glenoaks Boulevard, Central Avenue, and Broadway. Vehicles making right-turns, parking, or accessing driveways would be allowed to enter the bus lanes.

269-6 This comment expresses general opposition to the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 270

Q. Sarah Ostendorf

270-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The refined Proposed Project incorporates the Beautiful Boulevard’s design concepts by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is

provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR. Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 271

Rachel Hastings Saunders

- 271-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular the station at Olive and Verdugo Avenues, which is indicated as an “optional station” in the Draft EIR. The Project is now anticipated to include a BRT station in proximity to the Olive Avenue/Verdugo Avenue intersection.

Letter No. 272

Raymond Palagano

- 272-1 Metro Line 501 is an express line, which differs from a BRT line. These differences for a BRT line can include dedicated bus lanes and signal priority, enhanced stations (not typical bus stops) with lighting and amenities, stations spaced every half-mile to a mile apart, branded buses, and frequent headways. The existing Metro Line 501 maintains connection between the North Hollywood Station and Pasadena under the Nextgen Bus Plan. NextGen weekday service frequency on Metro Line 501 Line is proposed to be every 15 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods, with service every 15-30 minutes in the weekday off-peak periods.

Letter No. 273

Rebecca Kalauskas

- 273-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.
- 273-2 The comment expresses support for the station located at Olive and Verdugo Avenues, which was identified as optional in the Draft EIR. This station has been carried forward in the Final EIR as part of the Proposed Project.
- 273-3 Olive Avenue would be reconfigured to provide dedicated bus lanes without any anticipated sidewalk narrowing. There would be no potential for sidewalk widening to conflict with City of Burbank's Complete Streets vision that prioritizes pedestrians.

The comment expresses opposition to the removal of trees on Olive Avenue. Potential impacts to trees have been minimized with the refined design. In addition, trees required to be removed as part of the Proposed Project would be replaced, as authorized by City of Burbank Municipal Code 7-4-111, which requires a tree removal permit and replacement plantings for any street tree removed within the City.

273-4 The comment expresses concern related to pedestrian safety on the Olive Avenue Bridge. The Proposed Project no longer includes a BRT station on the Olive Avenue Bridge, as the location of this station has been shifted to the west to Lake Street.

273-5 The comment requests that Metro coordinate with the City of Burbank to align the Proposed Project with the Complete Streets vision and improve pedestrian safety at the Olive/Verdugo Avenues intersection. Metro is committed to coordinating with the cities affected by the Proposed Project throughout the environmental, design, engineering, and construction processes.

The Proposed Project was reviewed with respect to pedestrian facilities for consistency with applicable plans, ordinances, and policies at the local jurisdiction level for the City of Burbank. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Burbank. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

273-6 The comment expresses opposition to the removal of bike lanes on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock and a shared bus/bicycle facility. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 274

Reg Willson

274-1 Metro notes that Reg Wilson submitted this comment at the public hearing and by email. The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that if a travel lane were removed, the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard would transfer to the freeway system and not to local streets, as the local streets are not continuous for a

long enough distance to be a viable alternative to Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

Letter No. 275

Reiner Kolodinski

275-1 This comment expresses support for the BRT operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Draft EIR included an equal analysis of the community effects associated with each alternative for consideration by the Metro Board. The Proposed Project includes options for the BRT route and configurations. This was based upon public feedback during the completion of the Alternatives Analysis and EIR scoping process. It was not possible to reach a consensus on one route preferred by Metro, the cities, stakeholders, and general public. Metro determined that all stakeholders would best be informed about the Proposed Project by equally evaluating the potential environmental impacts of multiple routes in the four cities.

The comment states that the construction activities would result in impacts related to noise, traffic disruption, and nighttime activities. The Draft EIR includes detailed analysis of potential construction impacts and no significant impacts were identified for construction noise or traffic disruption. Refer to Section 3.1, Transportation and Section 3.9, Noise of the Draft EIR for additional details. Regarding traffic, Mitigation Measures **TRA-1** through **TRA-4** would eliminate potential construction impacts associated with traffic, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle disruptions. Regarding noise, Mitigation Measure **NOI-1** would eliminate potential construction impacts by requiring construction activities to comply with the local noise ordinances.

Nighttime activities are not anticipated to be needed to construct the Proposed Project. However, at this stage of the planning process and without a construction contractor, it cannot be confirmed if nighttime construction would be necessary for specialized construction tasks. For these specialized construction tasks, it may be necessary to work during nighttime hours to minimize traffic disruptions. As explained in Section 3.9, Noise, page 3.9-17, of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure **NOI-1** includes a performance standard requiring compliance with the local noise ordinances, which would ensure potential construction noise impacts are less than significant.

Letter No. 276

Reiner Kolodinski

- 276-1 This comment asserts that it appears that the public has been omitted from the decision process. Refer to Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR and Master Response No. 1 for details regarding Metro's public input and decision process for the Proposed Project.

This comment also expresses opposition to the Proposed Project due to concerns of increased pollution, traffic impacts, and potential effects of gentrification. Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

Letter No. 277

Rene

- 277-1 The comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project, in particular with the BRT operations in Burbank.

Letter No. 278

Rex Mayreis

- 278-1 There is no Metro Line 401 in the Project Area. If the commentor is referring to Metro Line 501, this line is an express line, which differs from a BRT line. These differences for a BRT line can include dedicated bus lanes and signal priority, enhanced stations (not typical bus stops) with lighting and amenities, stations spaced every half-mile to a

mile apart, branded buses, and frequent headways. The existing Metro Line 501 maintains connection between the North Hollywood Station and Pasadena under the Nextgen Bus Plan. NextGen weekday service frequency on Metro Line 501 Line is proposed to be every 15 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods, with service every 15-30 minutes in the weekday off-peak periods.

Letter No. 279

Richard Luczynski

279-1 The comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena (Route Option H1). Further, the comment supports Route Option H2 that would have the buses travel along Green Street and Union Street. The Metro Board selected the Route Option H1 in Pasadena for further consideration in this Final EIR. The Proposed Project would operate in mixed traffic conditions and serve curbside stations.

Letter No. 280

Richard Margulieux

280-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating in a dedicated lane on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Option F2), support for additional refinements to the side-running treatment including eliminating street parking, adding a stand-alone bike lane, and widening the sidewalks. The comment also expresses support for Route Options E1 and G1. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. In addition, the Metro Board selected the Route Option E1 in Glendale and the Route Option H1 in Pasadena to carry forward for further consideration in this Final EIR.

Letter No. 281

Richard Mcfarlane

281-1 The comment expresses opposition to converting a mixed travel lane or median to a dedicated bus lane on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR.

Regarding left turns across a dedicated median bus lane (as proposed in Route Option F1), left-turns would be accommodated at signalized intersections in left-turn lanes to the outside of the bus lanes and would be allowed to turn across the bus lanes during a portion of each traffic signal cycle.

Regarding ridership projections for the Proposed Project, transit ridership was forecast through a travel demand model, Metro's Corridors Based Model 18. The model was calibrated for the Proposed Project. The model considers current travel patterns and applies future transit service changes to the network resulting from the Proposed Project to forecast trips by mode and estimate boardings.

Letter No. 282

Rick Marquez

- 282-1 The comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project and states that express bus lanes should only be on freeways. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 282-2 This comment also expresses concern regarding additional development along the corridor. Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

Letter No. 283

Riker Haddon

- 283-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project removing the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 284

Robert A Stoughton

- 284-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on surface streets in Glendale (Route Option E1). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 285

Robert Barbosa

- 285-1 This comment expresses concern related to traffic congestion on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock due to the Proposed Project. CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). Although the effects of a project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions.
- 285-2 After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. One of these design options maintains two traffic lanes per direction on Colorado Boulevard throughout the extent of Eagle Rock, so no additional traffic would be expected to use alternate streets. The second design option would provide one traffic lane per direction on Colorado Boulevard between Eagle Rock Boulevard and the SR-134 access ramps. The potential for traffic to use alternate streets with this option was analyzed with the regional travel demand model. Results of analysis indicate that the diversion of traffic to parallel streets would be minor, as the parallel streets are not continuous and would

not provide time savings for motorists. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.

285-3 The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

285-4 This comment expresses preference for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 286

Robert DeVelasco

286-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 287

Robert Frampton

287-1 This comment suggests a location for maintaining and storing buses. The maintenance facility location has not been identified at this time in the planning process, although it will be an existing Metro facility. A new maintenance facility is not needed to support the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 288

Robert Frampton

288-1 This comment suggests a location for maintaining and storing buses. The maintenance facility location has not been identified at this time in the planning process, although it will most likely be an existing Metro facility. It is not anticipated that a new maintenance facility will be needed to support the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 289

Robert Huddy

- 289-1 This comment expresses support for better bus service. The commenter suggests that, even with a dedicated bus lane, high traffic volumes and a high number of signalized intersections along the route would reduce any potential gains in route travel time. Metro does not agree with this opinion and believes that dedicated bus lanes are instrumental in improving the operating speed and the travel time reliability for the BRT service. Other concerns for potential issues include traffic neighborhood spillover as well as more and longer queueing at intersections. Traffic analyses indicate that the dedicated bus lanes would not result in widespread queueing at intersections or degradation in traffic flow.
- 289-2 This comment expresses concerns related to traffic on parallel streets. The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway system and not to local streets. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.
- This comment also expresses concern for the Proposed Project's potential to result in increased traffic congestion and corresponding air pollution emissions. Section 3.3, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR includes a detailed impact analysis in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The analysis assessed consistency with air quality plans, the significance of construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions, exposure of sensitive populations to substantial pollutant concentrations, and exposure to other emissions such as odors. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.
- 289-3 This comment expresses support for signal coordination/pre-emption, longer spacing between bus stops, and higher capacity bus doors.
- 289-4 This comment makes a number of design suggestions unrelated to the CEQA analysis in the Draft EIR, including larger bus doors and all door boarding. Metro studied the use of buses that allow for two-sided boarding outside of this study. This style of bus is not part of the existing fleet. The comment expresses support for all door boarding, which is being considered by Metro.
- 289-5 This comment expresses hope that the preceding comments would be useful in promoting positive impacts without unnecessary and avoidable impacts to other corridor users and communities. The Draft EIR did not identify in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the Proposed Project. The modifications made to the Proposed Project in response to public comments on the Draft EIR do not alter the significance conclusions of the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 290

Robert L. Inman

- 290-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 291

Robert Velazquez

- 291-1 This comment expresses preference for the Proposed Project operating in mixed-flow traffic lanes on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock or on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 292

Roberta Medford

- 292-1 The Proposed Project recommends a BRT station at Glendale Avenue under the Proposed Project Route Option E1 (Broadway and Glendale Avenue) and Route Option E2 (Colorado Street and Glendale Avenue). A stop is not recommended for Route Option E3, as this route is along the SR-134. Route Options E2 and E3 were not carried forward for further consideration in this Final EIR.

