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MS. LITVAK: We'll officially start the hearing. A couple little housekeeping things before we do get into it. First of all, where is our Korean translator? Come on up. If there's anybody here who needs simultaneous Korean translation tonight, we have that available for you. She's going to repeat that message in Korean. Just raise your hand, and we'll take care of you. So here we go. Anybody? Okay. Great.

My name is Jody Litvak. I'm with Metro. Joining me tonight during the presentation is David Mieger. He'll be up in a little while. We love it when our elected officials follow along with us, and they've been doing a great job. But I especially want to note, here in the audience with us tonight is Borja Leon from Mayor Villaraigosa's office.

Where did you go, Borja? I know he's here. There he is. Thank you for coming. Vivian Rescalvo from Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky's office, sitting with Borja in the back. And all alone by herself over here is Carolyn Ramsay from Councilman Tom La Bonge's office.

So we thank you all for coming very much.
And with that, unlike our previous public meetings that we've had before, this is a public hearing, so it's a little more structured and more formal. And so before we begin the meat of what we're here for, I have to read this rather long announcement. So if you will bear with me, we're going to go through this now.

The West Side Subway Extension Transit Corridor Studies Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report was released on September 3rd, 2010, along with a notice of intent to hold public hearings in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, N.E.P.A., and the California Environmental Quality Act, C.E.Q.A.

The Federal Transit Administration, F.T.A., is the lead agency for the purposes of N.E.P.A. and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authorities, Metro, is the lead agency for the purposes of C.E.Q.A. Both agencies prepared the draft E.I.S./E.I.R.

A notice of availability and intent to hold public hearings was published in the Federal Register, State of California Clearing House, Los Angeles Times, La Opinion, Ne Con Sahn (phonetic), and filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk. The notices were published on September 3rd, 2010. Copies of the draft E.I.S./E.I.R. are available for public review at the following venues:
The Beverly Hills Public Library, the Donald Bruce Kaufman Brentwood Library, the Fairfax Library, the Felipe de Neve Library, the Frances H. G. Hollywood Regional Library, the John C. Fremont Library, the Memorial Library, the Metro Transportation Library, the Pio Pico Koreatown Library, the Robertson Branch Library, the Santa Monica Main Library, the West Hollywood Public Library, the West Los Angeles Regional Library, the West Woods Library, and the Wilshire Library.

In addition, electronic copies of the document, also known as C.D.'s, were distributed by mail to 232 agencies, listed owners and properties identified in the document, local elected officials, and additional interested stakeholders. In addition to display adds of the public hearing, we're published in the Beverly Hills Courier, Beverly Hills Weekly, Jewish Journal, Korean Times, Larchmont Chronicles, Park La Brea Beverly Press, Santa Monica Daily Press, and online Daily Brew dot com and at WeHo News dot com.

Copies of the press release -- the release of the draft E.I.S./E.I.R. were sent to a distribution list of over 120 medial organizations. The draft E.I.S./E.I.R. and information about the hearings was posted on Metro's website.

Information about the release of the draft
E.I.S./E.I.R. and the hearings was also printed in brochure form and distributed widely on Metro buses and trains as well as hand delivered at key locations in the study area. Brochures were sent by U.S. Mail to a list of nearly 1,000 contacts in the project study area. The same information was sent electronically to a distribution list of 1,790. All of these materials including information about how to find the draft E.I.S./E.I.R. as well as more information about the West Side Subway Extension Transit Corridor Study remain available on the Web. Affidavits of publication and copies of detailed mailing lists are available upon request. Thank you.

And Jay Greenstein from Councilman Paul Koretz's office just arrived. There he is. Jay, thank you very much. Okay.

How many of you are first-timers, have never been to any of our public meetings over in the last three plus years? Well, welcome. A lot of people. Okay. Good.

So the next things I have to say are important to everybody, but some of it may be especially important to you. Tonight's public hearing is really for us to give you a brief summary of what's in the draft E.I.S./E.I.R. It is not a substitute for the report. This is a very high level overview.

If you want to find out what's in the document,
I invite you. We have copies of the document on this table in the back here, hard copies. We ask you to leave them here. It is a big thick document, and it has a lot of appendices, and it even has many more technical reports, which are not included here.

I invite you to start with the executive summary. Read through that. It covers everything, and if you see something in there that is of interest to you, you can then go deeper into the document and find out more information about that.

And I see Alex has arrived. And so I'm going to go out of order a little bit and let you know that in addition to the Korean translation, we also have simultaneous Spanish translation available for you tonight. And you can just raise your hand and let Alex know that. And he's going to repeat that message.

Thank you. Okay. So as I said, the purpose tonight is to give you a brief overview of what's in the document, describe some of the key decisions that are required to select the locally preferred alternative, which is the next important step in moving this project forward. We're going to give you what the next steps are.

But mostly, as I said, we're here to that listen to your comments. They become part of the official record at this point, but we cannot respond to your questions or
comments tonight as part of the public hearing. I know many of you were talking to the staff or consultants individually around the board, and we're happy to do that at the end of this evening when we close the public hearing. But we can't respond to you in a formal way. And the official responses will happen in the final E.I.S./E.I.R.

You're welcome to comment on anything you want to tonight, but there's a few things we'd especially like to hear from you, and I'm going to repeat this at the end, but maybe it will make a little more sense then if you can think about this as we go through things. We obviously want to hear your comments of what's in the daft, particularly as it relates to impacts or mitigation. If you have any additional questions or additional information you would like provided, as we move forward into the next phase and develop the final E.I.S./E.I.R., let us know now.

If you have comments on what the locally preferred alternative is going to be, which alternative we choose, we have multiple station options in some cases. We have alignment options, other things. And, again, we have other aspects, and if you have any suggestions beyond the locally preferred alternative, we want to hear about that.
And comments are due -- they must be received by October 18th to be considered a part of this. Again, if you want to comment tonight verbally, we invite you to fill out these forms. Some of you may have already done that. If you didn't, and you -- some of you may have already filled it out and turned it in. Rebecca is in the back with extras. If you need a form, raise your hand, and she'll give it to you. If you filled a form out and you haven't turned it in yet, or you decide to in the course of the evening, wave it about, and I'll have someone come get that. And I'll keep reminding you as we move on.

So where we are in the process, we've been working on this for about three years, beginning in late 2007. We did an alternative analysis. There was a Board decision made in January 2009 that kicked off the draft E.I.S./E.I.R. We've been working on that for about the last year and a half, and we're heading up to a Metro Board decision on selecting the L.P.A.

This is not the end of the analysis. There will be some decisions made, some narrowing of options, and we'll talk about that as we move forward. But the Board will have the option to select the local alternative at the end of October, and based on what they select, we will take that into final environmental review and clearance.
I mentioned that's when we'll be developing the responses
to your comments and questions and hopefully get this
project ready to go.

Now, for those of you that are new to the process
or may not have remembered everything, we have a lot of
information both from the earlier analysis in 2007, 2008,
as well as during this last 18 months. We can't go into
that in great detail tonight. We have a variety of fact
sheets available for you, and there's some presentations
available for you online. All of this material is online.
So if you want to see how we've reviewed options, ruled
some things in, taken other things out, I invite you to
go back and do that.

If you're especially interested in issues
relating to how a subway is built, please look at our
presentations from last summer. If you want to see
information about how the various alternative perform,
most recent summer -- I'm skipping around. I apologize.
Last fall, winter, we held meetings where in each
locations we talked about the stations in that area. So
if you want to see, kind of, what we brought in and how
things evolved out of that, you can look at that.
We've also had focus meetings on tunneling and
alignments, and whether or not there should be a Crenshaw
station. But about over 2500 of you have participated all
along the way. Again, that's our Web address, Metro dot net slash Website, and it's all available online.

Let me just say, by the way, to all of you in this room tonight, as well as I know, we have this meeting going out by live Webcast, we're going to work to have this presentation posted online hopefully by the middle of the week. But if you signed in and we have your E-mail, we'll let you know when that happens.

So there are really seven alternatives under study. One, is no bill. We always have to evaluate against what if we don't do anything. The second is called T.S.M., Transportations Systems Management, which is, if we don't build rail, what is the best thing we can do, the most robust series of improvements we can do on the streets and with the buses?

So that's T.S.M. And we have five build alternatives, two of which are within the adopted funding - excuse me. Two of which in the funding umbrella that was adopted into a long range transportation plan and part of Measure R that was approved almost two years ago now by the voters.

Those are the two that go down Westwood -- go down Wilshire to U.C.L.A. ending either at Westwood U.C.L.A. or going one station further to Westwood V.A. Beyond what we have funding anticipated for, would be
continuing all the way to Santa Monica or adding in the West Hollywood extension.

We have this general fact sheet. All the fact sheets look the same on the front, except the words right here in this purple bar. But if you see the one that has general facts sheet in it, it has all the maps in there, and I invite you to take a look at that; and we have boards in the back, and you can look at that in more detail.

There's 4.2 billion in about current dollars allocated to this project over in about 30 years. It will be built in three phases. 2019 to here at Fairfax. 2026 to Century City, and 2036 to Westwood. There's been a lot of talk of trying to accelerate that. We're all very excited. We're working hard on that. We'd like to get this all done in ten years. So that's our goal, but we don't know where that money is yet. We'll certainly change the top part of that slide when this changes, but if that were to happen, we could get to Westwood by about the end of the decade, and it could all be done in one phase.

Now, I'm going to turn it over to David to talk about the draft itself, and then I'll be back.

MR. MIEGER: Thanks for those of you who have really borne with us for the last year and a half to two years.
It's like a reunion each time we come back to these meetings. And I appreciate your endurance. All of those meetings we've been saying for the last year and a half, "At the end of this process, we're going to have to draft E.I.S." And that's where we're going to pick the locally preferred alternative. So we actually are here, and it's a big accomplishment we've gotten this far.

I wanted to point out that this E.I.S. is not just a Metro document. Our partner in this is the Federal Transit Administration, the federal agency who we're hoping is going to give us a big check at the end of this to help build the project. And everything we're doing in terms of the performance of this alternative is to compete against other cities around the country who are also trying to get --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Will you slow down? You're speaking too fast.

MR. MIEGER: I'll slow down. I'm sorry. So the Federal Transit Administration is our partner. And this document is a federal document as well as a local document. Feds are responsible for the N.E.P.A. We're responsible as the leading agency for the C.E.Q.A.

I'll try to go slow. They want me to go fast to get through this.

Just briefly, the purpose of the draft E.I.S.,
what it's doing, first of all, we evaluate the performance
of the alternatives against the required criteria. This
is a set of measurements we have to use when we talk about
the ridership, the cost, the cost effectiveness. We have
to evaluate the adverse and beneficial impacts of the
alternatives, the options. We have to look at not just
the long term effects, what happens after we build the
project, but also during the construction phase.

And for those of you who have been to hearings
on Light Rail or Bus Rapid Transit, the big difference is
this is a subway project. It's underground. It's
covered. So the big part of this is building it, building
the subway project, moving the dirt, constructing it.
Once it's built, it's underground and we hope it's going
to be seamless and blend into the background, and all
you'll see is the portals, the ways you come in and out
of the stations.

The drafts E.I.S./E.I.R. provides the locations
and details of where the impacts are going to be during
the construction, and then in the long-term operations.
And it also identifies potential mitigation measures.
Wherever there's an impact, it has a mitigation measure.
So we would really like to hear comments on those because
what we will do in the final, the next phase of the work
after this, is to develop the detailed mitigation measures
that we're going to fund, and pay for out of the project.

So those will be incorporated whenever the project
will be built, And then during the final E.I.S. for the
development mitigation program. So comments on that would
be very helpful to us.

I'm not going to go through the whole E.I.S.

It's a long document. I think the tips for going through
it, which we recommend, there's over 20 categories of
environmental impacts. So as Jody said, if you look at
the executive summary, and read through that, hopefully
it's fairly easy to understand the document. And then in
areas where it talks about your particular neighborhood or
areas you have an interest in, then go into the larger
document, the C.D. and read that part. And I think that's
a good way to approach it so you don't get lost in the
document.

And for those of you that are really into this,
we have technical reports which are online. When you go
on Metro dot net, we have a whole document by chapter, and
then each of those 20 has a technical report which has the
very, very detailed information for those of you that
really want to get into the weeds and the very detailed
information.

We have two slides, one about construction
impacts, and one about long term operating impacts. And
in terms of time, they said just focus on one or two
just to give people a highlight of one or two of these
categories so that -- as you're going into them. So since
we're here at Fairfax tonight, the two that are probably
nearest and dearest to this neighborhood's heart are
underground gases, the hydrogen sulfate and methane gases
that we have bubbling up at the La Brea Tar Pits and the
Page Museum and historic archaeological and
paleontological.

We're in the historic building tonight.
L.A.C.M.A. lets us use it. And one of the things that
the environmental document does is identify all the
historic buildings along the route, says what would be any
impacts on those buildings, and normally we try to avoid
touching a historic building.

In this case working with L.A.C.M.A., we've
looked at possibly having an entrance right in this very
building where you'd be coming out of the subway coming
into the ground floor of the May Company. We have a
couple of other choices, but we have to look at that and
make sure that we could do it in a historically sensitive
way that fits in with the architecture of the building,
doesn't cause damage to the building, and fits in with
the overall plans of this area.

Paleontological. When the museum recently built
Their parking garage in the back, they found fossils. And some of the richest findings in the world are in the area around the La Brea Tar Pits. Because of that, when we come to dig in this area, we're going to have the section of the document that talks about paleontological, talks about exactly how we're going to go into the ground, identify those fossils, remove them, and preserve them, and restore them, and save them in a way that can be recorded, and kept for the future. We need to work with the Page Museum and the Natural History Museum. So that's sort of what the chapter on paleontology talks about in this area.

Subsurface gases. We have to dig in such a way that we're sensitive to that where we can go in. We know that there's gases below ground. But we also know that within the last 20 years, there's many, many projects around the world that have built in similar conditions successfully, and we've had successful subway projects on the east side where there's gas, and in North Hollywood where we've built with gassy conditions. So we have a track record now of doing it successfully, not quite with this concentration, but we found examples throughout the world with technology that does do that. So that part of the document talks about that.

So those are the two examples I was going to give on when we build the project. But, again, these carry
through to the long-term operation of the project. Once
the subway is built, and we have a subway portal down
here, you can walk in down at the subway, and get on
the trains and continue on.

We have to look at what's the long-term effect
on property values around the stations. What would be
the long-term ways of mitigating gas intrusion into the
subways, having to do with, maybe, thicker walls in the
subway station ventilation. And it talks about those
types of mitigations.

So there's a couple strategies when you talk
about mitigations. We divide them into the design and
construction operations. A lot of what we identify, we
can actually mock mitigate if we can design it into the
project successfully, if the subway walls would mitigate
gas penetration. To the extent that we can identify
issues, we can build that into the design of the project
into the coming year.

During the construction phase, we can also design
it in such a way that, for example, if there's an issue
of vibration, if you're too close to the surface of the
tunnels and perhaps on the surface, you might be able
to feel it in the basement of some buildings. We can
actually move the tunnels a bit deeper, or we can put
mitigation measures under the track to dampen the
vibration so you won't feel it. That's what we've done on our other projects where we essentially eliminated the vibrations in the projects by doing that.

And then in the operations, once these projects are open, we still have to monitor. We have monitoring equipment we have to measure for gas levels in the station, any kind of issues that come up. So there's a long-term monitoring program that we set up that continues through operations.

Last point for me before I give it back to Jody is, impacts are not all negative. And the whole reason we want to remind everybody that we're building this project is because of the tremendous beneficial effects of this project.

Of course, the Wilshire and the Santa Monica Boulevard corridors are two of the most congested corridors we have in the L.A. region. The buses and the cars that we have moving on the street are all moving slower and slower and slower as years go by, as traffic moves up. We have three of the largest job centers in Southern California. That's Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood. A number of people going into those areas every day. It's denser than any other city in the western U.S. outside of San Francisco.

In terms of those job centers we're going to on
the west side, people coming throughout the region that go there, if we can get those people off the roads, that would be a tremendous benefit. There's really no room for new freeways and street widening. So this is the equivalent of a new freeway going underground carrying people to another area, not tying up the surface. That's the major, major reason.

And one benefit I want to point out, if you're going downtown to U.C.L.A., that's about a 54-minute trip on our fastest bus today, And that's about a 24-minute trip on the subway. So a 30-minute travel time savings on that trip every day for everybody that's going to that area. So we want to leave you with the beneficial impacts too, and the document doesn't hide those. They talk about the beneficial effects as well as the adverse ones.

We have do get through one more section before we open it up to talk about the options and choices we have in the document. Jody's going to go through those.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you. Before I get into that, I just want to let you know this is a long narrow row, and I see some people who just came in late in the back. There are a number of seats up front, and I invite you to move up front. If you've got an empty seat next to you, please raise your hand. And, please, people in the back -- see. See how many nice welcoming people we have? So
everybody please move up front. I know this is hard to read.

As I said, we're going to have this posted online hopefully by the middle of the week. And if you gave us your E-mail, we'll let he you know when that's up there.

So as I mentioned before, we're moving towards the selection of the locally preferred alternative. That's the next step we need to get to moving this project forward for final environmental review. And most importantly -- or equally importantly, going after that all important federal matching funds.

To do that, we have to -- staff has to do this analysis and come up with what we think is the best alternative, utilizing both the federal criteria and considering all the public input that we've gotten along the way, as well as during this official public comment period. We also have to make decisions about those five alternatives, including multiple stations and alignment options.

So, obviously, with a project this complex, there's a myriad of decisions, but I want to talk about five key areas of decision making that we're focusing on. Although, of course there's many more. And I'm going to go through each one of these. I have a slide on each. But we want to talk about how we pick what that best performing alternative is within those funding
constraints. We have two options for how far we go west within those funding constraints. We will talk a little bit about the Wilshire, Crenshaw Station tonight. We know that that's important here.

There are five areas where we have multiple station locations we're looking at. And between downtown Beverly Hills and Century City, and Century City to Westwood, we have different alignment options. And, again, working our way through this, all of that is going to be informed by the draft document itself, technical appendices, and of course, the public input.

So in choosing the best performing alternatives, alternatives one, two, and three, those are the ones that go down Wilshire, came closest to meeting the federal cost effectiveness target for the performance of the heavy rail subway. Santa Monica is a great corridor. Santa Monica Boulevard through West Hollywood is a great corridor.

But Wilshire, as we all know, is the 800-pound gorilla in Los Angeles of transportation for both car and public transit. It just has better land use and transit connections than the Santa Monica corridor. Although, as I said, Santa Monica has a great corridor. It serves more key regional destination centers, Wilshire, Beverly Hills, Century City and, Westwood.

It has high population and employment
concentrations. And because that alignment connects through Union Station, it has greater regional connections throughout the area. So it will make this line available to people who come into Union Station from Antelope Valley and San Gabriel Valley, the Inland Empire, and the southeast, and Orange County and places around.

However, only alternatives one and two, the two that go to one of the two locations in Westwood, are currently fundable through Measure R and the anticipated new starts. And those are what's adopted to the long range transportation plan. However, over the last 18 months, we had a lot of support for all five of them.

I just want you to know I don't want to spend a lot of time on this slide here tonight, but we're evaluating the two station options in Westwood, whether we end the line at U.C.L.A. or are we trying to get a tad west of the 405 to serve the V.A. Hospital.

Should there be a station at Wilshire and Crenshaw? I know a subject near and dear to the hearts of many people in this room tonight. Some background on that, it would cost about $153 million in current dollars to build that station. It is not an especially high boarding station with 4200 to 4300 daily boarding anticipated at that station.

Let me just back up a little bit. I just want
to compare that to what's estimated at Westwood U.C.L.A.

That's the end of the line station, which would be the highest boarding station. So it's a significantly different number.

If that station goes away, we wouldn't lose all those riders. We think we'd only lose about a third of them. Other people that boarded there will get on the line elsewhere. It's a low density area.

There's some issue of station spacing. While it's not a hard and fast rule, we typically like to space the stations about a mile apart. It's only a half a mile from the end of the Purple Line now at Western to Crenshaw. However, without that station, it will be two miles to La Brea.

I need to say a note about transit connectivity because many people in this room know that Crenshaw light-rail line is also being planned. At this moment, there are no plans to bring that line north of Expo. So at this point, there's no reason to connect to that line with a subway station here.

In addition, while some earlier preliminary studies did indicate that if and when that line ever does come north of Expo to connect up to the Wilshire corridor, it would probably be best not to bring it north to Wilshire at Crenshaw. That it should connect someplace
else. Again, there's been a lot of input on this and I know the community is split on whether this station should be there.

This may be -- I know in the back of the room this is hard to read. There are five locations where we've got multiple stations that we're taking a look at. And there are a series of factors that we take a look at in evaluating that, and all of these are really important. I'm going to quickly read them across the top for you. "Ridership, construction issues, engineering issues, properties for portals, seismic issues, bus, bike, and pedestrian connections, future rail connections, termination station issues, public opinion support."

When you see a checkmark, it's to let you know that all of these are important. In all of these things that there's a checkmark, which of the two or three different station locations we're looking at, it may make a difference for this factor.

And because we're here, I just want to talk about these two. Here at Wilshire, Fairfax, some of you know we've looked at two station locations. One where the station would be located under Wilshire all the way on the west side of Fairfax. And the public said very clearly that they would also like us to look at a station located spanning Fairfax which would allow more access to the east
There are some construction issues with each of those two options that have to do with how we can build and where we can get construction staging because of the gassy ground in this area. Everywhere you go, it gets slightly different to deal with. So there's some engineering issues. Again, how we locate property for portals becomes important.

Immediately to the west of here in the city of Beverly Hills, the Wilshire, La Cienega station. Again, there's some construction issues, some properties for portals. There are some issues that pertain to that station that have to do with a potential future connection to a West Hollywood line. So that's what I want to say about that.

I think many of you know that we're looking at multiple station alignments. I already talked about from Wilshire to Century City, and from Century City to Westwood. We have some boards with a great deal of detail about that available for you.

One of our other new fact sheets -- by the way, I talked about the performance of the alternatives. We have more information on that in the back, and we have a fact sheet that gets into a lot of the details on tunneling. So I invite you to take a look at that. And, again, these
are all online.

Very quickly, I don't want to spend a lot of time on it, but here is the estimated depths to the track. That's where noise and vibrations come from for the Beverly Hills to Century City options. And the number of residential easements that would be required for each of the three. And then, again, going from Century City to Westwood.

The difference is -- in the Century City to Westwood, there's actually a big difference among the three main alignments between length and, therefore, cost of travel time, and ridership. So that becomes a greater factor going forward.