Letter No. 293

Rody Stephenson

- 293-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.
- 293-2 It is not clear what November 10th briefing is referenced in this comment. Public meetings related to the Draft EIR were held on November 12th and November 14th. The links for the meetings were posted on the Proposed Project website, newspaper ads, Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, and emailed to those that requested to be on the Project email list.

- 293-3 The end-to-end travel time is estimated to be approximately one hour. This is a preliminary estimate and will change as the design is advanced.

Letter No. 294

Roger Carnow

- 294-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project. The comment supports fast travel times, dedicated bus lanes on surface streets, and bicycle infrastructure. Specifically, the comment supports a new dedicated bus lane in North Hollywood on Chandler Boulevard, which is a route previously studied in the Alternatives Analysis but eliminated from consideration and not studied in the Draft EIR. Refer to Section 2.2, Project History, for a detailed discussion on the selection of routes assessed in the Draft EIR as well as a discussion of the routes eliminated from further consideration by Metro.

The comment also expresses preference for surface street operations in Glendale (Route Option E1 and Route Option E2), Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2), and both options in Pasadena (Route Options G1/G2 and H1/H2). Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR for a description of the route in each city.

Letter No. 295

Roger Carnow

- 295-1 This comment expresses support for the North Hollywood Route Option with the best time and highest ridership, opposes the use of SR-134 through Glendale (Route Option F3), supports the use of Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2), and notes no route preference in Pasadena. The comment expresses support for separated bus/bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR for a description of the route in each city and proposed bicycle lanes.

Letter No. 296

Ron Bergeron

- 296-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and encourages the use of transit priority, including facilitating bus movements by allowing buses to proceed while other vehicles are stopped at traffic signals.

Letter No. 297

Ron McGill

- 297-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concept by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, sidewalks may require an approximate 1 to 2 foot reduction in width to accommodate station platforms and/or widening of the roadway to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; however, the remaining sidewalk width would typically exceed 10 feet and in no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 298

Ronda Jovanelly

- 298-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado

- Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 298-2 The Proposed Project is a regional transit project. Comments are being appropriately provided by stakeholders that live in communities other than Eagle Rock.
- 298-3 This comment expresses concerns related to traffic on parallel streets. The potential diversion of traffic to parallel streets was evaluated in the regional travel demand model. The results indicate that the majority of traffic that would divert from Colorado Boulevard if a travel lane were removed would transfer to the freeway system and not to local streets. Refer to Appendix D of the Final EIR for additional details.
- 298-4 Metro disagrees with the characterization that bus stations would be “needle infested and filthy.” As is Metro’s regular practice, stations would be cleaned and maintained on a regular basis.
- 298-5 The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that “Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes.” As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project’s social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.
- 298-6 This comment expresses opposition to the proposed median due to safety. The Proposed Project includes many safety measures to reduce traffic hazards including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.
- 298-7 This comment questions the ridership estimates shown in the Draft EIR. Transit ridership was established through a forecasting analysis utilizing Metro’s Corridors Based Model 18 to estimate ridership. The model was developed by Metro and calibrated for the Proposed Project. The model considers current travel patterns and applies future transit service changes to the network resulting from the Proposed Project to forecast trips by mode and estimate boardings. Furthermore, Metro anticipates that regional ridership will return to pre-COVID level prior to the Proposed

Project opening date of 2024 and social distance requirements will be similar to pre-pandemic.

- 298-8 This comment expresses concern that the Proposed Project is being constructed for real estate interests. Land use regulations are controlled by each city and Metro cannot change existing zoning. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. The Proposed Project would be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.
- 298-9 The Proposed Project is a regional transit project. The North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor was identified by Metro's 2013 Countywide Bus Rapid Transit and Street Design Improvement Study as one of the region's most heavily traveled corridors without a premium bus service. The Proposed Project would provide improved and reliable transit service to meet the mobility needs of residents, employees, and visitors who travel within the corridor and not just Eagle Rock.
- 298-10 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3).

Letter No. 299

Ross Selvidge

- 299-1 The entirety of public comments may be viewed in the Final EIR.

Letter No. 300

Roy Orecchio

- 300-1 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR or raise environmental concerns. This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and suggests consideration of dedicated bus lanes in Pasadena.

Letter No. 301

Ryan Gallagher

- 301-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board selected Route Options A1 to B to C to D to E1 to F1 to G1 to H1. The Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. The commenter's concerns about the Proposed Project's impact to property value has been noted for the record by Metro.

Letter No. 302

Ryan Johnson

- 302-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.
- 302-2 Note that many of the curb extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 303

Ryko Kohne

303-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 304

Sam Erman

304-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard, keeping bicycle lanes, and beautification. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Letter No. 305

Saman Bravo-Karimi

305-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concept by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility.

These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, sidewalks may require an approximate 1 to 2 foot reduction in width to accommodate station platforms and/or widening of the roadway to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; however, the remaining sidewalk width would typically exceed 10 feet and in no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 306

Samuel Siegel

- 306-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.
- 306-2 The comment expresses support for powering the BRT with overhead catenary wires as opposed to electric batteries. Overhead catenary wires are not being considered for the Proposed Project. In 2017, the Metro Board adopted a motion to transition the agency to a 100 percent zero emission bus fleet by 2030. All buses on the Proposed Project would be owned and operated by Metro.
- 306-3 The comment expresses support for designing the Proposed Project to facilitate the future implementation of LRT. Rail conversion is not being considered as part of the Project design.
- 306-4 The comment expresses support for dedicated center- and median-running transit lanes, in addition to a variety of design changes. General purpose traffic will be discouraged from driving in dedicated bus lane sections through barriers that may include signage and pavement markings, raised delineators, rumble strips, and raised curbs or medians.
- 306-5 The comment suggests an alternative route for the Proposed Project in North Hollywood and Burbank. The Alternatives Analysis prepared for the project, provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, includes a detailed analysis that discusses connectivity to the regional transit network, connectivity to major activity centers in the region, and

socioeconomic/demographic factors benefited by the Proposed Project. A Chandler Avenue route was considered in the Alternatives Analysis.

Letter No. 307

Sandra Kay Beckley

307-1 The comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

A detailed noise analysis was provided in Section 3.9, Noise, of the Draft EIR. No permanent noise impacts were identified on Colorado Boulevard based on methodology contained in the Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual.

Letter No. 308

Sara Antebi

308-1 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR or the Proposed Project.

308-2 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR or the Proposed Project.

Letter No. 309

Sarah Dean-Gooderham

309-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 310

Scott and Christina Newland

- 310-1 This comment expresses support for adding buses to I-210 freeway. Refer to Section 2.2, Project History, of Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR for a detailed discussion of the selection of routes and routes that were eliminated from further consideration by Metro.

Letter No. 311

Scott Keiner

- 311-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard but opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 312

Sean Shen

- 312-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular for a route along local streets instead of along the freeway (SR-134). Additional station options are not being considered at this time. All segments and route options of the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 will be in mixed-flow traffic. Although the proposed design does not include dedicated bus lanes on the freeway, buses may use the existing high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes where practicable. See Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft and Final EIR for further information.

Letter No. 313

Sergio Hernandez

- 313-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock; the comment also supports center-running BRT and preserving bicycle lanes (Route Option F1) and opposes operation on the SR-134 (Route Option F3). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the

Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 314

Sergio Padilla

- 314-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 315

Severin Martinez

- 315-1 The comment provides an introduction to the letter. Detailed responses to comments included in the letter are provided in the following responses
- 315-2 The comment suggests narrowing traffic lanes to accommodate bicycle lanes in general with a specific suggestion to extend bicycle lanes along Glenoaks Boulevard from Alameda Avenue to Providencia Avenue. In general, the Proposed Project has been designed to maximize use of the existing street right-of-way for all modes including bicycles; however, design of the roadway would be required to adhere to local design criteria governing lane widths, turn lane transitions, bicycle buffers, and intersection configurations. Impacts to bicycle facilities are addressed on pages 3.1-24 to 3.1-27, in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Metro is coordinating with the City of Glendale to include bike lane improvements along Glenoaks Boulevard.
- 315-3 This comment suggests investigating opportunities to narrow travel lanes to enhance bicycle infrastructure. Preliminary lane widths are defined in the Concept Plans presented in Appendix Z of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project generally includes 11- and 12-foot bus lanes, as Metro has experienced problems with “mirror strikes” in lanes narrower than 11 feet. The lane widths for roadway elements, including medians, travel lanes, turn lanes, bike lanes, and parking/loading lanes may be refined considering local jurisdiction standards during the design phase.
- 315-4 As described in Chapter 2, Project Description of the Draft EIR, the existing bicycle lanes and facilities along Glenoaks Boulevard would be retained. The lane widths for roadway elements, including medians, travel lanes, turn lanes, bike lanes, and parking/loading lanes may be refined considering local jurisdiction standards during the design phase should the Proposed Project be approved by Metro Board. Chapter

- 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR includes an addition to indicate that there is opportunity to provide additional buffers for bicycle lanes along Glenoaks Boulevard.
- 315-5 This comment states that 4-foot bike lanes are only permitted if there is no on-street parking present. The existing configuration of bicycle lanes on Central Avenue includes a 4-foot bike lane next to the parking lane in both directions. The Proposed Project would locate the bus lane adjacent to the existing bicycle lane and parking lane with bicycle bypasses at the proposed station to ensure bicyclist safety. The City of Glendale's Bicycle Transportation Plan states that a minimum width of a bike lane is 5 feet. The lane widths for roadway elements, including medians, travel lanes, turn lanes, bike lanes, and parking/loading lanes may be refined considering local jurisdiction standards during the design phase should the Proposed Project be approved by Metro Board.
- 315-6 This comment expresses the desire to create "protected intersections" to minimize conflicts between right-turning vehicles and bicycles. Design details such as the specific configuration of travel and bicycle lanes at intersections may be refined considering local jurisdiction standards during the design phase should the Proposed Project be approved by Metro Board. Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** required coordination with the City to design safe bicycle lanes.
- 315-7 This comment expresses opposition to narrowing sidewalks in the City of Burbank. The Proposed Project does not include sidewalk narrowing in Burbank.
- 315-8 This indicates a preference to only widen the roadway where necessary at intersections. Street widening is no longer proposed in Burbank for the Project.
- 315-9 The comment expresses support for center-running bus lanes for the entire length of the route along Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock. The Proposed Project includes side-running bus lanes between West Broadway and El Rio Avenue to reduce congestion and facilitate left turns while maintaining adequate walk times for pedestrians crossing Colorado Boulevard.
- 315-10 The comment addresses specific station placements indicated in the Concept Plans presented in Appendix Z of the Draft EIR. The station placements shown in the Concept Plans were developed considering site-specific opportunities and constraints, as well as safety, bus operations, and pedestrian access (including crosswalk locations).
- 315-11 The comment expresses concern for impacts to transit riders resulting from an alignment along the SR-134, including air quality, noise, and safety effects for riders. The previously proposed Harvey Drive stop in the eastbound direction would have been located at an existing bus stop for the Commuter Express with direct access to the Park and Ride Lot intended for commuters to park and use transit, whereas the stop in the westbound direction would be located adjacent to the SR-134 on-ramp.