So, almost your turn. What happens next? From here is -- again, as we've said, the public comment period closes October 18th. We will be developing our staff recommendations and summarizing the public comments for the board.

October 28th is a chance for the Metro Board to really consider and weigh in on all of this. They are the decision-making entity. They will consider our recommendations on the locally preferred alternative. They'll have an opportunity to adopt one, we believe.

Many of options that go with these alternatives, they may select one of the locally preferred alternatives,
but where we have multiple options, they could narrow them
down to one, or they may keep more than one option alive.
So if we have, for instance, multiple station options or
multiple alignment options with any of the locally
preferred alternatives that they pick, they may pick one,
and ask us to move forward with that, or they keep more
than one alive. We don't know. They will be asked to
authorize preparations of the final environmental review,
and go into preliminary engineering. And, of course,
we'll have continued outreach, and we will then also
pursue the F.T.A. approval to enter new start preliminary
engineering and any additional recommendations that may
arise.

Very quickly, during the final E.I.S./E.I.R.,
2011 will be a busy year. There will be much continued
public involvement. As I said, we'll be developing the
responses to the comments we get during this stage. There
will be much more geotechnical investigation. We have a
board somewhere over there that talks about the geotech
work we've done up until now and then what will be done
in the final.

Engineering will be refined. The cost estimates
will be finalized. We're going to have to really work
out the details of the stations and the alignments.

Preliminary engineering, determine the construction
locations, and really develop the mitigation program,
and commit to those mitigation measures.

So how to comment? This is the same board that's
over here. You can stand up and testify tonight. You can
submit written comments. We have these written comment
forms available for you. You can turn these in tonight.
There's also a mailing address on the bottom. So if you
take it home with you and you think of something brilliant
after you leave here tonight, please mail it in to us.
You can send it to David. That's his address. I'm not
going to read it, but it's right on the board over there.
You can go to our Website, Metro.net/westside. Click on
"contact us." We have an online comment form. Or you can
E-mail it to us to westsideextension@metro.net.

To all of you who are following us on Twitter and
our fans of ours on Facebook, 1700 of you, we love all the
conversation that goes on there. But because we're in
this official formal public comment period, I can't count
comments and questions that come in in those ways as part
of the official public comments. So keep talking to each
other through those venues, but send us your comments
these other ways. And I'm going to say it again,
October 18th.

Tomorrow night, we'll be in Westwood. Wednesday,
we'll be in Plummer Park in West Hollywood. A week from
tonight, we'll be at Roxbury Park at Beverly Hills. That meeting we'll have available by live web stream. By the way, we're tweeting all of them. And then a week from Wednesday we'll conclude at the Main Library in Santa Monica. All the meetings are at 6:00 p.m.

So here's how things are going to go tonight.

Can I get the speaker cards we have so far up here?
Thank you.

Clarissa, I need you to do the rearranging we discussed. There's two minutes per speaker. Four, if you need translations. Please let us know if you need translations.

I'm going to call three names at a time. I'll invite you to line up over here. Please don't stand in front of our court reporter. But, really, everybody please come up quickly and line up. We really want to have time to hear from you. We want to limit the down time between speakers.

State your name clearly. We'll start the countdown here. Everybody gets two minutes. And please speak clearly for the court reporter. Please be respectful of everybody who is commenting. As I said, there will be no response to the comments tonight. It is addressed in writing in the final E.I.S./E.I.R.

I want to repeat again, what we'd especially like
to hear from you tonight, what are your comments on the
draft E.I.S./E.I.R., the impact it discusses, or the
mitigation measures. Do you have additional questions, or
issues, or information you would like us to look into, or
provide in the final E.I.S./E.I.R.? Please let us know
that.

What are your comments on the L.P.A. decision the
Board will be asked to make at the end of the month? Do
you have opinions on the station options? Do you have
opinions on the alignment options, anything that goes
along with that? Do you have other suggestions? You
don't have to comment on these things. Feel free to
comment on everything else. We're interested in
everything you have to say, but this especially.

Okay. So with that I want to make sure -- okay.
We're going to back this up just a little bit. I want to
make sure you can see the countdown on this clock.

Great. So our first three speakers, and while
they're coming up, those of you know I'm famous for my
microphone 101. Tom Rasmussen, followed by David West,
and then is it Ron Fields; is that correct?

MR. FIELDS: Yes.

MS. LITVAK: Okay. So while the three of you are
coming up -- are you going to be our microphone assistant	onight?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. LITVAK: Okay. We'll try and adjust the microphone for you. So if you're short like I am, or if you're tall like somebody else, you can get up high. Please get up close to the microphone like this, like an ice cream cone. Don't hold it way down here, or talk with it this way down here (indicating). Don't start talking or moving your head around because as you talk, it goes away. So get really close to it. Speak right into it.

We're having trouble with the microphone stand. We need your help. It's not the volume. It's the microphone stand. Okay. Great.

So David West took himself out. So we have Tom Rasmussen, Ron Fields, and Steve Twining.

Are you Tom?

MR. RASMUSSEN: Yes.

MS. LITVAK: Come on up. State your name. Get up close to the microphone.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Yes. My name is Tom Rasmussen.

I'm here to suggest a better alternative route through Beverly Hills going through all those houses and two schools. The far better alternative route would be to run the subway tunnel underneath Wilshire, past Santa Monica Boulevard, the Beverly Hilton Hotel, the Robinson's Department Store building, and the gas station.

Your comment in support of the Century City Santa Monica Station and concerns about tunneling beneath homes and schools has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors decided to continue to study both station location options in Century City (Santa Monica Boulevard and Constellation Boulevard) to address concerns raised by the community regarding locating a station directly on a seismic fault and the safety of tunneling under homes and schools. The Metro Board of Directors also decided to not include the Constellation South alignment between the Wilshire/Rodeo and Century City Stations as part of the LPA, but to continue to study the Constellation North and the Santa Monica Boulevard alignments. The Constellation South alignment passed beneath more residential properties than the Constellation North or Santa Monica Boulevard alignments. In addition, the Metro Board of Directors decided to not include the West or Central alignments between Century City and Westwood/UCLA as part of the LPA, but to continue to study the East alignment because the East alignment is the most direct and least expensive route between the two stations.

Safety, both during construction and eventual operations, is one of Metro’s highest priorities and is one of the key evaluation criteria in selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). In response to the Metro Board of Director’s request for more information, further analysis was undertaken to focus on the engineering and environmental aspects of the two options during the preparation of the Final EIS/EIR to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that prior to conducting the comparative study, the Santa Monica Boulevard Station location was shifted slightly to the east from the location in the Draft EIS/EIR to avoid the Santa Monica Fault zone.

On most transit tunnel projects, significant portions of the alignment are constructed adjacent to or beneath buildings. The LPA passes beneath homes and schools in these neighborhoods because the curve radius required for subway tunnels is much wider than that required at a typical surface street intersection. The current alignment minimizes tunneling under buildings to the east and west of both the Century City Stations. The station position on Constellation Boulevard requires the tunnel alignment to be under the south portion of Beverly Hills High School Building B in order to reach the station location. There is no reasonable tunnel alignment that does not pass under homes or structures within the Beverly Hills High School campus.

The geotechnical studies conducted during preparation of the Final EIS/EIR concluded that tunneling can be safely carried out beneath the Beverly Hills High School campus and the West Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood neighborhoods. The use of state-of-the-art pressurized closed-face TBMs for soft-ground tunneling has greatly improved the control of ground movements such that tunneling can be done with minimal surface settlements. The presence of the tunnels will neither affect the risk to buildings above them during an
earthquake nor change the severity of shaking. Finally, tunnels can be constructed and operated safely in gassy grounds and oil wells do not pose an unmitigatible risk to tunneling.

The additional detailed geotechnical studies also assessed soil conditions and determine the potential for noise or vibration impacts on the surface along the refined alignments. These studies concluded that the predicted vibration and noise levels are within the FTA requirements and operation of the subway is not anticipated to have adverse impacts with the implementation of mitigation, including areas where the tunnels pass beneath homes and schools. During construction, low levels of noise and vibration may be experienced for a day or two as each of the two TBMs pass under a given location. In addition, as the tunnels are driven, construction trains bring supplies to and from the tunnel heading. However, these underground construction noises will also be controlled to be within Metro criteria.

The Westside Subway Extension will not reduce the availability of BHHS for use as an emergency shelter or impact the operations of its use as an emergency shelter. Furthermore, tunneling would not prevent future development of the BHHS campus. The vertical alignment of the tunnel would be 55 to 70 feet below the ground surface (to the top of the tunnel), which would allow for construction of an underground structure over the tunnel at a later date.

These geotechnical studies also determined that the Century City Santa Monica Station would cross the West Beverly Hills Lineament, a northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood Fault, which poses a significant safety risk to passengers at this station location. No evidence of faulting was found at the proposed Century City Constellation Station site. Tunnels to the east and west of Century City pass through at least two active faults. However, there are numerous tools, designs, and construction means and methods that have been used elsewhere that can be used to safely tunnel through these fault zones.

In addition, the Century City Constellation Boulevard Station has the best pedestrian environment, can be expected to attract the most transit riders, and is centrally located to help shape the redevelopment of Century City as an important transit-oriented destination on the Westside Subway Extension. Further refinements to the ridership analysis concluded that the Century City Constellation Station would result in 3,350 more boardings along new Westside Subway Extension stations than the Century City Santa Monica Station due to proximity to jobs and residences within the critical 600-foot and 1/4-mile walksheds.

Based on all of these factors, the Century City Station Location Report concluded by recommending that the Century City Station be located along Constellation Boulevard due to seismic safety concerns at the Santa Monica Boulevard Station and higher ridership...
Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station and alignments and Section 8.8.4 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more detailed response to geotechnical concerns. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
I write mainly about our architecture, our people, our places, our buildings. So that's a bit of background about who I am.

What I really am here about tonight is my passion for finally maybe seeing the light in the tunnel. Pardon the pun. I grew up in this building. I sold papers in front of May Company when I was ten years old, 1952. I got my back to school clothes here. I saw Hopalong Cassidy in the parking lot on a Saturday. So my life has been on Wilshire Boulevard, and I live on Wilshire. I live at Wilshire and Holmby in the corridor presently.

As long as I can remember, as a youngster, I can remember all the mayors. Mayor Bowron, Mayor Poulson, Sam Yorty, our present mayor, all the mayors promising, wanting to have better transit. They were all going to maybe dig this hole finally, but nobody ever did it. They talked about monorails on the freeway. Maybe that would be a solution. That never happened.

What did happen is, we're choked. We're choked with this gridlock. That is a two syllable word, but any of us that live in it and have to be in it, it's miserable.

It costs us time, frustration, money, et cetera.

So I'm all for anything. I'm not here to talk about details that you talked about. That's all up to your experts and maybe politicians. I'm just here to

Your comment in support of the Westside Subway Extension Project has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative. Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan, and between them, Alternative 2 provides higher ridership and improved cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

Your comment about the project schedule has been noted. In April 2010, the Metro Board of Directors adopted the America Fast Forward 30/10 Initiative that directs that the Westside Subway Extension Project to seek accelerated federal funding to deliver the Project in a single phase to Westwood. Based on this accelerated funding schedule, the parallel construction of portions of the alignment and stations would allow the entire LPA to be open and operational to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station in 2022 as a single phase.