Regarding air quality and noise risks to transit riders, as has been defined in CEQA case law (*California Building Industry Associates v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 396), agencies subject to CEQA generally are not required to analyze the impact of existing environmental conditions on a project's future users. Metro notes, however, that there is no existing regional transit service directly connecting North Hollywood to Pasadena. It is believed that commuters use SR-134 to traverse the Project area in the existing conditions, as the freeway would be faster than surface streets even during congested hours. There would not be a change to the existing health effects associated with commuting between North Hollywood and Pasadena. Exposure and health outcomes are likely to decrease as riders would spend less time on the SR-134 than under existing commuting conditions. Regarding safety, buses would operate in accordance with all laws and Metro policies related to safe operations of buses on freeways. Metro would train drivers for safe freeway operations and require reoccurring training.

- 315-12 The comment expresses a desire for a street-running option on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock with center-running bus lanes. Refer to Master Response No. 1.

Letter No. 316

Shannon Goss Schwartz

- 316-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concepts by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks

would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 317

Shant Jaltorossian

- 317-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, including the BRT operating on Broadway in Glendale (Route Option E1). The comment also supports a street-running option in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1 or F2). After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board selected Route Options A1 to B to C to D to E1 to F1 to G1 to H1 to carry forward for further consideration in the Final EIR.

Letter No. 318

Shelagh McFadden

- 318-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) but opposition to the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) and to station locations at Harvey Drive and Figueroa Boulevard. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR.

Letter No. 319

Simon Byrne

- 319-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and Pasadena (Route Option H1). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 320

Siobhán Burke

320-1 This comment introduces the following comments and an attached letter from the Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council. The attached letter is not addressed to Metro and does not directly address the Draft EIR. It is not required to be addressed by Metro in the Final EIR.

Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. Safety measures associated with the Proposed Project's BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. The Proposed Project would also include improvements designed to enhance pedestrian safety, including signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Further, the BRT service would include queue jumps at selected locations; before a green indication is given to other traffic, a traffic signal with special bus indications would display a bus-only phase, which would allow buses to enter an intersection and maneuver across mixed-flow travel lanes ahead of conflicting traffic. Since other traffic would be observing a red signal during the bus phase, adverse safety impacts associated with buses weaving across the mixed-flow travel lanes would be minimal.

As noted on page 3.2-14 in Section 3.2, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, there are no designated state scenic highways within the Project Area. In addition, buses would travel at the posted speed limit similar to existing traffic.

The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is a fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

It is not anticipated that the Proposed Project would interfere with outside dining. As stated on page 3.2-20 in Section 3.2, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

- 320-2 Refer to comment above related to design refinements in Eagle Rock associated with the Proposed Project and bicycle lanes.

The landscaping plan has not been prepared at this point in the Project's development. Trees and native landscaping will be considered in the Project's design phase. Treatment for bicycle buffers will be determined in the Project's design phase.

Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

The Proposed Project would not change the existing posted speed limits. Travel lane widths may be adjusted in some locations along the length of the project, including narrowing of travel lanes. Through travel lanes for vehicular traffic will not be narrower than 10 feet and turn lanes for vehicular traffic will not be narrower than nine feet. The dedicated bus lanes for the BRT line will be a minimum of 10 feet.

This comment expresses support for center-running bus lane treatments to minimize delays from right-turns and parking cars.

- 320-3 This comment suggests a new route option in the City of Pasadena. The Alternatives Analysis prepared for the Project, provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, includes an analysis that considers connectivity to the regional transit network, connectivity to major activity centers in the region, and socioeconomic/demographic indicators that informed the route options which were assessed in the Draft EIR. The comment does not identify any significant environmental effects that would be reduced by the route option proposed in the comment. No further response is required.

Letter No. 321

Stan Yu

- 321-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular, for routing the BRT along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Routes F1 and F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 322

Stephen Berens

- 322-1 The comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 323

Steve Messer

- 323-1 The comment expresses support for a street running option in Glendale (Route Options E1/E2) and the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concept by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of

each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, although not within the Eagle Rock segment of the Project, sidewalks may require an approximate 1 to 2 foot reduction in width to accommodate station platforms and/or widening of the roadway to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; however, the remaining sidewalk width would typically exceed 10 feet and in no instances would sidewalks be reduced to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of ADA standards. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Letter No. 324

Susan Buchanan

- 324-1 The Proposed Project would not result in changes to the existing roadway configuration or operation for the proposed route options in Pasadena, as the bus would travel in lanes shared with automobile traffic. The operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to vehicle circulation since the Project would operate in mixed-flow traffic within the City of Pasadena. The location of the terminus in Pasadena would be on Hill Avenue at Pasadena City College, near the Colorado Boulevard/Hill Avenue intersection. Refer to Figure 2-2 in the Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. Westbound buses would leave the terminal station on Hill Street northbound and turn left at the signalized Colorado Boulevard/Hill Avenue intersection. Per the Draft EIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Section 2.3.12: the “route turns east continuing along Colorado Boulevard to the eastern terminus at Pasadena City College near the Colorado Boulevard/Hill Avenue intersection.”

Letter No. 325

Susan Bull

- 325-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project reducing mixed-flow traffic lanes or affecting medians. This comment also expresses concern related to congestion and effects to businesses on Colorado Boulevard should the number of mixed-flow traffic lanes be reduced. CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). Although the effects of a project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines,

Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 326

Suzanne Smith

- 326-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating along Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 327

T Y

- 327-1 This comment expresses doubt as to the accuracy of the ridership estimates for the Proposed Project through Eagle Rock. Transit ridership was estimated through a forecasting analysis utilizing the Metro's Corridors Based Model 18. The model was developed by Metro and calibrated for the Proposed Project. The model considers current travel patterns and applies future transit service changes to forecast trips and estimate boardings. The estimated ridership for the Colorado Boulevard/Townsend Avenue station is approximately 500 riders per day.

Letter No. 328

Terenig Topjian

- 328-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, but advises Metro to consider the Project as an extension of the Metro G Line (Orange) rather than a stand-

alone project. As discussed in the Draft EIR, Chapter 2, Project Description, the Project corridor was identified in Metro's 2013 Countywide Bus Rapid Transit and Street Design Improvement Study as one of the region's most heavily traveled corridors without a premium bus service. As a result, the Proposed Project was planned to address the need for a premium bus service that connects Metro's existing rail lines and activity centers within North Hollywood, Burbank, Glendale, Eagle Rock, and Pasadena. The Proposed Project was not conceived as or designed to be an extension of the Metro G Line (Orange).

Letter No. 329

Theodore Stern

- 329-1 The comment expresses opposition to a dedicated bus lane on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and supports the SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro acknowledges receiving a large number of comments expressing a preference for the SR-134 (Route Option F3). However, Metro has also received a large number of comments expressing a preference for a BRT alignment along Colorado Boulevard, many from residents of Eagle Rock. Metro is pursuing the Proposed Project to provide improved and reliable transit service to meet the mobility needs of residents, employees, and visitors who travel within the corridor.

Letter No. 330

Thurmon Green

- 330-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). This comment further states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Many of the curb

extensions proposed as part of the City of Los Angeles Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 project would be retained.

Letter No. 331

Thurmon Green

- 331-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 332

Thurmon Green

- 332-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but opposition to the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Options E3 and F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The comment expresses support for prioritizing pedestrian and cyclist-centered infrastructure and the needs of existing riders rather than potential ones. Station amenities associated with the Proposed Project would be designed using a kit of parts approach, similar to Metro rail stations. Although the kit of parts approach is under

development by Metro, station elements as described below would be utilized to establish a baseline of amenities for platforms. At locations with higher ridership or where space allows, additional enhanced amenities would be provided to support the Proposed Project. Stations siting would allow for safe and accessible paths of travel for transit riders including those accessing stations on foot, bike, and other rolling modes. It is anticipated that the stations servicing the Proposed Project may include the following elements:

- Canopy and wind screen;
- Seating (benches);
- Illumination, security video and/or emergency call button;
- Real-time bus arrival information;
- Bike racks; and
- Monument sign and map displays.

Letter No. 333

Thurmon Green

333-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Letter No. 334

Tim Leetrakul

- 334-1 The existing Metro Line 501 maintains connection between the North Hollywood Station and Pasadena under the Nextgen Bus Plan. NextGen weekday service frequency on Metro Line 501 is proposed to be every 15 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods, with service every 15-30 minutes in the weekday off-peak periods. The Proposed Project would not alter service of the Metro Line 501.

Letter No. 335

Tim Mellin

- 335-1 The commenter suggests operating buses on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) on weekends and operating buses on SR-134 (Route Option F3) during the weekdays. A hybrid operational route is not being considered for the Proposed Project. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 336

Tim Mellin

- 336-1 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR or the Proposed Project. Per Response to Comment PH 2-8 included in this Final EIR, bus design throughout the Metro system has incorporated fixed closed windows to maximize heating, venting, and air conditioning (HVAC) system. To leave suggestions, opinions, or other comments regarding Metro services, please email Metro's Customer Relations team at customerrelations@metro.net.