In the event that accelerated federal funding cannot be secured, the LPA would be constructed in three sequential phases in accordance with the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. The first phase to the Wilshire/La Cienega Station would open in 2020, the second phase to the Century City Station would open in 2026, and the final phase to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station would open in 2036.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process. Also Please refer to Section 2.6.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for further information on the construction schedule.
Your support for Alternative 5 (Santa Monica Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

The Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated a significant market for a subway serving Santa Monica and West Hollywood. However, there is not sufficient Measure R or other funding available to construct a Santa Monica or West Hollywood subway at this time. The Santa Monica and West Hollywood corridors are included in the Strategic Element of the 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan. Further study could occur should funding be identified and secured in the future. If the LPA is approved for implementation by the Metro Board, the LPA will also be designed so as not to preclude future westward extension of the subway.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.
Appendix H - Response to Comments

220-2
Your comment on future transit connections to a Sepulveda/I-405 line has been noted. The San Fernando Valley I-405 Corridor Connection is included in Metro’s 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan and funding has been allocated in Measure R for the project. Metro will undertake planning studies for the corridor to identify the mode, alignment and appropriate connections to other area transit projects, including the Westside Subway Extension.

220-3
Your preference for the Westwood/ UCLA Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board decided to continue to study both Westwood/UCLA station location options (On-Street and Off-Street).

A comparative study of the two proposed Westwood/UCLA station locations, including engineering, costs, urban design, and environmental impact considerations, was conducted during the Final EIS/EIR phase to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR.

The Off-Street Station and tunnels would need to be deeper than the On-Street Station to clear the underside of foundations for a future hotel on Gayley Avenue, which makes the station and tunnels riskier and more expensive to construct, and requires more time for transit riders to travel between the platform and the station entrance. Additionally, the Westwood/UCLA Off-Street Station location would require approximately 13 additional permanent underground easements.

The On-Street Station location would provide at least one of entrance at the corner of Wilshire and Westwood Boulevards. This entrance location would provide better access to bus connections along Westwood Boulevard and would be closer to the major office buildings and Westwood Village than the entrances for the Off-Street Station. Furthermore, one of the station entrance options for the On-Street Station is a split entrance between the north and south sides of Wilshire Boulevard, providing access to both sides of busy Wilshire Boulevard. However, the Westwood/UCLA On-Street Station option is also expected to have greater traffic impacts during construction due to in-street construction along Wilshire Boulevard.

Based on these factors, the recommendation is to locate the Westwood/UCLA Station On-Street as this location could accommodate an entrance at the Wilshire Boulevard and Westwood Boulevard intersection, providing better pedestrian access to Westwood Village and connections along Westwood Boulevard.

Your preference for the Westwood/VA Hospital Station has been noted. As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board decided to continue to study both Westwood/VA Hospital station...
location options (South and North).

A comparative study of the two proposed Westwood/VA Hospital station locations, including engineering, costs, urban design, and environmental impact considerations, was conducted during the Final EIS/EIR to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR.

While both options are within one-quarter mile of the VA Hospital, the Westwood/VA Hospital South Station site is 500 feet from the hospital and on the same side of Wilshire Boulevard, while the Westwood/VA Hospital North Station site is 1,200 feet away on the other side of Wilshire Boulevard. Additionally, the North Option could be problematic in the event of a future extension to Santa Monica due to the tight radius curve that would be required to extend west beneath residential properties. However, the construction of the South Option would result in more impacts to traffic circulation during construction, including temporary ramp closures at the I-405 interchange.

Based on these factors, the recommendation is to locate the Westwood/VA Hospital Station on the south side of Wilshire Boulevard as this location would provide better pedestrian access to the VA Medical Center and would more easily accommodate a future westward extension of the subway.

Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Westwood/UCLA Station and the Westwood/VA Hospital Station Locations Report for a comparison of the two Westwood/VA Hospital Station locations. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Please refer to Sections 8.8.5 and 8.8.6 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Westwood/UCLA and the Westwood/VA Hospital Stations. Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Westwood/UCLA and Westwood/VA Hospital Stations following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Westwood/UCLA Station and the Westwood/VA Hospital Station Locations Report for a comparison of the two Westwood/UCLA and Westwood/VA Hospital locations. In addition, the Westside Subway Extension Station Entrance Location Report and Recommendations provides a comparison of the potential entrance locations at Westwood Boulevard, Gayley Avenue and Veteran Avenue for both the On-Street and Off-Street Stations for Westwood/UCLA. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your comment in support of the Century City Constellation Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors decided to continue to study both station location options in Century City (Santa Monica Boulevard and Constellation Boulevard) to address concerns raised by the community regarding locating a station directly on a seismic fault and the safety of tunneling under homes and schools.

In response to the Metro Board of Director’s request for more information, further analysis was undertaken to focus on the engineering and environmental aspects of the two options during the preparation of the Final EIS/EIR to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that prior to conducting the comparative study, the Santa Monica Boulevard Station location was shifted slightly to the east from the location in the Draft EIS/EIR to avoid the Santa Monica Fault zone.

The geotechnical studies conducted during preparation of the Final EIS/EIR concluded that tunneling can be safely carried out beneath the Beverly Hills High School campus and the West Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood neighborhoods. However, these studies also determined that the Century City Santa Monica Station would cross the West Beverly Hills Lineament, a northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood Fault, which poses a significant safety risk to passengers at this station location. No evidence of faulting was found at the proposed Century City Constellation Station site.

In addition, the Century City Constellation Boulevard Station has the best pedestrian environment, can be expected to attract the most transit riders, and is centrally located to help shape the redevelopment of Century City as an important transit-oriented destination on the Westside Subway Extension. Further refinements to the ridership analysis concluded that the Century City Constellation Station would result in 3,350 more boardings along new Westside Subway Extension stations than the Century City Santa Monica Station due to proximity to jobs and residences within the critical 600-foot and 1/4-mile walksheds.

Based on all of these factors, the Century City Station Location Report concluded by recommending that the Century City Station be located along Constellation Boulevard due to seismic safety concerns at the Santa Monica Boulevard Station and higher ridership projections with Constellation Boulevard Station.

Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area
Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Your support for Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 as the Locally Preferred Alternative. Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan, and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.
Your support for Alternative 5 (Santa Monica Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

The Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated a significant market for a subway serving Santa Monica and West Hollywood. However, there is not sufficient Measure R or other funding available to construct a Santa Monica or West Hollywood subway at this time. The Santa Monica and West Hollywood corridors are included in the Strategic Element of the 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan. Further study could occur should funding be identified and secured in the future. If the LPA is approved for implementation by the Metro Board, the LPA will also be designed so as not to preclude future westward extension of the subway.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.
to Universal City Walk, going to the Grove, going to the Beverly Center. I don't like to drive. The traffic here is crazy. So eventually, I know you guys aren't going to do this right away, but this is the best alternative to do. It makes a lot of sense.

The other gentleman that was up here earlier saying don't go into the peoples homes, go down, go into the golf course, that makes sense, too, because then you don't have to worry about going into people's houses like they did going back to Universal Studios.

Again, I appreciate everybody coming to these meetings, as I'm a rider. I don't know how many people here actually riding the bus actually came. I hope more of them do come because if we don't speak up as riders, nothing gets done. Thank you very much.
earthquake nor change the severity of shaking. Finally, tunnels can be constructed and operated safely in gassy grounds and oil wells do not pose an unmitigatable risk to tunneling.

The additional detailed geotechnical studies also assessed soil conditions and determine the potential for noise or vibration impacts on the surface along the refined alignments. These studies concluded that the predicted vibration and noise levels are within the FTA requirements and operation of the subway is not anticipated to have adverse impacts with the implementation of mitigation, including areas where the tunnels pass beneath homes and schools. During construction, low levels of noise and vibration may be experienced for a day or two as each of the two TBMs pass under a given location. In addition, as the tunnels are driven, construction trains bring supplies to and from the tunnel heading. However, these underground construction noises will also be controlled to be within Metro criteria.

The Westside Subway Extension will not reduce the availability of BHHS for use as an emergency shelter or impact the operations of its use as an emergency shelter. Furthermore, tunneling would not prevent future development of the BHHS campus. The vertical alignment of the tunnel would be 55 to 70 feet below the ground surface (to the top of the tunnel), which would allow for construction of an underground structure over the tunnel at a later date.

These geotechnical studies also determined that the Century City Santa Monica Station would cross the West Beverly Hills Lineament, a northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood Fault, which poses a significant safety risk to passengers at this station location. No evidence of faulting was found at the proposed Century City Constellation Station site. Tunnels to the east and west of Century City pass through at least two active faults. However, there are numerous tools, designs, and construction means and methods that have been used elsewhere that can be used to safely tunnel through these fault zones.

In addition, the Century City Constellation Boulevard Station has the best pedestrian environment, can be expected to attract the most transit riders, and is centrally located to help shape the redevelopment of Century City as an important transit-oriented destination on the Westside Subway Extension. Further refinements to the ridership analysis concluded that the Century City Constellation Station would result in 3,350 more boardings along new Westside Subway Extension stations than the Century City Santa Monica Station due to proximity to jobs and residences within the critical 600-foot and 1/4-mile walksheds.

Based on all of these factors, the Century City Station Location Report concluded by recommending that the Century City Station be located along Constellation Boulevard due to seismic safety concerns at the Santa Monica Boulevard Station and higher ridership.
Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station and alignments and Section 8.8.4 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more detailed response to geotechnical concerns. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your support for Alternative 1 (Westwood/UCLA Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative. Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan, and between them, Alternative 2 provides higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

Your comment about the project schedule has been noted. In April 2010, the Metro Board of Directors adopted the America Fast Forward 30/10 Initiative that directs that the Westside Subway Extension Project to seek accelerated federal funding to deliver the Project in a single phase to Westwood. Based on this accelerated funding schedule, the parallel construction of portions of the alignment and stations would allow the entire LPA to be open and operational to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station in 2022 as a single phase.

In the event that accelerated federal funding cannot be secured, the LPA would be constructed in three sequential phases in accordance with the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. The first phase to the Wilshire/La Cienega Station would open in 2020, the second phase to the Century City Station would open in 2026, and the final phase to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station would open in 2036.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process. Please also refer to Section 2.6.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for further information on the construction schedule.
any other segments. This is the basic one that we've been
waiting for probably 50 years. And I really hope that we
can accelerate the project.

But I do think it's important that there be a
portal near the main entrance to the county museum.
Basically, it would be an attraction for the whole
community, the whole Southern California County, the whole
County of Los Angeles, that there's a connection to a
great L.A. County Art Museum. So there should be probably
two portals, one near Fairfax and one close to the
entrance if possible of the museum.

As far as the station at Crenshaw, I'm not that
sure that it's necessary. I think that those two stations
at La Brea and Fairfax will serve the area. You have to
get those done. And then I'm all for the other option,
but basically, we've got to work for this first segment,
and we may not get all the funding. Who knows what's
going to happen in Congress. So that's the important to
get it done before 2019, so we have the option of having
some mobility in this community. Thank you very much.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you.
Tim Deegan, followed by Carolyn Ramsay and
Carol Spencer.
MR. DEEGAN: Thank you. My name is Tim Deegan.

222-2
Your comment supporting the East location for the Wilshire/Fairfax Station has been noted.
On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative, which includes the Wilshire/Fairfax East Station location due to stronger community support and better access and land integration opportunities, including proximity to Museum Row.

The number of entrances at each station was based on the ridership projections for that station. Based on these projections, Metro will construct one station entrance at each of the proposed stations, with the exception of two station entrances at the Westwood/UCLA Station due to high ridership projections.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/Fairfax Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

222-3
Your comment on the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station has been noted. In October 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). A Wilshire/Crenshaw Station was not included in the LPA.

The Wilshire/Crenshaw Station would be located in the Park Mile section of Wilshire Boulevard, adjacent to lower density land uses that are not planned for future growth in the adopted Community Plan and Park Mile Specific Plan. This site is only 0.5 mile from the existing Wilshire/Western Station and does not serve a major north south intersection, as Crenshaw Boulevard terminates at Wilshire Boulevard and does not extend to the north. Because this is a comparatively lower ridership station with a cost of $153 million, eliminating this station from the LPA improves the cost-effectiveness of Alternative 2. Furthermore, future connections from the Westside subway stations along Wilshire Boulevard to the planned Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit project to the south have been recommended to take place at La Brea, La Cienega, or San Vicente rather than at Wilshire/Crenshaw.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside
15 years. Thirteen years ago, I gave up three automobiles, a B.M.W., a Thunderbird, and a Honda as an experiment to see if I could take the bus and public transportation for a year, and I’ve had no need to go back and purchase a car, even though I have a driver’s license. I rent a car when I need it, which is rarely. So Metro, you’re doing a good job of getting me where I need to be. Thank you.

I’m speaking as a transit rider. I’m speaking as a community person. I work at L.A.C.M.A. I came here ten years ago as a volunteer. On Friday, I’ll start year number nine on the staff. I’m committed to Hancock Park. I’m committed to this community. And the statement that I’m sending in, I will read it to you.

“I’m speaking on the behalf of the station option, and I’m asking that you please consider locating the Wilshire Fairfax station and station portal east of Fairfax as close to Hancock Park as possible to provide access and entry to the park, the cultural institutions in and near the park, such as L.A.C.M.A., the Page Museum, the Tar Pits, the Craft and Folk Art Museum, and Peterson Automobile Museum. These institutions represent Museum Row. Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

And that reminds me, because Tim had filled out a written form. Please, if you have one, feel free to
Your comment in support of the Westside Subway Extension Project has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative. Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan, and between them, Alternative 2 provides higher ridership and improved cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.

Your comment regarding the alignment of the Westside Subway Extension has been noted. Metro completed an Alternatives Analysis Study (AA Study) for the Westside Subway Extension Project in January 2009. The AA Study considered whether improvements were needed to the transit system in the area and evaluated various alignments. These alignments as well as alternative modes are illustrated in Section 2.3 of this Final EIS/EIR. The alignments were developed with the goal of linking major activity centers within the Study Area as illustrated in Section 1.3.2 in this Final EIS/EIR. The public comments that were submitted during the Early Scoping Period were considered in the further development of these and other alignments, including connections to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center extending into West Hollywood. Extending the alignment on Wilshire Boulevard further north and then heading to Century City via Burton Way would add additional costs due to additional length and not provide for the most direct connections at the Wilshire/Rodeo and Century City Stations. A people mover, depending on the distance, could increase project costs and long-term maintenance. These alignments were evaluated based on various engineering, environmental, financial, and ridership criteria and the recommended alignment - Wilshire Boulevard with options in Century City was moved forward for further evaluation in the Draft EIS/EIR phase. Please refer to the Westside Extension Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis Study for more details. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Please see the response to comment 224-2 above.
representing both myself and my neighborhood, and that's Comstock Hills. We're a little bit west of Beverly Hills. I haven't had a lot of time to review the E.I.S., as it was released while I was in Europe. I'm interested in the safety of both riders on the subway train, and the areas above and along the sides in the stations and tunnels. I'd like to understand some of the findings.

Why do you need to remove so many trees, number one? Is it correct that no oil is being pumped on the oil well at Beverly Hills High School? It also shows that all the oil wells in that area have been abandoned. And regarding the earthquake faults, specifically the Santa Monica fault, which lies within your criteria time line, I'd like to know if it is possible to build a subway station perpendicular to the fault, when in fact the station is --


Right. Go ahead.

MS. SPENCER: Here I'm back on the Santa Monica fault, which affects the Santa Monica Boulevard Station, if that is in fact the one those chosen in that particular Century City area. And according to your appendix where they have all the detail, it said that the only way to cross a fault line that is active within that time period is to do it

Safety, both during construction and eventual operations, is one of Metro's highest priorities and is one of the key evaluation criteria in selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). In response to the Metro Board of Director's request for more information, further analysis was undertaken to focus on the engineering and environmental aspects of the two options during the preparation of the Final EIS/EIR to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that prior to conducting the comparative study, the Santa Monica Boulevard Station location was shifted slightly to the east from the location in the Draft EIS/EIR to avoid the Santa Monica Fault zone.

On most transit tunnel projects, significant portions of the alignment are constructed adjacent to or beneath buildings. The LPA passes beneath homes and schools in these neighborhoods because the curve radius required for subway tunnels is much wider than that required at a typical surface street intersection. The current alignment minimizes tunneling under buildings to the east and west of both the Century City Stations. The station position on Constellation Boulevard requires the tunnel alignment to be under the south portion of Beverly Hills High School Building B in order to reach the station location. There is no reasonable tunnel alignment that does not pass under homes or structures within the Beverly Hills High School campus.

The geotechnical studies conducted during preparation of the Final EIS/EIR concluded that tunneling can be safely carried out beneath the Beverly Hills High School campus and the West Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood neighborhoods. The use of state-of-the-art pressurized closed-face TBMs for soft-ground tunneling has greatly improved the control of ground movements such that tunneling can be done with minimal surface settlements. The presence of the tunnels will neither affect the risk to buildings above them during an earthquake nor change the severity of shaking. Finally, tunnels can be constructed and
operated safely in gassy grounds and oil wells do not pose an unmitigatable risk to tunneling.

The additional detailed geotechnical studies also assessed soil conditions and determine the potential for noise or vibration impacts on the surface along the refined alignments. These studies concluded that the predicted vibration and noise levels are within the FTA requirements and operation of the subway is not anticipated to have adverse impacts with the implementation of mitigation, including areas where the tunnels pass beneath homes and schools. During construction, low levels of noise and vibration may be experienced for a day or two as each of the two TBM’s pass under a given location. In addition, as the tunnels are driven, construction trains bring supplies to and from the tunnel heading. However, these underground construction noises will also be controlled to be within Metro criteria.

The Westside Subway Extension will not reduce the availability of BHHS for use as an emergency shelter or impact the operations of its use as an emergency shelter. Furthermore, tunneling would not prevent future development of the BHHS campus. The vertical alignment of the tunnel would be 55 to 70 feet below the ground surface (to the top of the tunnel), which would allow for construction of an underground structure over the tunnel at a later date.

These geotechnical studies also determined that the Century City Santa Monica Station would cross the West Beverly Hills Lineament, a northern extension of the active Newport-Ingleswood Fault, which poses a significant safety risk to passengers at this station location. No evidence of faulting was found at the proposed Century City Constellation Station site. Tunnels to the east and west of Century City pass through at least two active faults. However, there are numerous tools, designs, and construction means and methods that have been used elsewhere that can be used to safely tunnel through these fault zones.

In addition, the Century City Constellation Boulevard Station has the best pedestrian environment, can be expected to attract the most transit riders, and is centrally located to help shape the redevelopment of Century City as an important transit-oriented destination on the Westside Subway Extension. Further refinements to the ridership analysis concluded that the Century City Constellation Station would result in 3,350 more boardings along new Westside Subway Extension stations than the Century City Santa Monica Station due to proximity to jobs and residences within the critical 600-foot and 1/4-mile walksheds.

Based on all of these factors, the Century City Station Location Report concluded by recommending that the Century City Station be located along Constellation Boulevard due to seismic safety concerns at the Santa Monica Boulevard Station and higher ridership projections with Constellation Boulevard Station.
Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station and alignments and Section 8.8.4 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more detailed response to geotechnical concerns. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

During construction, some removal or pruning of trees may occur please see Section 4.10 Ecosystems/Biological Resources of the Final EIS/EIR. As these trees are protected under native tree protection ordinance or municipal code, a tree removal permit may be required. Removal and replacement of these trees would be conducted in compliance with applicable regulations and tree protection ordinances of the Cities of Los Angeles and Beverly Hills.

Your comment regarding the risks of tunneling near oil wells have been noted. Tunnels, through known oil well fields, have been safely constructed with no adverse incidents with either hazardous gas or oil casings. In recent Los Angeles tunneling history, there have been no oil well incidents related to tunneling, and oil well casings have been safely removed and re-abandoned.

During the Draft EIS/EIR, known oil fields and documented active or abandoned oil wells were identified from published oil well maps. Table 4-45 in the Draft EIS/EIR identifies oil wells (abandoned and active) that may be located within 100 feet of the proposed tunnel or station, as well as those that may be located within the proposed tunnel alignment. The oil fields themselves are much deeper than the potential subway tunnels. Shafts for existing active and abandoned oil wells have been mapped in the vicinity of the project alignment along with other utilities such as sewer, water, gas, and electric lines.

During the preparation of the Final EIS/EIR, a comprehensive study of all available information found that there was one mapped abandoned oil well within the proposed tunnel alignment. According to the state’s records, the location of this well is beneath a parking structure on Century Park East and does not lie within the Beverly Hills High School (BHHS) campus. The magnetic survey program indicated that the mapped locations
of abandoned oil wells could be inaccurate by 50 to 200 feet.

A geophysical (magnetic) survey was performed on the BHHS campus to detect metal, which would indicate the presence of an abandoned oil well casing. The survey identified only one anomaly on the BHHS campus that is close to the alignment. It is on the west edge of the lacrosse field and is located 5 to 10 feet north of the tunnel envelope. The anomaly may or may not be a well casing, but it will be further investigated and addressed appropriately as described below.

For exploration beneath the BHHS buildings during the next phases of design, horizontal directional drilling (HDD) investigation will be conducted along the alignment at tunnel level. A magnetometer probe survey will be conducted in the drilled hole to detect metal casings so that if found, they can be re-abandoned properly below the tunnel depth prior to tunneling. Moreover, during tunnel construction in Los Angeles, magnetometer surveys have been conducted in probe borings extending in front of the TBM to ensure that obstructions, such as well casings, are detected before they are reached by the TBM. In suspected oil field areas, probing of the tunnel zone will be carried out by HDD either before tunneling or ahead of the face during tunneling. To ensure that these additional studies are conducted, the following mitigation is included in the Final EIS/EIR.

- **CON-53—Further Research on Oil Well Locations**

With implementation of this mitigation measure, oil wells do not pose a risk to tunneling for the project. Abandoned oil wells have been encountered in the past during tunneling in Los Angeles. Procedures have been developed to evaluate the well conditions and safely re-abandon them. Metro has experienced no gas incidents related to encounters with oil well casings during tunnel excavation on other projects.

Please refer to Section 4.8 and Section 4.15 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed discussion of oil wells. The results of further geotechnical investigations conducted during the Final EIS/EIR can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report*. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Your comment about seismic safety has been noted. The LPA, as with most sites in southern California, is susceptible to strong ground shaking generated during earthquakes by nearby faults. At least one segment of the Santa Monica Fault crosses the LPA. In addition to the Santa Monica Fault, the West Beverly Hills Lineament (WBHL)/Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone crosses the LPA in the vicinity of Moreno Drive in the Century City area. However, many underground facilities—subway tunnels, sewers, and storm drains—have been built in Los Angeles and throughout California near and across active faults.
fault lines.