Letter No. 337

Timothy Eckert

- 337-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 338

Tom Krumal

- 338-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and states that the majority of the community supports using SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require lead agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, Metro intends to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project.

Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and

policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

Letter No. 339

Tony Butka

- 339-1 The comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project. Metro anticipates that regional ridership will return to a pre-COVID level prior to the Proposed Project opening date of 2024. Please note that many commuters are not able to work remotely due to job requirements (e.g., essential workers).

Letter No. 340

Tyler Bonstead

- 340-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project.
- 340-2 The Project includes a BRT station in proximity to the Olive Avenue/Verdugo Avenue intersection.
- 340-3 Metro acknowledges the comment related to streetscape improvements on Olive Avenue through Magnolia Park. As discussed in Section 3.2, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, implementation of Mitigation Measures **VIS-1** and **VIS-2** would reduce potential visual impacts by requiring landscaping and streetscape beautification
- 340-4 Metro standard practice is to coordinate with local jurisdictions to minimize construction effects. In addition, as shown in the Executive Summary, Mitigation Measures **TRA-1** through **TRA-4** are designed to reduce potential for construction activities to effect traffic and transportation. Mitigation Measure **NOI-1** is designed to control construction noise.

Letter No. 341

Vdkbod (Null)

- 341-1 This comment expresses opposition to constructing the Proposed Project on Eagle Rock Boulevard. Note that the Proposed Project will not travel on Eagle Rock Boulevard. There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Trees that could be removed within

the City of Los Angeles are non-native and are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Letter No. 342

Vdkbod (Null)

- 342-1 The comment expresses opposition for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 343

Wajinc (Null)

- 343-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and expresses support for the BRT operating in SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 344

Walt Kasha

- 344-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating in Glendale on surface streets, for reasons including increased traffic and impacted parking due to dedicated bus lanes and impacts to neighborhood character and safety.
- 344-2 Draft EIR Appendix Z Concept Plans indicate that the current plans would repurpose one travel lane for a dedicated bus lane in each direction along Glenoaks Boulevard, Central Avenue, and Broadway. In May 2021, the Metro Board of Directors selected the Proposed Project which included Broadway (Route Option E1 in the Draft EIR) as

the Proposed Project route through Glendale. There would be minor removal of parking spaces and impacts to medians in proximity to the proposed stations.

- 344-3 Metro disagrees that the street-running BRT would affect neighborhood character. No specific comment on this issue is provided related to the contents of the Draft EIR and no further response is required. The bus fleet would be maintained daily, and Metro disagrees with the characterization that buses are dirty and unsafe.

The comment expresses concern related to the Proposed Project leading to increased density in Glendale. Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth in housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. As discussed in Chapter 4.0, Other Environmental Considerations, the local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor

Letter No. 345

Warren Brodine

- 345-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and preference for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

- 345-2 The public review period began on October 26, 2020 and was initially scheduled to end on December 10, 2020. The comment period was extended to December 28, 2020, to accommodate community requests for additional time to review the Draft EIR. CEQA requires a 45-day review period for EIRs submitted to the State Clearinghouse. Metro extended the review period to approximately 60 days, allowing ample time for public comment.
- 345-3 Metro acknowledges the commentor's concern related to the Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council. Please direct specific concerns directly to that community group.
- 345-4 Metro anticipates COVID restrictions will be lifted by the time the Project is expected to open in 2024 and that regional ridership will return to pre-COVID level prior to that date. Please note that many commuters are not able to work remotely due to job requirements (e.g., essential services).
- 345-5 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F1/F2) and preference for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3).

Letter No. 346

Will Proctor

- 346-1 This comment expresses general support for the Proposed Project, primarily the center-running bus lanes treatment whenever possible and protected bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 347

William Walker

- 347-1 The Draft EIR was available on Metro's website beginning on October 26, 2020. The website link is <https://www.metro.net/projects/noho-pasadena-corridor/>. Due to the large size of the file, the Draft EIR was not provided in a single PDF document.

Letter No. 348

WM Johnson

- 348-1 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Letter No. 349

yourwhathurtsu

- 349-1 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service) to be assessed in the Draft EIR. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Letter No. 350

Zachary Rynew

- 350-1 The comment expresses support for the Beautiful Boulevard proposal in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No.1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock incorporate the Beautiful Boulevard's design concepts by providing a new protected bicycle facility along Colorado Boulevard that would route bicycles to the outside of the parking lane. Other aspects of the Beautiful Boulevard design concept that have been incorporated into the design include green pavement markings for the proposed bicycle facility. These improvements would be consistent with the Mobility Plan, which requires roadways with multiple enhanced networks to be designed to incorporate elements of each enhanced network. Further detail on changes to the bicycle infrastructure as a result of the refined Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

4.7 RESPONSES TO PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearing on November 12, 2020

Alex Boekelheide

- PH1-1 The comment from Pasadena City College expresses support for the Proposed Project and a station serving the campus. The comment requests Metro consider reduced fares for students who are facing hardships from transportation costs.

Oscar Pena

PH1-2 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating center-running bus lanes through Eagle Rock and raises concerns regarding street-running bus lanes through Glendale due to slower bus speeds. Metro acknowledged that street-running buses operating in mixed-flow traffic would travel at slower average speeds than buses operating in dedicated lanes. The comment also opposes shared bicycle and bus lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Mona Field

PH1-3 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). The comment also opposes shared bicycle and bus lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Mehmet Berker

PH1-4 This comment expresses opposition for shared bicycle and bus lanes. The comment also supports buses that allow boarding on both sides to facilitate a BRT line that includes median- and side-running bus lane treatments. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard, both of which do not include shared bus/bike facilities and provide parking-protected bicycle lanes. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. The only proposed shared bus/bike facilities would be along Broadway in Glendale. On Broadway, the existing roadway is designated a Class III bike route and consists of a vehicle lane with bicycle markings indicating a shared vehicle/bike lane. The Proposed Project would replace this lane with a dedicated bus lane that would allow shared use by bicycles. This would provide a safety benefit for bicyclists along Broadway as bicyclists would be sharing the facility with relatively few bus vehicles compared to existing volumes of personal automobiles using the shared

lane. Metro studied the use of buses that allow for two-sided boarding outside of this Project. This style of bus is not part of the existing Metro bus fleet. Metro intends to utilize buses from its fleet which is shared across multiple bus lines and the type of buses in the Metro bus fleet would be the same with or without the Proposed Project. Center-running or median-running bus configurations with right-side boarding are proposed along Vineland Avenue in North Hollywood, along Glenoaks Boulevard in Burbank and Glendale, and along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock.

Lisa Payne

PH1-5 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Israel

PH1-6 This comment expresses support for the center-running bus lanes through Eagle Rock (Route Option F1). The comment opposes shared bicycle and bus lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Michael McDonald

PH1-7 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to not including dedicated bicycle lanes (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised

design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Darren Hall

PH1-8 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to removal of bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR. After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board selected the F1 Route Option in Eagle Rock. After further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard including an option similar to the Beautiful Boulevard proposal. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

David Newman

PH1-9 This comment expresses opposition to removal of mixed-flow travel lanes on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock.

Sebastian Reyes

PH1-10 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock and opposition to removal of bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Additionally, the comment expresses a desire to prioritize bicyclists and pedestrians along the route, including the intersection of Vineland Avenue and Lankershim Boulevard in North Hollywood. Segment A of the Proposed Project includes the upgrade of existing Class II bike lanes along Vineland Avenue into Class IV two-way

cycle-track bike lanes through the Vineland Avenue/Lankershim Boulevard/Camarillo Street intersection continuing further south to Hortense Street. At this intersection, Segment A would also include crosswalk improvements designed to enhance pedestrian safety.

Cherryl Weaver

PH1-11 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project either operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3) or the side-running bus lanes treatment should the BRT operate on Colorado Boulevard (Route Option F2). Regarding Colorado Boulevard, the comment supports having two mixed-flow traffic lanes and opposes removal of medians. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro anticipates local bus service will provide connections to the Hollywood Burbank Airport.

Ed Stevens

PH1-12 This comment expresses support for the center-running bus lanes treatment (Route Option F1) on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The comment expresses a desire to improve the pedestrian experience. Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Anonymous

PH1-13 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project.

Sean Nasser

PH1-14 Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, Metro intends to preserve as much parking as possible along the route. Note the side-running bus lanes configuration developed for Olive Avenue (between Buena Vista Street and Lake Street) since the circulation of the Draft EIR retains the on-street parking in this segment of the Proposed Project.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Natalie Freidberg

PH1-15 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. The Project does not include street widening in Eagle Rock. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Andrew Jacobs

PH1-16 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

While pedestrian and bicycle safety has been considered during this project's development, Metro does not have the authority to construct traffic calming measures unrelated to BRT operations. Please contact your local elected representative for assistance with this matter.

John Kerr

PH1-17 The comment expresses disappointment that the Proposed Project appears to be designed around the needs of private motorists. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the revised design is consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

The VMT presented in the Draft EIR is for the countywide roadway network, which is the reason the total VMT reduction appears negligible. It is anticipated that the Proposed Project would reduce the regional VMT by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.

Fred Dresch

PH1-18 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating along Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) due to the possibility of increased congestion and zoning density. Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a

discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

Regarding outreach, to encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period and Draft EIR review period, legal advertisement notices were published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) notices and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts. The hearings also provided simultaneous Spanish translation, and previous meetings for the Proposed Project included live Spanish and Armenian translators.

Chloe Renée Ziegler

PH1-19 This comment expresses support to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The comment also expresses support to preserve medians and preference for new landscaping. There is potential for tree and vegetation removal within the City of Los Angeles. Based on observations during the windshield survey, the area is fully developed transit corridor. Vegetation is limited to common ornamental trees, grasses, and shrubs that are not protected under the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree

Relocation and Replacement Ordinance. In accordance with Mitigation Measure **VIS-1**, replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction's Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk. Metro would replace street trees at a 2:1 ratio, as specified by City standards.

Metro acknowledges and appreciates the public involvement in Eagle Rock throughout the CEQA process, including the Land Use Committee members of the Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council.

Alejandro Pardo

PH1-20 This comment expresses opposition to removing a mixed-flow travel lane and expresses general concerns related to traffic and parking. Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

Regarding business access, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in the corridor. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Kim

PH1-21 This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and support for the BRT operating on SR-134. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the

Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

DASH bus service is operated by the City of Los Angeles. DASH is a local service that would not meet all Project Objectives listed in Chapter 2, Project Description, which include enhancing connectivity to Metro and other regional transit services.

Emergency evacuation is addressed in Section 4.1.2, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. As stated therein, the Proposed Project would be constructed along or near several emergency/disaster routes, including the SR-134 Freeway, Colorado Boulevard, Glenoaks Boulevard, Olive Avenue, and Lankershim Boulevard. Los Angeles County and each of the cities affected by the Proposed Project have developed emergency response plans. Temporary lane closures may be required and emergency routes may be temporarily disrupted during construction activities. The Project Area is a fully built roadway network with parallel streets in every direction. Detour routes, of which there are multiple options, would be established in consultation with emergency service providers. Although lane closures are anticipated, full street closures are not anticipated, and roadway access would be maintained to accommodate response to emergencies. Construction activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction activities. After construction, the bus lanes would be open to emergency vehicles, which could improve response plans. During emergencies, the bus-only lanes would be open to all evacuating vehicles. Operational activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The Proposed Project would operate on existing roadways and would not affect the ability of emergency services to serve the Project Area in the event of an emergency or disaster. Bus-only lanes would be open to emergency vehicles, which could reduce response times. During emergencies, the bus-only lanes would be open to all evacuating vehicles. Operational activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to operational activities.

Ben Foushee

PH1-22 This comment expresses concerns related to the Proposed Project sharing lanes with other bus services and bicycles under Route Option F2. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Pat Niessen

PH1-23 This comment generally expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Blvd through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). This comment urges Metro to prioritize bicycles and the pedestrian experience. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Zachary Rynew

PH1-24 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, although the comment asserts that the current design would not provide adequate service. The comment also states that center-running bus lanes are the preferred solution.

Joyce

PH1-25 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

The Proposed Project does not propose reducing the number of existing buses. Metro monitors existing Metro bus services and makes changes to Metro bus routes where warranted based on ridership, demand, efficiency and other factors.

DASH bus service is operated by the City of Los Angeles. It is a local service that would not meet all Project Objectives listed in Chapter 2, Project Description, which include enhancing connectivity to Metro and other regional transit services.

Felicia Garcia

PH1-26 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to

development of the two design options and the selection process. The design option converting one travel lane in each direction would have fewer conflicts with the ATP curb extensions being implemented by the City of Los Angeles than the design option retaining both travel lanes in each direction.

Regarding outreach, to encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period and Draft EIR review period, legal advertisement notices were published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) notices and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts. The hearings also provided simultaneous Spanish translation, and previous meetings for the Proposed Project included live Spanish and Armenian translators.

Marc Caraan

PH1-27 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, including a dedicated bus lane. The comment does not support shared bus and bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR and to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Severin Martinez

PH1-28 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock but expressed concern with the design options in the Draft EIR (Route Options F1/F2). The comment expresses support for context sensitive design that supports walking, biking, and transit. Metro is designing a project that maximizes walking, biking, and transit. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR for related changes to the Proposed Project and Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure proposed for the Final EIR.

Ava V.

PH1-29 The CEQA Guidelines do not directly address social justice and equity. Metro has considered social justice and equity through the deliberate location of stations to service populations. Metro takes social justice and equity very seriously with its own Metro Board adopted Equity Platform. Metro's Office of Equity and Research is responsible for enacting the adopted goals of the Equity Platform and ensure that the Proposed Project meets equity needs. Metro has also prepared a Title VI Equity Analysis which was reviewed by the Federal Transit Administration.

Elliot The Colorist

PH1-30 The comment expresses general support for the Proposed Project, although opposition to reducing Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock to one lane in each direction.

Michael Sweeney

PH1-31 This comment expresses general support for the Proposed Project but states concern that the road configurations proposed for Route Options F1/F2 do not appear to adequately ensure pedestrian and bicycle safety. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. The refined Project route eliminated Route Option F2 from further consideration. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Potential impacts to transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities and safety are addressed in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project's potential impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions in section 3.8, greenhouse gas emissions. As discussed in impacts related to transportation, safety, and greenhouse gas emissions. Metro is designing a project that maximizes walking, biking, and transit. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR for related changes to the Proposed Project and Master Response No. 1.

Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits, obey traffic laws in a similar manner as automobiles, and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Fred Dresch

PH1-32 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro has no authority to change zoning regulations as this power lies solely with the jurisdictions along the corridor or possibly the State legislature. For a discussion of the

Proposed Project's potential land use and planning impacts, refer to Section 4.1.4, pages 4-13 to 4-16 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of the Proposed Project's population and housing impacts, refer to Section 4.1.6, pages 4-18 to 4-19 of the Draft EIR; for a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, refer to Section 4.3, pages 4-32 to 4-33 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project could indirectly affect development in the Project Area by focusing growth on housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. This development pattern would be consistent with regional goals. The local land use plans for the jurisdictions along the project corridor include several goals and policies centered around establishing transit centers, maximizing transit service, accommodating future traffic demands, reducing reliance on the automobile, decreasing congestion, minimizing environmental impacts, increasing transit ridership, and developing compact pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use neighborhoods with accommodations for bicyclists. Importantly, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS indicates that most of the Project Area is already located within a High Quality Transit Area including the entirety of Colorado Boulevard. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with or supportive of many of the goals and policies of the applicable jurisdictions along the corridor.

Joyce

- PH1-33 Metro acknowledges that accidents on SR-134 can cause traffic on parallel surface streets. This is part of the existing condition that would not change with implementation of the Proposed Project.

Barbara Kremins

- PH1-34 Emergency evacuation is addressed in Section 4.1.2, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. As stated therein, the Proposed Project would be constructed along or near several emergency/disaster routes, including the SR-134 Freeway, Colorado Boulevard, Glenoaks Boulevard, Olive Avenue, and Lankershim Boulevard. Los Angeles County and each of the cities affected by the Proposed Project have developed emergency response plans. Temporary lane closures may be required and emergency routes may be temporarily disrupted during construction activities. The Project Area is a fully built roadway network with parallel streets in every direction. Detour routes, of which there are multiple options, would be established in consultation with emergency service providers. Although lane closures are anticipated, full street closures are not anticipated, and roadway access would be maintained to accommodate response to emergencies. Construction activities would not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction activities. After construction, the bus lanes would be open to emergency vehicles, which could improve response plans. During emergencies, the bus-only lanes would be open to all evacuating vehicles. Operational activities would not impede public access to

emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

After construction, the bus lanes could potentially be used to facilitate an evacuation if required. Emergency services would be allowed to access the bus lanes. Operational activities would also not impede public access to emergency/disaster routes and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

Regarding small businesses, CEQA does not require social and economic impacts to be evaluated in an EIR. Metro notes, however, that the transit project would improve access to many key activity centers, including local businesses. The increased foot traffic near station areas would support and benefit local businesses.

Natalie Freidberg

PH1-35 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and states that the BRT would benefit local businesses.

Cherryl Weaver

PH1-36 Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities, although Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Eagle Rock.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Pat Niessen

PH1-37 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, but would like a better balance between bike safety, pedestrian safety, and providing improved transit along Colorado Boulevard. After consideration of public comments and further public

engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Public Hearing on November 14, 2020

Marcel W.

PH2-1 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 as the primary route (Route Option F3). Secondly, this comment expresses support for the side-running bus lanes treatment on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro standard practice is to coordinate with local jurisdictions to minimize construction effects. In addition, as shown in the Executive Summary, Mitigation Measures **TRA-1** through **TRA-4** are designed to reduce potential for construction activities to effect traffic and transportation. Mitigation Measure **NOI-1** is designed to control construction noise. Regarding businesses and parking, Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities, although Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Sam Lerman-Hahn

PH2-2 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating in center-running bus lanes on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Option F1) and in Glendale (Segment D and E). The comment also expresses opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). The comment further expresses opposition to shared bus and bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. The Proposed Project would operate in median-running bus lanes along Glenoaks Boulevard through the City of Glendale from Alameda Avenue to Central Avenue.

Paul Dyson

PH2-3 The comment expresses general opposition to the Proposed Project stating that the Proposed Project does not seem matched to the corridor's transit needs. The commenter believes the ridership projections are optimistic and prefers a distribution of investment into the individual corridor cities to provide improvements to their local transit services. It should be noted that the Line 501 bus has far fewer stops compared to the proposed BRT service, which is one of the reasons why higher ridership is forecasted.

Sergio Hernandez

PH2-4 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating as a center-running treatment on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Option F1). The comment also expresses opposition to the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Birgitta Martinez

PH2-5 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and prioritizes bus only lanes and protected bike lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer

to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Joanne Knokomodo

PH2-6 This comment expresses general opposition to the Proposed Project.

Niall Huffman

PH2-7 The comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and states preference for street-running alternatives in order to maximize access points to businesses. The comment also encourages Metro to prioritize active transportation modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1.

Tim

PH2-8 This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR but expresses concern over bus window design. The commenter requests that buses for the Proposed Project have the ability to open the windows to allow greater air filtration. In this regard, bus design throughout the Metro system has incorporated fixed closed windows to maximize heating, venting, and air conditioning (HVAC) system.

The commenter suggests operating buses on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) on weekends and operating buses on SR-134 (Route Option F3) during the weekdays. A hybrid operational route is not being considered for the Proposed Project. Metro Rapid Line 780 has been consolidated with Line 180 as part of Metro's NextGen Bus Plan. Line 180, which connects Pasadena to the I-10 and I-110 Freeways, operates every 10 minutes throughout most of the day on weekdays and with a slightly reduced frequency on weekends.

John Vu

PH2-9 This comment expresses opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) and opposition removal of bicycle lanes on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Kim

PH2-10 This comment expresses skepticism about the Proposed Project due to declining regional ridership trends. The comment further expresses support for route options which utilize the SR-134 freeway versus local roadways to provide faster service. After consideration of public comments, the Metro Board selected Route Options A1 to B to C to D to E1 to F1 to G1 to H1. Route Options B and G1 include operations on the SR-134 in Burbank and Pasadena. It should be noted that the alternatives analysis projected higher ridership for alternatives operating primarily along local roadways despite slower end-to-end travel times in part due to the fact that more stations would be served.