The hazards from an earthquake include fault rupture (cracking/fracturing of the ground where one side of the fault moves relative to the other), shaking, and other secondary effects. While the hazard due to shaking can be designed against, the hazard due to fault rupture is potentially much more severe, but is also much more limited in area, being confined to the specific zone of rupture. Because surface fault rupturing is generally confined to a relative narrow zone of tens to several hundred feet wide, avoidance is often a practical means of avoiding surface fault rupture hazards for facilities such as stations. Furthermore, since subway stations are structures for human occupancy, they should not be built on active fault/deformation zones because of life/safety concerns expressed in state regulations and in Metro Design Criteria.

However, for linear facilities such as tunnels, avoidance may not be possible. Design will allow for the tunnels to cross the faults as perpendicular as possible to the fault line to limit the area of potential damage. Tunneling or building stations along an active fault in a parallel direction is generally not recommended and is in some instances prohibited by State law. Depending on the predicted fault off-set and area over which the movement is distributed, some distortion may be accommodated by the structure. Special designs, such as larger tunnel diameters and enhanced tunnel linings, are employed when crossing fault zones to reduce the risk of damage and allow for a relatively swift return to regular operations should fault displacement take place at a tunnel crossing. The Metro Red Line tunnels cross the Hollywood Fault north of the Highland Station and were built to these heightened standards.

During the Final EIS/EIR phase, Metro conducted further geotechnical studies to supplement the studies conducted during the Draft EIS/EIR, which concluded that both the Santa Monica fault zone and the WBHL in the Century City vicinity are active fault zones and each fault zone is capable of generating earthquakes of M7 or greater with average surface displacements of 3 to 6 feet. Moreover, there is no knowledge of where either of these faults resides in their respective seismic cycles.

Santa Monica Boulevard effectively lies within the Santa Monica Fault zone from west of Century Park West to east of Avenue of the Stars. The originally proposed Santa Monica Boulevard Station at Avenue of the Stars would be directly within the fault zone. The WBHL is a wide fault zone with several well-defined strands situated along the eastern margin of Century City. It is the inferred northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood fault zone. The WBHL terminates the active Santa Monica Fault to the east. The refined location of the Santa Monica Station at Century Park East would straddle the WBHL. No evidence of faulting was found on the Constellation Boulevard Station site.

In summary, both of the Santa Monica Boulevard Station options are located within active
fault zones, but the Constellation Boulevard Station site is located outside zones of active faulting and can be considered a viable option. The LPA will cross fault zones and will require special designs to accommodate fault movement. These mitigation measures, which are detailed in Section 4.8 of this Final EIS/EIR include:

- GEO-2—Fault Crossing Tunnel, Fault Rupture, Tunnel Crossing
- GEO 7 – Tunnel Advisory Panel Design Review

With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts will reduced to less than significant. During subsequent design phases, explorations will continue to more precisely locate the fault zones with respect to the tunnel alignment selected and the fault characteristics for design.

All tunnels, stations, shafts and all other project facilities and infrastructure are designed and built with due consideration and a strict adherence to earthquake design requirements, building codes and conformance to Metro Design Standards for the ground motions of the design level earthquakes.

- GEO-1—Seismic Ground Shaking
- GEO-3—Operational Procedures During an Earthquake
- GEO 7 – Tunnel Advisory Panel Design Review

By compliance with these regulations and requirements, potential seismic ground shaking impacts will be minimized and impacts will be reduced to less than significant.

Please refer to Section 4.8 and Section 4.15 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed discussion of seismic safety both during operation and construction. The results of further geotechnical investigations conducted during the Final EIS/EIR can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your comment regarding noise and vibration during operation has been noted.

Subway tunnels are typically at least 50 to 70 feet below the surface to the track depth. As a result, noise and vibration are not typically noticeable at the surface. In the Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood areas, the proposed subway tunnels would generally be deeper than this in the areas where it would pass beneath homes and schools. For example, at Beverly Hills High School, the track depth would be 75-80 feet below the first floor of the school buildings. In Westwood, the track depth is more than 100 feet deep in most places. Since the first segment of the subway opened in 1993, Metro has received no complaints about noise or vibration due to subway operations.

Additional detailed geotechnical studies were conducted during the Final EIS/EIR phase to assess soil conditions and determine the potential for noise or vibration impacts on the surface along the refined alignments. This included measurements at the Beverly Hills High School site and in its buildings, as well as in the residential area between the Century City and Westwood/UCLA Stations.

These studies concluded that the predicted vibration and noise levels are within the FTA requirements, and tunnel operation is not anticipated to have adverse impacts with the implementation of mitigation. Noise from operation of the LPA from such sources as station ventilation system fans, emergency ventilation fans, traction power substations, and emergency generators will be designed to meet the noise-level limits specified in Metro Rail Design Criteria and will not result in any noise impacts. There are no vibration-sensitive receivers along the LPA that are predicted to exceed the FTA ground-borne vibration criteria.

Three locations along the LPA were identified where exceedance of the FTA ground-borne noise criteria will occur due to train operations along tangent track or through crossovers, if mitigation measures are not implemented. These locations are the Wilshire Ebell Theatre, an apartment building on Wilshire Boulevard at Orange Drive, and the Saban Theatre. To mitigate the potential for ground-borne noise impacts at these three locations, the following mitigation measures will be implemented:

- **VIB-1**—High compliance direct-fixation resilient rail fasteners will be incorporated into the design of the trackwork at the Wilshire Ebell Theatre and the Saban Theatre, which will reduce ground-borne noise by 5 to 7 dBA.
- **VIB-2**—A low impact crossover such as a moveable point frog or a spring-loaded frog will be used in the design of Wilshire/La Brea No. 10 double crossover for the apartments, which will reduce ground-borne noise by 5 to 6 dBA.

With these mitigation measures, there are no vibration-sensitive receivers that are predicted to exceed the FTA ground-borne vibration criteria during operation. Mitigation
Measure VIB-2 was added subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR due to the additional studies conducted during preparation of this Final EIS/EIR.

Should future underground construction be considered that would place a school building foundation closer to the tunnel, mitigation measures could be implemented to reduce ground-borne noise and vibration impacts. To mitigate such noise impacts, a high-compliance direct-fixation resilient rail fastener can be incorporated into the track work.

Results of these additional noise and vibration analyses and mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.6 of this Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Noise and Vibration Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
226-1

Your support for Alternative 5 (Santa Monica Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

The Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated a significant market for a subway serving Santa Monica and West Hollywood. However, there is not sufficient Measure R or other funding available to construct a Santa Monica or West Hollywood subway at this time. The Santa Monica and West Hollywood corridors are included in the Strategic Element of the 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan. Further study could occur should funding be identified and secured in the future. If the LPA is approved for implementation by the Metro Board, the LPA will also be designed so as not to preclude future westward extension of the subway.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.
226-2

Your comment on the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station has been noted. In October 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). A Wilshire/Crenshaw Station was not included in the LPA.

The Wilshire/Crenshaw Station would be located in the Park Mile section of Wilshire Boulevard, adjacent to lower density land uses that are not planned for future growth in the adopted Community Plan and Park Mile Specific Plan. This site is only 0.5 mile from the existing Wilshire/Western Station and does not serve a major north south intersection, as Crenshaw Boulevard terminates at Wilshire Boulevard and does not extend to the north. Because this is a comparatively lower ridership station with a cost of $153 million, eliminating this station from the LPA improves the cost-effectiveness of Alternative 2. Furthermore, future connections from the Westside subway stations along Wilshire Boulevard to the planned Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit project to the south have been recommended to take place at La Brea, La Cienega, or San Vicente rather than at Wilshire/Crenshaw.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

226-3

Your comment in support of the Century City Constellation Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors decided to continue to study both station location options in Century City (Santa Monica Boulevard and Constellation Boulevard) to address concerns raised by the community regarding locating a station directly on a seismic fault and the safety of tunneling under homes and schools.

In response to the Metro Board of Director’s request for more information, further analysis was undertaken to focus on the engineering and environmental aspects of the two options during the preparation of the Final EIS/EIR to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that prior to conducting the comparative study, the Santa Monica Boulevard Station location was shifted slightly to the east from the location in the Draft EIS/EIR to avoid the Santa Monica Fault zone.

The geotechnical studies conducted during preparation of the Final EIS/EIR concluded that tunneling can be safely carried out beneath the Beverly Hills High School campus and the...
West Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood neighborhoods. However, these studies also determined that the Century City Santa Monica Station would cross the West Beverly Hills Lineament, a northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood Fault, which poses a significant safety risk to passengers at this station location. No evidence of faulting was found at the proposed Century City Constellation Station site.

In addition, the Century City Constellation Boulevard Station has the best pedestrian environment, can be expected to attract the most transit riders, and is centrally located to help shape the redevelopment of Century City as an important transit-oriented destination on the Westside Subway Extension. Further refinements to the ridership analysis concluded that the Century City Constellation Station would result in 3,350 more boardings along new Westside Subway Extension stations than the Century City Santa Monica Station due to proximity to jobs and residences within the critical 600-foot and 1/4-mile walksheds.

Based on all of these factors, the Century City Station Location Report concluded by recommending that the Century City Station be located along Constellation Boulevard due to seismic safety concerns at the Santa Monica Boulevard Station and higher ridership projections with Constellation Boulevard Station.

Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Your preference for the Off-Street location of the Westwood/ UCLA Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board decided to continue to study both Westwood/UCLA station location options (On-Street and Off-Street).

A comparative study of the two proposed Westwood/UCLA station locations, including engineering, costs, urban design, and environmental impact considerations, was conducted during the Final EIS/EIR phase to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the
The Off-Street Station and tunnels would need to be deeper than the On-Street Station to clear the underside of foundations for a future hotel on Gayley Avenue, which makes the station and tunnels riskier and more expensive to construct, and requires more time for transit riders to travel between the platform and the station entrance. Additionally, the Westwood/UCLA Off-Street Station location would require approximately 13 additional permanent underground easements.

The On-Street Station location would provide at least one entrance at the corner of Wilshire and Westwood Boulevards. This entrance location would provide better access to bus connections along Westwood Boulevard and would be closer to the major office buildings and Westwood Village than the entrances for the Off-Street Station. Furthermore, one of the station entrance options for the On-Street Station is a split entrance between the north and south sides of Wilshire Boulevard, providing access to both sides of busy Wilshire Boulevard. However, the Westwood/UCLA On-Street Station option is also expected to have greater traffic impacts during construction due to in-street construction along Wilshire Boulevard.

Based on these factors, the recommendation is to locate the Westwood/UCLA Station On-Street as this location could accommodate an entrance at the Wilshire Boulevard and Westwood Boulevard intersection, providing better pedestrian access to Westwood Village and connections along Westwood Boulevard.