Cyndi Otterson

PH2-11 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to not including dedicated bicycle lanes (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced

network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Jared Berenholz

PH2-12 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and preservation of bicycle lanes. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Laura Gonzalez

PH2-13 This comment expresses opposition to the removal of bicycle lanes on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Brandon Yung

PH2-14 The comment expresses concern for bicycle safety. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR. Refer to Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR for a discussion on bicycle safety. In addition, in response to public comments, the Proposed Project includes buffers to existing Class II lanes where present, or upgrades of Class II lanes to Class IV cycle-tracks, and incorporation of bicycle by-pass lanes at curbside stations to eliminate bicycle conflicts with buses at loading zones.

Tamala Takahashi

PH2-15 The comment identifies existing safety concerns within the City of Burbank at the Olive Avenue/Sparks Street/Verdugo Avenue intersection and the Olive Avenue bridge that should be considered in the design of the Project. Additionally, the comment notes the importance of Metro's NextGen Bus Plan and expresses concern with how the Project would affect curb parking, including delivery vehicles.

Chapter 5.0, Cumulative Impacts, of the Draft EIR identifies the Olive Avenue/Sparks Street/Verdugo Avenue Intersection Improvements as a related project which was reviewed for potential cumulative effects and conflicts. As discussed in Chapter 5.0, it

is anticipated that the Proposed Project would be integrated with the planned improvements at the intersection. It should be noted that the Project no longer includes any improvements to the Olive Avenue bridge.

As stated in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would be designed per applicable State, Metro, and city design criteria and standards. The safety measures of the Proposed Project include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Further, the BRT service would include queue jumps at selected locations, at which a traffic signal with special bus indications would display a bus-only phase. This would allow buses to enter an intersection before a green indication is given to other traffic in order to allow the bus to maneuver across mixed-flow lanes ahead of conflicting traffic.

The Proposed Project has been integrated into the planning effort for the NextGen Bus Plan and both projects are compatible with each other. The NextGen Bus Plan is discussed in Chapter 5.0, Cumulative Impacts, of the Draft EIR, and no significant cumulative impacts or conflicts between the projects were identified.

John Gordon

PH2-16 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular a center-running bus lanes treatment on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock that maintains bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Jonathan Matz

PH2-17 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular a center-running bus lanes treatment on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock that maintains bicycle lanes. The comment also expresses opposition to BRT stations being located on SR-134. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR.

Aaron Stein-Chester

PH2-18 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular a center-running bus lanes treatment on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock that maintains bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Marcel W.

PH2-19 This comment is acknowledged and does not address the contents of the Draft EIR.

Christopher Cotton

PH2-20 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project. The comment advises route options that connect Central Avenue to Colorado Boulevard (Route Option E2) and recommends a future extension of a light rail line connecting the Metro G Line (Orange) busway to Pasadena, as well as integration with the existing Metro Line 501 bus route. The comment also expresses support for design options that include buses, cars, and bikes.

Amanda Colligan

PH2-21 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project but states opposition to the removal of the dedicated bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Option F2). The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design

options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Ashley Atkinsin

PH2-22 This comment expresses support for Proposed Project but requests consistency with the Take Back the Boulevard project. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and vehicle) when designing a street that includes multiple modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Natalie Freidberg

PH2-23 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, specifically the center-running treatment through Eagle Rock (Route Option F1). The comment also expresses support for maintaining bicycle lanes and consistency with the Mobility Plan and the Take Back the Boulevard initiative. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-5** would ensure that the Proposed Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with Mobility Plan 2035 avoiding potential conflicts between the Proposed Project operations and bicycles. Further, the revised design is consistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan, which identifies Colorado Boulevard as part of the Transit Enhanced Network and the Bicycle

Enhanced Network. This requires designs to include both dedicated transit facilities and protected bicycle facilities. In addition, the Final EIR's design options on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock are consistent with Mobility Plan Policies 2.6 and 2.9. Policy 2.6 calls for safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities. Policy 2.9 calls for the consideration of each enhanced network (transit, bicycle, and motor vehicles) when designing a complete street that includes multiple transportation modes. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details.

Felicia Garcia

PH2-24 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular a design that maintains bicycle lanes. The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock.

After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Regarding outreach, to encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period and Draft EIR review period, legal advertisement notices were published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) notices and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts. The hearings also provided simultaneous Spanish translation, and previous meetings for the Proposed Project included live Spanish and Armenian translators.

Ben Foushee

PH2-25 This comment expresses general concerns related to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard (Route Options F1/F2) and SR-134 (Route Option F3) through Eagle Rock, stating that none of the route options provide adequate transit service. Metro disagrees with the characterization that none of the Proposed Project's Route Options provide adequate service. The Proposed Project has been designed with a goal of advancing a premium transit service that is more competitive with auto travel than existing service.

Geoffry Nutting

PH2-26 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Don

PH2-27 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project and the development and maintenance of alternative transportation infrastructure.

Christopher Cotton

PH2-28 This comment suggests a potential extension of the route to the Sierra Madre Villa Station. A connection to this station is not being considered at this time. The Project will connect with the Metro L Line (Gold) at Memorial Park Station in Old Pasadena.

Natalie Freidberg

PH2-29 To encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period and Draft EIR review period, legal advertisement notices were published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) notices and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts.

Benjamin Phelps

PH2-30 This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and encourages improving pedestrian safety. After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process. With regard to the intersection of Vineland Avenue and Lankershim Boulevard, the Proposed Project would add a crosswalk to shorten the crossing distance for pedestrians across Lankershim Boulevard. In addition, the traffic signal will protect pedestrians from cross-

traffic and will provide adequate pedestrian crossing times. Finally Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily and approximately 9,418 lbs/day of CO₂e in 2042.

4.8 RESPONSES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS AT PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearing on November 12, 2020

Anonymous

Comment 1: I want my kids to have access to effective public transit on the corner of my block!

Response 1: The comment requests convenient transit access.

Comment 2: Angelinos love their cars. Adding more buses is not going to make them ride them. During rush hour, Glen Oaks is jammed packed. And now you're thinking removing a lane and dedicating it to a mode of transportation which is not desirable? I can foresee in five years this project just bleeding money.

Response 2: The comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project.

Ben Foushee

Comment 1: have any considerations been given to the fact that the stretch of Colorado through Eagle Rock was once Route 66?

Response 1: Metro is aware that Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock was part of Route 66. It has no bearing on the CEQA impact analysis associated with operating a BRT line on this street.

Comment 2: how do all buses utilizing the same lane when other buses have at least 4x more stops than the 2 for BRT? and so all buses will merge into traffic when approaching bike in the proposed F2 option?

Proposed Project - F2

Colorado Boulevard: -

Response 2: The Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes in Eagle Rock. Route Option F2 was eliminated from further consideration. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Comment 3: is consideration being given to the fact that there may be less commuters post covid, with more businesses and schools embracing working remotely?

Response 3: Metro anticipates that regional ridership will return to pre-COVID level prior to the Proposed Project opening date of 2024. Please note that many commuters are not able to work remotely due to job requirements (e.g., essential services).

Comment 4: please explore using funds to improve and extend existing bus lines, Alternative 2, seems to be the best move forward with the stress the pandemic has caused to all businesses

Response 4: The comment expresses support for Alternative 2 to the Proposed Project, which is discussed in the Alternatives Section of the Draft EIR. Alternative 2 would implement improved bus service instead of a new BRT line.

Comment 5: but on Montrose they don't have 5 bus lines running?

Response 5: The comment is not clear enough to allow a response.

Comment 6: why in consideration of F3, is there no thought of having the stops on the actual freeway. I am told F3 is not considered because of time it takes to get on and off the freeway. Keep bus on freeway. Have a stop below freeway. Have an elevator and real-time info when bus arrives. Make the stop a hub. Look at sales force in SF

Response 6: This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Comment 7: how will the entry to 134 look using F2?

Response 7: After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Route Option F2 has been eliminated from further consideration. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Bill Lam

Comment 1: If the BRT segment is built on a freeway or locally, then will it conflict with any other bus lines such as Metro Local lines, Metro Rapid lines, Metro Express lines, or other municipal bus lines? I feel like the center median is not a good choice if almost all of the local segment is chosen because it's blocking cars turning left on the center lane maybe run at the side or curb running lane.

Response 1: Regarding conflicts with existing transit services, the Proposed Project has been designed to be compatible with existing bus services including the reimagined Metro bus network resulting from the NextGen Bus Plan.

Comment 2: I also want to add the mixed flow option on my Q&A comment which is my top choice for the BRT project

Response 2: The comment expresses support for mixed-flow operations.

Chloe Renée Ziegler

Comment: It would be nice if you acknowledged the residents and business owners of Eagle Rock, giving their time and attention to this meeting. Also the Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council board members, including the Land Use Committee members who have been participating in this DEIR?

Response: Metro acknowledges and appreciates the public involvement in Eagle Rock throughout the CEQA process, including the Land Use Committee members of the Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council.

Clyde B. Brown

Comment: Regarding proposed bus lane down the middle of Colorado Blvd. in Eagle Rock.... many reasons for this project to be stopped: the fire department is on the boulevard and needs tremendous space to get in and out of their station... businesses along the Blvd. need huge delivery truck access day and night. traffic detours send every car up to Las Flores or Hill Drive, both being way too narrow for extra traffic and are in neighborhoods full of children, resulting in large accident risks. Crosswalks are in jeopardy for people being struck, including so many children who cross to get to school and also church. The businesses on Colorado are already struggling because of no parking. The busses that go thru Colorado boulevard now do not have a good ridership as it is. We, of all towns, do NOT need any kind of bus or vehicle running down the middle of the Main Street. The Bus needs to go along the 134 freeway... it's such a total "no brainer". My wife has lived here her entire life, 77 years, her parents before her and her grandparents were two of the founding families. My daughter chose to live here with her family because Eagle Rock is a wonderful small town to be in and to raise a family. And now the bureaucrats want to ruin one of the last small,

quiet and beautiful communities left in Los Angeles. It's an insane idea! If they would take the time to interview the business owners in E.R. and some of the long-time residents, they would become informed as to what a disaster this project will bring upon hundreds of people who love this community as it is. Our Eagle Rock is wonderful just like it is.

Response: This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3) and opposition to the BRT operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. The BRT system will follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits, obey traffic laws in a similar manner as automobiles, and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Regarding fire department access, it is Metro standard practice to coordinate with emergency services during final design to confirm that station access is not inhibited in any way. Regarding crosswalks, the Proposed Project would improve pedestrian safety by adding signalized crosswalks to Colorado Boulevard. As stated in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, emergency vehicles would be permitted to use the Proposed Project's dedicated bus lanes, and emergency response time would be no worse than under current conditions and would likely be improved.