Please refer to Section 8.8.6 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Westwood/UCLA Station. Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Westwood/UCLA Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Westwood/UCLA Station and the Westwood/VA Hospital Station Locations Report for a comparison of the two Westwood/UCLA locations. In addition, the Westside Subway Extension Station Entrance Location Report and Recommendations provides a comparison of the potential entrance locations at Westwood Boulevard, Gayley Avenue and Veteran Avenue for both the On-Street and Off-Street Stations. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your comment about alternative routes and technologies for the subway has been noted. Between 2007 and 2009, Metro conducted an Alternatives Analysis (AA) Study for the Westside Corridor. The AA Study considered the need for transit improvements in the corridor and evaluated various transit technologies and alignments. During Early Scoping meetings, Metro presented the public with technology options that included Heavy Rail Transit (HRT), Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). In response to comments received, Metro added monorail to those other technologies to be analyzed in the AA Study. As a result of these analyses, the Metro Board decided to carry five subway alternatives into the Draft EIS/EIR. An underground alignment was recommended because it has fewer land use, traffic, visual, historic, and noise impacts than an elevated alignment. This is due to the impacts an elevated alignment would have on adjacent buildings (some historic), visual quality, shadow, noise, land acquisitions and traffic, as well as the mitigations needed. The AA Study also identified HRT as the preferred mode for further study because it has the capacity to meet the anticipated ridership demand and would minimize the number of transfers.

Please refer to Section 2.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis Study, available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
I have a question for you Jody. Do you know about this?

MS. LITVAK: I can't answer questions right now, so just ask your questions.

MR. WARSUMA: Okay. Does anybody know about this, anybody?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is it?

MR. WARSUMA: It's a 2001 long range transportation plans for Los Angeles County.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sure somebody here has it in their collection.

MR. WARSUMA: Oh, okay. All right then. Yes, they're doing really well, M.T.A. And I'm really proud of them. They really are making it. I think we can do it. I think they have the ability to do it. If London Underground can do it, and they can build a subway all over London, then M.T.A. Los Angeles can do it. Yes, so they can do it.

I'm worried that so many people losing their jobs now, and so many people -- many Americans are just living in poverty, and some people just don't have any cars, and they take the subway, and transportation is really scary in Los Angeles. So -- but I think M.T.A., Los Angeles County can do it. Yes, they can do it. Yes, so they can build a subway. And thank you so much, M.T.A. I know you
Your comments about construction impacts have been noted.

The subway tunnels will be built using “Earth Pressure Balance” tunnel boring machines. Most of the tunneling happens completely below ground with little if any noticeable impact on the surface. Subway stations are built by excavating the site or the “station box” and then building the station below ground. If the station is built under a street, it is covered over with concrete decking during construction to allow traffic to continue to flow overhead. Traffic would be disrupted at the beginning of station construction to allow for initial excavation and installation of the concrete decking, and again at the end to remove the decking and reconstruct the street. Section 3.8, Section 4.15, and Appendix E of this Final EIS/EIR describe the construction process in detail.

Impacts of construction and potential mitigation measures were further evaluated in the Final EIS/EIR. Typical impacts that would occur during construction include temporary lane or roadway closures (to install decking over station areas or for temporary placement of construction equipment or materials), removal and hauling of earth from tunneling and station excavation, construction traffic and parking, potential detours to reach businesses or residences, and noise and air quality impacts. Mitigation measures will be implemented to reduce the intensity and inconvenience of these impacts. However, some impacts will remain significant and unavoidable during construction, including traffic, noise and air quality emission impacts.

As with other construction projects, Metro will work to minimize those impacts on businesses, residents, and property owners. Mitigation measures will encompass ensuring that the decking is flush with the street, locating earth removal sites near major streets and freeways, specifying haul routes, closing lanes for deck placement or removal during off-peak traffic periods, etc. Improved communications, including signage and advertising, are typically employed to help maintain access to businesses. In addition, Metro has established procedures to document existing conditions at properties along the subway construction alignment in advance of construction to accurately assess and address any damage claims that may arise.

Refer to Sections 3.8 and 4.15 of the Final EIS/EIR for an analysis of construction impacts and mitigation measures, and Appendix E for more discussion on subway construction methods.

Your comment regarding cost overruns has been noted. Section 6.4 of the Final EIS/EIR includes a discussion of risks and uncertainties regarding project cost and funding. Prior to FTA’s approval of the Project into Preliminary Engineering, Metro, FTA, and FTA’s Project Management Oversight Contractor assessed potential cost risks, developed strategies for mitigating risks, and evaluated the level of contingency included in the Project’s budget. Metro is continuing to work with FTA throughout Preliminary Engineering to refine the cost.
like the visitors. Remember the visitors that came on television. "We're here to help you. We'll cure cancer. Just follow us." And they pulled it off, and they were gigantic ugly vicious lizards. Now, you want to believe them, go ahead and believe them.

I'm telling you, you want the truth? HollywoodHighlands.org, my Website, one half million visits. "All right. Come to our Twitter." If you want to find out what's happening here, look, they skulk when I talk about it. There's enough, "And look at the Expo Line, the light rails to the sea. How are you doing? Oh, it's only a hundred million dollars over budget and a year behind schedule." And no one gives a damn because it's in a black neighborhood. No one cares about it. Only when it comes to a white neighborhood --

MS. LITVAK: John, your time is up. Thank you.

Craig Thompson, followed by Tania Ibanez. And I'll take some more comment cards if you've got them. Raise them about, and someone will get them to you, or Rebecca will hand them to you. Okay.

Go ahead.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. I'm Craig Thompson from Citizens for Better Mobility, and our organization is dedicated to improving public transportation here in the southland.

Now, for example, I've seen on these maps, the estimate and the financial plan.

Your comments about transit ridership have been noted. Transit ridership projections for the forecast year of 2035 were developed using the travel forecasting model developed by Metro and the Southern California Association of Governments, which followed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance and meets FTA's goals: to have the model tell a coherent story about travel behavior, reliably reproduce current travel patterns, and ensure a rational response to change. Metro's travel demand model is a resident model stratified by three income levels and includes the three standard trip purposes of Home-Based Work, Home-Based Other, and Non-Home Based, plus the additional trip purpose of Home-Based University. The model does not include tourism or special events. The modeling effort included FTA's participation throughout the process and a final review was held in September 2009 during which FTA concurred that the model was ready for application to this Project. The model was calibrated with 2001 and 2006 on-board survey data and then validated against transit ridership information to ensure it properly represents travel activity for the Los Angeles County and regional transportation system.

The Metro forecasting model uses "best practices" for urban travel models in the U.S. and reflects changes in land use, socioeconomic conditions, trip flows and transportation network improvements. The model is based on a set of realistic input assumptions regarding land use and demographic changes between now and 2035 and expected transportation levels-of-service on both the highway and public transit system. Key data used by the model include the following:

- Southern California Association of Government (SCAG) forecasts of population and employment densities
- SCAG-forecasted socio-demographic characteristics of travelers
- Person-trip flows
- Characteristics of the roadway and transit systems, including travel times, costs, and capacity reflective of No Build, TSM, and Build Alternatives

Documentation is available in available in Section 3.2.1 of this Final EIS/EIR and in the Los Angeles Mode Choice Model: Calibration/Validation Report.

Please refer to Section 3.2.1 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information on ridership forecasting methodology. In addition, the Los Angeles Mode Choice Model: Calibration/Validation Report provide detailed information about the ridership model and the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives provides a summary of the updated results prepared for the Final EIS/EIR. The Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your comment regarding the purpose of the subway has been noted. As described in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS/EIR, the main purpose of the Project is to improve transit time in order to provide more reliable transit service to the 286,200 transit riders who access the Study Area today. More specifically, the Project purpose is to make improvements to Study Area mobility and travel reliability; transit services within the Study Area; access to major activity and employment centers in the Study Area; opportunities for transit supportive land use policies and conditions; and transportation equity.

Your comment regarding tunneling through the La Brea Tar Pits has been noted.

Construction of the LPA is expected to encounter paleontological resources in asphaltic matrix in and around Hancock Park (Rancho La Brea Tar Pits) in an area extending from the existing Wilshire/Western Station to the Wilshire/Fairfax Station. Fossils from non-asphaltic deposits may be recovered along the remainder of the LPA alignment based on known paleontological resources along La Cienega Boulevard, Wilshire Boulevard near Beverly Drive, near Century City, and at Wilshire and Thayer.

The areas surrounding the Wilshire/Fairfax and Wilshire/La Brea Stations are known to have tar deposits and/or tar sands and possibly paleontological features that may have to be removed under special conditions. Preliminary preparation and excavation in advance of construction could minimize construction delays, if feasible.

The following mitigation measures will be implemented to reduce the impacts of the Project on paleontological resources:

- PA-2—Early Fossil Recovery
- PA-3—Retain the Services of a Qualified Principal Paleontologist
- PA-4—Development of a Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (PRMMP)
- PA-5—Required Activities for Recovered Fossils in the PRMMP
- PA-6—Preparation of a Report on Paleontological Resources Recovered
- PA-7—Curation of Identified and Prepared Fossils

Please refer to Section 4.14 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed discussion of impacts to paleontological resources during construction. As well as the Westside Subway Extension Cultural Resources Technical Report and the Westside Subway Extension Archaeological Resources Supplemental Survey Report. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
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1. subway just ends right in Santa Monica, but there's
2. something wrong with that. Why not curve it to go south
3. down Lincoln Boulevard, bring it -- elevate it, and run it
4. straight to L.A.X. That way, you'll have a high speed,
5. high capacity, very safe public transportation system.
6. Of course, you could go with light rail, but light
7. rail is second choice, lower speed, less capacity, and
8. with AnsaldoBreda cars, very unsafe. I suggest that this
9. matter be looked into with -- pertaining to bringing the
10. subway elevated once it reaches Santa Monica, down Lincoln
11. to L.A.X.
12. Furthermore, I feel that money should be spent on
13. expanding the Wilmont (phonetic) juncture at Wilshire and
14. Vermont. So that trains going eastbound can go northbound
15. on Vermont up into North Hollywood. And also with the
16. west Hollywood line, why do you have to end it there at
17. Highland? You can run a set of tracks past Highland to
18. join right into the existing Red Line tracks, and you
19. will provide better service. Thank you very much.
20. MS. LITVAK: Thank you.
21. Tania Ibanez, then Monroe Jones, and then
22. Duane Weisenhaus.
23. MS. IBANEZ: Hi. My name is Tania Ibanez. I live in
24. the Miracle Mile area. I'm an attorney, and I work
25. Downtown Los Angeles. And I take the bus and the Metro to
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Your comment on future transit connections has been noted. Stations have been designed
as not to preclude future transfer connections.

Your comment regarding the length of the alignment has been noted. On October 28,
2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital
Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). This alternative is the longest
alignment that is affordable with available funds. In selecting a route, Metro considered
several factors, including ridership, user benefits, travel time, capital costs, performance
characteristics, and environmental impacts. If the LPA is approved for implementation by
the Metro Board, the LPA will be designed so as not to preclude future westward extension.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the
development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.
work every day, five days a week. And what I usually end
up having to do is, I will walk through to La Brea and
Wilshire stop. And then I take the bus, which is the 720
or the 20 to Western and Wilshire. And from there, I take
the Purple Line and get off at Pershing Square or Civic,
depending on whether or not I have a court appearance.

So I'm one of the people who actually uses the
Purple Line. And I'm one of the people that actually uses
the bus. And the reason I'm here today is to say, hurry,
please. I'd like to see the Metro go to La Brea and
Fairfax before I retire.

And second of all, I think you should really
consider the Crenshaw stop. I understand your rationale
for not doing it. It's not a mile apart and that the
ridership at Crenshaw is not that significant. But from
my personal observation, there are a lot of people that do
get on the bus to take the Purple Line from Crenshaw and
Wilshire. There's a lot of people.