Regarding businesses and parking, Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, Metro intends to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). Although the effects of a project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is

coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Dex

Comment: Colorado blvd is constantly congested with vehicles running from Glendale to Pasadena and vice versa. There are already a few buses and Dash that are currently underutilized. We do not need more traffic and a dedicated bus line. It will just add to the congestion. You ought to use the 134 fwy and bypass Colorado Blvd. This project can only benefit property developers and not the house owners of Eagle Rock, CA.

Response: This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 through Eagle Rock (Route Option F3). This comment expresses opposition to the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Ellen Goldberg

Comment: I do live right near the intersection of Lankershim and Camarillo and Vineland and I am very concerned with the impact on this already difficult intersection. Especially for pedestrians. It's a very walkable area except for this intersection as

it is. Any implementation of the BRT needs to upgrade pedestrian planning or risk making this intersection a bigger nightmare.

Response: This comment asks Metro to upgrade the pedestrian plans at the intersection of Lankershim/Camarillo/Vineland in North Hollywood. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety for all street users. Safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, along with signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas.

Manuel Eduardo Hernández

Comment: What's going to happen with the 501? Will it be cancelled as a result due to duplication?

Response: The Proposed Project would not affect the Metro Line 501. The Metro Line 501 maintains connection between the North Hollywood Station and Pasadena under the NextGen Bus Plan. NextGen weekday service frequency on Metro Line 501 Line is every 20 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods, with service every 30 minutes in the weekday off-peak periods.

Mona Field

Comment 1: Where is rep. For councilman de Leon?

Response 1: The comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR.

Comment 2: Is Eagle Rock chamber of commerce here?

Response 2: No members of the Eagle Rock Chamber of Commerce identified themselves at the first Draft EIR public hearing.

Pat Niessen

Comment 1: Thank you Metro for providing this opportunity and for allowing the public an opportunity to provide feedback. There is an opportunity being lost here to make streets equitable for all - pedestrians, bike riders, and all multi-modal forms of transit. Giving the priority to car traffic over alternative means of transit set up the city to never get to where it can be. I'm a lifelong transit rider, and will continue to use it, but please consider all possible safety possibilities for bike riders and pedestrians.

Response 1: This comment asks Metro to consider all possible safety possibilities for bike riders and pedestrians. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. Safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb

ramps, along with signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for additional details regarding the Proposed Project's active transportation improvements, including pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.

Comment 2: Why is Fred given 2 opportunities to speak?

Response 2: All speakers were allowed equal opportunity to provide multiple comments.

Patricia Yossen

Comment: My name is Patricia Yossen and I am a 10 year Eagle Rock resident and I support the BRT on Colorado with a dedicated lane. We live a block and a half from Colorado and have children at Dahlia Heights elementary. I think this is a important transportation option for my family and neighbors and also for people from outside the area who otherwise may find it hard to visit and patronize local businesses. It is a socially just option that will benefit people of a diverse economic background, enhance public safety, and be more environmentally friendly. This should not be a NIMBY situation: Eagle Rock will benefit economically in the long term if better public transportation reaches here; a bus lane on the freeway will simply push people around the area and will actually hurt businesses in the long term. Thank you.

Response: This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) but opposition to the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Sean Nasseri

Comment: I am a business owner in Burbank. The proposed route would greatly negatively impact my business as it would take away any parking options for customers. What steps is Metro taking to make sure businesses are not negatively impacted?

Response: Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. Note the side-running bus lanes configuration developed for Olive Avenue (between Buena Vista Street and Lake Street) since the circulation of the Draft EIR retains the on-street parking in this segment of the Proposed Project. Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines, Section

15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible in Burbank. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Tim Lindholm

Comment: I support any option in eagle rock that uses colorado boulevard and not the 134.

Response: This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project operating on Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock (Route Options F1/F2) and opposition to the BRT operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3). After consideration of public comments and further public engagement, the Final EIR includes two design options on Colorado Boulevard. Refer to Chapter 2, Project Description, in this Final EIR for an explanation of the two design options. The Metro Board will select one of the design options after considering the Final EIR. Refer to Master Response No. 1 for additional details related to development of the two design options and the selection process.

Public Hearing on November 14, 2020

Adrian

Comment: We currently have Dash, Metro, Metro Rapid, Uber and Lyft. Why do we need another bus line in Eagle Rock? Has a needs assessment been done? There is no need to take another lane and parking away. Our small businesses are already hurting. Not giving customers a place to park will further impact these businesses.

Response: Project Objectives, as listed in Chapter 2, Project Description, include enhancing connectivity to Metro and other regional transit services. This would not be achieved through reliance on limited, local DASH service or private rideshare companies. Similarly, Metro local service would not provide the connectivity

associated with the BRT. The NextGen Bus Plan began in 2018 and is not part of the Proposed Project.

This comment opposes the removal of a mixed-flow traffic lane and parking. Regarding businesses and parking, Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible along the route.

Regarding the contents of the Draft EIR, the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15131, Economic and Social Effects, states that "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes." As a result, the Draft EIR does not consider economic impacts as environmental impacts. The indirect environmental effects of the Proposed Project's social and economic impacts are assessed, as applicable, in the individual resource sections of the Draft EIR. Metro values local business and is committed to reducing potential negative effects of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response No. 2.

Adriana Quinn

Comment: Anything that will eliminate parking is NOT acceptable.

Response: The comment opposes parking removal related to the Proposed Project. Metro acknowledges that the Proposed Project would remove parking in some locations. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require Lead Agencies to assess the effects of a project on parking facilities; however, Metro has studied the effects of the Proposed Project on parking and is coordinating with local jurisdictions to alleviate effects. During future design phases of the Proposed Project, it is Metro's intention to preserve as much parking as possible.

Allen Carter

Comment: Will the dedicated bus lanes be protected from other vehicles using them? Perhaps using either raised curbs, plastic bollards, or police enforcement?

Response: As the design for the Proposed Project is advanced, options for barriers between the bus lanes will be investigated. Options along the route may include signage and pavement markings, raised delineators, rumble strips, and raised curbs or medians. Regarding enforcement of bus lane restrictions, Metro will coordinate with the City and local police service agencies to develop appropriate enforcement strategies. Per newly enacted legislation under Assembly Bill (AB) 917, operations of the Proposed Project may incorporate camera enforcement on the buses.

Anonymous

Comment 1: what's being done to ensure speed? Current BRTs & LRTs in LA are excruciatingly slow.

Response 1: This comment expresses concern about route travel times. The Proposed Project is a premium transit service that includes dedicated bus lanes, enhanced stations, all-door boarding, limited stops, and transit signal priority. These components improve travel time when compared to local bus service in mixed-flow traffic lanes. For example, transit signal priority expedites buses through signalized intersections and improves transit travel times. Transit priority is available areawide within several cities, as well as the City of Los Angeles, and is expected to be available in all the affected jurisdictions served by the time the Proposed Project is in service. Potential transit signal priority functions are described below:

- Early Green: When a bus is approaching a red signal, conflicting phases may be terminated early to obtain the green indication for the bus.
- Extended Green: When a bus is approaching the end of a green signal cycle, the green light may be extended to allow bus passage before the green phase terminates.
- Transit Phase: A dedicated bus-only phase is activated before or after the green for parallel traffic to allow the bus to proceed through the intersection. For example, a queue jump may be implemented, in which the bus departs from a dedicated bus lane or a station ahead of other traffic, so the bus can transition across lanes or make a turn.

With these improvements, it is estimated that the projected end-to-end travel time from the North Hollywood terminus to the Pasadena terminus would be approximately one hour, with an average operating speed of about 17 miles per hour, which includes time for boarding and alighting at the transit stations. The anticipated average speed along the route is substantially faster than typical Metro buses operating on surface streets in lanes shared with vehicular traffic.

Comment 2: As a reminder for everyone else, it certainly doesn't feel like it but covid is temporary.

Response 2: This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR.

Comment 3: Can we show these options again?

Response 3: The following response was provided during the meeting, "Thank you for your question, can you please clarify which options?"

Comment 4: I feel like the business owners of Eagle rock have taking an anti BRT stance. What is being done to prevent this powerful interest group from dictating how the project will be built. As a bus rider I was heckled a few years ago at the meeting at Eagle Rock city hall by people that are anti BRT.

Response 4: Metro values all public comments and considers all comments with equal weight.

Comment 5: What about the traffic impacts for the residents of Eagle Rock? That all residents north or surrounding Colorado Blvd are going to be facing serious impacts with losing lanes on Colorado Blvd.

Not to mention when the city continues to issue filming permits in this area with large trucks parked along Hill Drive and then additional traffic on that street to avoid Colorado Blvd.

Has the safety measures and increase in traffic accidents been looked at? Is this safe for the local residents?

Response 5: CEQA does not require intersection or roadway segment congestion impact analyses (e.g., Level of Service). Although the effects of a project on traffic congestion are no longer considered under the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is coordinating with cities transected by the Proposed Project outside of the CEQA process to assess traffic conditions. Additionally, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a reduction of regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 86,659 miles daily in 2042.

Metro puts the highest priority on public safety. Operations of the BRT bus system would follow the traffic signals and other safety measures required of passenger vehicles. Buses will operate at posted speed limits and Metro drivers receive regular driver safety training. General safety measures associated with BRT operations include signal-protected pedestrian movements, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, along with signage to provide for convenient and safe access to boarding areas. The stations near Eagle Rock Boulevard and Townsend Avenue would be built on loading islands accessible by signalized crosswalks. Further, the BRT service would include queue jumps at selected locations at which a traffic signal with special bus indications would display a bus-only phase, which would allow buses to enter an

intersection before a green indication is given to other traffic in order to allow the bus to maneuver across mixed-flow lanes ahead of conflicting traffic. Since other traffic would be observing a red signal during the bus phase, adverse safety impacts would be minimal.

Changes to pedestrian facilities are discussed on page 3.1-20 in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Operation of the Proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial changes to pedestrian circulation or facilities. At some locations, stations placed on sidewalks would require bus patrons to share portions of the sidewalk with general pedestrian traffic, and where on-street bicycle lanes exist, bikes may be routed onto the sidewalk in a shared zone behind the bus loading area to avoid conflicts with the bus loading zone. The Project includes curb extensions to reduce pedestrian crossing distances, upgrades unsignalized crosswalks with rectangular rapid flashing beacons to pedestrian actuated signalized crossings, and, specific to Eagle Rock, adds a new traffic signal at Dahlia Drive to improve pedestrian access to Dahlia Heights Elementary School. Overall, the Proposed Project would enhance walkability in the station areas.

Ben Foushee

Comment 1: Utilizing the F3. Option with stops on the freeway.

In my opinion there is an abundance of potential in the development of a NELA transit hub with community services and outreach. Creating a need to move through our city, through neglected and overlooked pockets of our community and maybe to become a beacon of the future as opposed to holding onto conventional ideas of how public transportation should work. I have been on those platforms on the freeway I do not agree with the idea they are polluted eyesores. If anyone has had the fortune of riding other forms of public transportation that reside underground, I venture that these are possible more contaminated, susceptible to neglect and places of caution. None the less I will ride them happily if they provide the service of being affordable, safe and efficient in getting me to my destination in a reasonable time. Give the bus the HOV lane. Make boarding at the freeway level. Have intelligent bus stops that know the arrival/departure times accurately.

Response 1: The comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR.

Comment 2: have optional secure waiting areas on freeway level and below with simple notification of arrivals. Have amenities, kiosks, e-bikes, postal service, homeless outreach. Job services. Solar panel sunscreens. The 134 was created as a connecting corridor. City and state officials had a vision of running it directly through Eagle Rock along Las Flores as opposed to the current location along the ridge. It cost more. It spared 100s of homes from demolition. And in my

opinion it relieved Colorado Blvd (RTE66) from the burden of receiving the incoming commuters from the east creating a comfortable community as opposed to a pass-through speedway.

Response 2: The comment appears to support the Proposed Project operating on SR-134 (Route Option F3) through Eagle Rock and suggests various station-related amenities. Station amenities associated with the Proposed Project would be designed using a “kit of parts” approach, similar to Metro rail stations. Although the kit of parts approach is under development by Metro, station elements would likely include a canopy with lighting, monument sign, seating and/or leaning rails, trash receptacles, bicycle parking, transit information panel(s) and wayfinding signage. Station-related access improvements would include safe, well-lit and accessible paths of travel for transit riders, including those accessing stations on foot, bike and other modes.

Comment 3: in options F1 and F2. both will require a complete regrade of Colorado Blvd for the entire stretch through Eagle Rock. The Red Road is asphalt. Will other services, electric water sewer be upgraded during this process?

Response 3: As discussed in Chapter 4.0, Other Environmental Considerations, of the Draft EIR, construction of the Proposed Project is not anticipated to require or result in the construction or relocation of utilities which could cause a significant environmental impact because utility relocations would be coordinated with utility companies.

Comment 4: For Eagle Rock. in the renders we see a portion of the proposed routes. How does it look entering and exiting Eagle Rock. I just really have a hard time visualizing how F1 would merge into the 134 at Linda Rosa.

Response 4: Buses would enter and depart Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock from Pasadena via the existing SR-134 ramps just east of Linda Rosa Avenue. With Route Option F1, an eastbound bus-only left-turn lane would be added to provide a “queue jump” onto the SR-134 on-ramp. In the westbound direction, buses would access Colorado Boulevard from the SR-134 off-ramp and operate in mixed-flow traffic for several blocks before transitioning to a dedicated bus lane at Dahlia Drive.

Diane Trout

Comment 1: Will other bus routes be able to use the Bus lane? at least part of the route is shared with foothill transit 187.

Response 1: The Proposed Project would add dedicated bus lanes in Los Angeles, Burbank, and Glendale. The bus lanes could potentially be utilized by other Metro bus services, as well as other buses operated by LADOT, the City of Burbank and the

City of Glendale, although such uses would require further coordination with other bus operators.

Comment 2: Also wouldn't there be greater environmental impacts from car and truck use under the no-project alternative?

Response 2: The Proposed Project would result in higher transit ridership and an overall vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction compared to the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative includes the existing transportation network and land use developments that generate environmental impacts. The No Project Alternative does not include any specific action that would cause an environmental impact. However, under the No Project Alternative, Metro would not be able to improve ridership and the environmental benefits accrued by improved ridership would not be realized. However, the potential construction-related impacts of the Proposed Project would not occur under the No Project Alternative. See Section 6.0: Alternatives of the Draft EIR for further information about the environmental impacts under the No Project Alternative.

Comment 3: (As an aside I want to complement staff on the design of the virtual meeting, the ground rules, and the style of moderation. I hope that post covid pandemic, that metro could regularly include at least one virtual meeting for project outreach)

Response 3: This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR. This comment compliments Metro on the meetings and requests regular virtual meetings after the COVID pandemic is over. This request has been noted by Metro.

Lynne Nishihara

Comment 1: Question: You mentioned there may be a stop at Pasadena City College. Will that stop be close to Caltech also? Will the stop be close to Hill Ave and Del Mar? I couldn't tell from the map you showed. Thanks.

Response 1: The Pasadena City College Station would be located near Colorado Boulevard and Hill Avenue. Refer to Figure 2-2 in the Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

Natalie Freidberg

Comment 1: Is Metro doing outreach in Spanish & Tagalog?

Response 1: The following response was provided during the meeting, "Hi Natalie, thank you for your question, we have done outreach in Spanish, Armenian, and Tagalog."

Regarding outreach, to encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period and Draft EIR review period, legal advertisement notices were

published in 11 newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) notices and distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts. The hearings also provided simultaneous Spanish translation, and previous meetings for the Proposed Project included live Spanish and Armenian translators.

Comment 2: <https://nextcity.org/daily/entry/how-oakland-is-helping-small-businesses-survive-during-the-pandemic>

Response 2: This comment does not address the contents of the Draft EIR.

Paul Dyson

Comment: Why are you showing Orange Line footage on your video? There is no separate right of way in this project, except for a few feet at NoHo.

Response: The Metro G Line (Orange) was used in the video to demonstrate BRT. While the Proposed Project does not include a totally separate right-of-way like the G Line (Orange), the Proposed Project does include dedicated bus lanes within the public right-of-way.

Robin Gemmill

Comment 1: How are social justice and equity integrated into the project so some Angelenos are not adversely impacted?

Response 1: The CEQA Guidelines do not directly address social justice and equity. Metro has considered social justice and equity through the deliberate location of stations to service all populations. Metro takes social justice and equity very seriously with its own Metro Board adopted Equity Platform. Metro has also prepared a Title VI Equity Analysis which was reviewed by the Federal Transit Administration.

Comment 2: How is the bike lane protected from the bus lane?

Response 2: It is not clear what bike lane is being referenced in the comment. In North Hollywood, with the Proposed Project route, the existing Class II bike lanes along Chandler Boulevard would be upgraded with buffers; along Vineland, bicycles would operate in a two-way cycle-track along the west curb of Vineland Avenue, protected by a buffer zone. In Glendale, bicycles will operate in bike lanes along the outside travel lanes of Glenoaks Boulevard, whereas the bus lanes will be in the median so buses and bicycles will not be adjacent to each other. Should the

service operate along Central Avenue south of Pioneer Drive, bicycles will operate in the existing Class II bike lanes, which are delineated with striping. The Class II Bike Lanes on Central Avenue would be routed behind the station platform near the Central Avenue/Lexington Drive intersection. Along Broadway, the existing Class III bike route is a shared facility where vehicles and bicycles share the outside travel lane. The Proposed Project would replace the lane with a dedicated bus lane providing a shared bus/bike facility which would be safer than existing conditions as a low volume of buses relative to existing traffic would share the facility with bicyclists. In Eagle Rock, the Proposed Project no longer includes shared bus and bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard and both options under consideration provide bicycle facilities where bicyclists would be afforded a dedicated, continuous and buffered Class II bicycle lane, and separated from traffic by parking-protection where feasible. Refer to the Project Description in the Final EIR. In Pasadena, there are no existing bike lanes along the Proposed Project route. However, the City is planning to construct a two-way cycle track along the south curb of Union Street (for Route Option H2, westbound buses would operate along the north side of Union Street).

The Big Dog

Comment 1: Will Metro provide detail about how many riders get off and on in Eagle Rock?

Response 1: The regional ridership forecast is provided in Table 3.1-1 of Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Regarding local ridership, preliminary forecasts for the Proposed Project indicate daily boardings for the three potential stations in Eagle Rock would be approximately 300 riders at Eagle Rock Plaza, 620 riders at Eagle Rock Boulevard, and 520 riders at Townsend Avenue.

Comment 2: If Colorado bl is used, how many stops will be made in Eagle Rock?

Response 2: The Proposed Project includes three stations in Eagle Rock. The stations would be located in proximity to Colorado Boulevard/Eagle Rock Plaza, Colorado Boulevard/Eagle Rock Boulevard, and Colorado Boulevard/Townsend Avenue.

Comment 3: There are already many empty busses going east and west on Colorado. How many will be eliminated?

Response 3: The Proposed Project does not propose reducing the number of existing buses. However, the NextGen Bus Plan is realigning Metro's bus network based upon data of existing ridership and adjusting bus service routes and schedules to improve the overall network. Service on the portion of the Line 180 between Glendale and Pasadena could be adjusted.

Teresa G.

Comment: I missed the presentation - would I be able to watch it and make comments after?

Response: The following response was provided during the meeting. “Hi Teresa, absolutely. You can review the presentation again at <https://nohopasbrt.com>. To submit a written comment once you have reviewed the presentation, you may send it through nohopasbrt@metro.net.”

Tony

Comment: Bus lanes are a good addition to community and the service BRT provides will be beneficial to those who aren't able to drive, primarily those who need handicap access. Buses and the lanes they are on provide more people throughput vs cars at the same time, this lane can be used by emergency vehicles. I'm in another part of the SFV and my community will lose parking too to LRT, but we see the future LRT service as highly beneficial to the community it serves. Glendale is a destination for Southern Californians that doesn't have Metro Rail access and the NoHo-Pasadena BRT (with electric buses) will be a good compromise on providing high-quality transit service without the high cost of rail. I hope Metro looks into camera enforcement on this BRT and other BRT service to enforce bus lanes. Thanks.

Response: This comment expresses support for the Proposed Project, in particular for its improved transit connection between Glendale and the surrounding communities. The comment also suggests considering using cameras as an enforcement tool for the bus lanes. It is possible to equip buses with cameras, but presently camera enforcement is not allowed and would require authorization in the California Code.