Those people are not here. They tend to be
Hispanic. They tend to be black. They tend to be Asian,
and I don't know that they're adequately represented by
these westside type of meetings. But there are a lot
of people that are getting on the bus from Crenshaw that
are not here today.

Another thing that I wanted to mention is that
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Your comment about the project schedule has been noted. In April 2010, the Metro Board
of Directors adopted the America Fast Forward 30/10 Initiative that directs that the
Westside Subway Extension Project to seek accelerated federal funding to deliver the
Project in a single phase to Westwood. Based on this accelerated funding schedule, the
parallel construction of portions of the alignment and stations would allow the entire LPA to
be open and operational to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station in 2022 as a single phase.

In the event that accelerated federal funding cannot be secured, the LPA would be
constructed in three sequential phases in accordance with the Metro Long Range
Transportation Plan. The first phase to the Wilshire/La Cienega Station would open in
2020, the second phase to the Century City Station would open in 2026, and the final
phase to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station would open in 2036.

Please refer to Section 2.6.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for further information on the
construction schedule.
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Your comment on the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station has been noted. In October 2010, the
Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Extension) as the Locally
Preferred Alternative (LPA). A Wilshire/Crenshaw Station was not included in the LPA.

The Wilshire/Crenshaw Station would be located in the Park Mile section of Wilshire
Boulevard, adjacent to lower density land uses that are not planned for future growth in the
adopted Community Plan and Park Mile Specific Plan. This site is only 0.5 mile from the
existing Wilshire/Western Station and does not serve a major north south intersection, as
Crenshaw Boulevard terminates at Wilshire Boulevard and does not extend to the north.
Because this is a comparatively lower ridership station with a cost of $153 million,
eliminating this station from the LPA improves the cost-effectiveness of Alternative 2.
Furthermore, future connections from the Westside subway stations along Wilshire
Boulevard to the planned Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit project to the south have been
recommended to take place at La Brea, La Cienega, or San Vicente rather than at
Wilshire/Crenshaw.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the
development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process.
The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following
Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the
Wilshire/Crenshaw Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community
comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside
the Crenshaw stop would also assist commuters that work along Highland Avenue. That would be much more convenient for them than La Brea. Furthermore, I think you should also consider that a lot of the people that are getting on the Crenshaw stop sign from the 720 -- yes. Obviously, the M.T.A. --

MS. LITVAK: Thank you. I’m sorry. Your time is up.

Send the stuff in.

Monroe Jones, it’s your turn. Come on up.

Duane Weisenhaus, and then Gerald Pass.

Rebecca, did you have more speaker cards for me?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MS. LITVAK: Okay. But we’ll take them. Keep on coming.

MR. JONES: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Monroe, and I’m a M.T.A. public transit rider, and I’m part of the L.A. County Regional.

I would like to say that I think it would be a good idea to extend the Red Line from North Hollywood all the way to Kilshire and Western and then take it all the way down, and take the Purple Line all the way down to Santa Monica, and Lincoln. That way, those of you who work in Santa Monica can take the Purple Line all the way into the west side because the west side is very crowded with a lot of people.
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Your support for Alternative 5 (Santa Monica Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

The Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated a significant market for a subway serving Santa Monica and West Hollywood. However, there is not sufficient Measure R or other funding available to construct a Santa Monica or West Hollywood subway at this time. The Santa Monica and West Hollywood corridors are included in the Strategic Element of the 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan. Further study could occur should funding be identified and secured in the future. If the LPA is approved for implementation by the Metro Board, the LPA will also be designed so as not to preclude future westward extension of the subway.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.
And some of you who work in the west side need a way to get there instead of taking a bus and trying to get there in a 10, 15-minute fashion. But sometimes you guys want to get to your home or job on time, so you have to take three or four buses just to get to where you’re going. So I think this alternative would be a good idea to take the Purple Line all the way into Santa Monica.

So those of you who work in Santa Monica, make sure you speak up at these meetings because they’re for your convenience. And it gives you an opportunity to speak up for yourselves and also for the transit system.

Thank you.

Duane, is it Weisenhaus?

MR. WEISENHAUS: Weisenhaus.

MS. LITVAK: Great. Followed by Gerald Pass, and then Charles Adelman.

MR. WEISENHAUS: Duane Weisenhaus. I just wanted to comment on where I think some of these alternatives should go. First, I think it is great that we’re this far along, that the staff has voted in with the Measure R and pushing the 3010 program, so it may actually happen.

As far as the Wilshire station, I agree with the previous speakers. Too bad that even though it doesn’t get as high a ridership as the other stations, there is a
Your comment on the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station has been noted. In October 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). A Wilshire/Crenshaw Station was not included in the LPA.

The Wilshire/Crenshaw Station would be located in the Park Mile section of Wilshire Boulevard, adjacent to lower density land uses that are not planned for future growth in the adopted Community Plan and Park Mile Specific Plan. This site is only 0.5 mile from the existing Wilshire/Western Station and does not serve a major north south intersection, as Crenshaw Boulevard terminates at Wilshire Boulevard and does not extend to the north. Because this is a comparatively lower ridership station with a cost of $153 million, eliminating this station from the LPA improves the cost-effectiveness of Alternative 2. Furthermore, future connections from the Westside subway stations along Wilshire Boulevard to the planned Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit project to the south have been recommended to take place at La Brea, La Cienega, or San Vicente rather than at Wilshire/Crenshaw.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Your comment supporting the East location for the Wilshire/Fairfax Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative, which includes the Wilshire/Fairfax East Station location due to stronger community support and better access and land integration opportunities, including proximity to Museum Row.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/Fairfax Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Your preference for the East location for the Wilshire/La Cienega Station has been noted.
On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). At Wilshire/La Cienega, the Board selected the East Station location without a West Hollywood connection structure as part of the LPA. This is the preferred station entrance location for the City of Beverly Hills because it will be located in a denser, more commercial area than the other station location to the west of La Cienega. This entrance location also will provide excellent connections to two major north-south arterials – La Cienega and San Vicente Boulevards.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/La Cienega Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Your preference for the inclusion of the West Hollywood connection structure has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The Board chose not to include a West Hollywood connection structure in the LPA due to funding constraints.

Additionally, the cost of the connection structure is not sufficiently justified when there may be alternative, less costly solutions to serve the West Hollywood transit market, such as a light rail line. The Draft EIS/EIR showed that there is a market for transit improvements serving West Hollywood, and this corridor is included in the Strategic Element of the 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan. Should funding be identified and secured, further study could be done to identify a project that would be competitive under Federal funding criteria.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/La Cienega Station, including the potential connection structure, following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Your comment in support of the Century City Constellation Station has been noted. On
October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors decided to continue to study both station location options in Century City (Santa Monica Boulevard and Constellation Boulevard) to address concerns raised by the community regarding locating a station directly on a seismic fault and the safety of tunneling under homes and schools.

In response to the Metro Board of Director’s request for more information, further analysis was undertaken to focus on the engineering and environmental aspects of the two options during the preparation of the Final EIS/EIR to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that prior to conducting the comparative study, the Santa Monica Boulevard Station location was shifted slightly to the east from the location in the Draft EIS/EIR to avoid the Santa Monica Fault zone.

The geotechnical studies conducted during preparation of the Final EIS/EIR concluded that tunneling can be safely carried out beneath the Beverly Hills High School campus and the West Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood neighborhoods. However, these studies also determined that the Century City Santa Monica Station would cross the West Beverly Hills Lineament, a northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood Fault, which poses a significant safety risk to passengers at this station location. No evidence of faulting was found at the proposed Century City Constellation Station site.

In addition, the Century City Constellation Boulevard Station has the best pedestrian environment, can be expected to attract the most transit riders, and is centrally located to help shape the redevelopment of Century City as an important transit-oriented destination on the Westside Subway Extension. Further refinements to the ridership analysis concluded that the Century City Constellation Station would result in 3,350 more boardings along new Westside Subway Extension stations than the Century City Santa Monica Station due to proximity to jobs and residences within the critical 600-foot and 1/4-mile walksheds.

Based on all of these factors, the Century City Station Location Report concluded by recommending that the Century City Station be located along Constellation Boulevard due to seismic safety concerns at the Santa Monica Boulevard Station and higher ridership projections with Constellation Boulevard Station.

Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area..
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Tunneling Safety Report. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
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Your preference for the Off-Street location of the Westwood/ UCLA Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board decided to continue to study both Westwood/UCLA station location options (On-Street and Off-Street).

A comparative study of the two proposed Westwood/UCLA station locations, including engineering, costs, urban design, and environmental impact considerations, was conducted during the Final EIS/EIR phase to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR.

The Off-Street Station and tunnels would need to be deeper than the On-Street Station to clear the underside of foundations for a future hotel on Gayley Avenue, which makes the station and tunnels riskier and more expensive to construct, and requires more time for transit riders to travel between the platform and the station entrance. Additionally, the Westwood/UCLA Off-Street Station location would require approximately 13 additional permanent underground easements.

The On-Street Station location would provide at least one of entrance at the corner of Wilshire and Westwood Boulevards. This entrance location would provide better access to bus connections along Westwood Boulevard and would be closer to the major office buildings and Westwood Village than the entrances for the Off-Street Station. Furthermore, one of the station entrance options for the On-Street Station is a split entrance between the north and south sides of Wilshire Boulevard, providing access to both sides of busy Wilshire Boulevard. However, the Westwood/UCLA On-Street Station option is also expected to have greater traffic impacts during construction due to in-street construction along Wilshire Boulevard.

Based on these factors, the recommendation is to locate the Westwood/UCLA Station On-Street as this location could accommodate an entrance at the Wilshire Boulevard and Westwood Boulevard intersection, providing better pedestrian access to Westwood Village and connections along Westwood Boulevard.

Please refer to Section 8.8.6 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Westwood/UCLA Station. Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the...
Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Westwood/UCLA Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Westwood/UCLA Station and the Westwood/VA Hospital Station Locations Report for a comparison of the two Westwood/UCLA locations. In addition, the Westside Subway Extension Station Entrance Location Report and Recommendations provides a comparison of the potential entrance locations at Westwood Boulevard, Gayley Avenue and Veteran Avenue for both the On-Street and Off-Street Stations. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Your comment in support of the Westside Subway Extension Project has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative. Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan, and between them, Alternative 2 provides higher ridership and improved cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.

Mitigation measures are needed to reduce potential impacts associated with the Project. Please refer to tables S-6, S-7, and S-8 in the Executive Summary of the Final EIS/EIR for a summary of impacts and mitigation for the Project. Also refer to Appendix I of the Final EIS/EIR for a detailed listing all proposed mitigation measures.
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Your support for Alternative 3 (Santa Monica Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

Although Alternative 3 (Santa Monica Extension) was not adopted as the LPA, and is not affordable within the adopted LRTP, an extension of the subway from Westwood to Santa Monica does demonstrate potential to be a successful rail transit line in the future. This corridor is included in the Strategic Element of the 2009 LRTP. Therefore, further study could occur should funding be identified and secured in the future. If the LPA is approved for implementation by the Metro Board, the LPA will be designed so as not to preclude future westward extension of the subway.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.
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Your comment on the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station has been noted. In October 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). A Wilshire/Crenshaw Station was not included in the LPA.

The Wilshire/Crenshaw Station would be located in the Park Mile section of Wilshire Boulevard, adjacent to lower density land uses that are not planned for future growth in the adopted Community Plan and Park Mile Specific Plan. This site is only 0.5 mile from the existing Wilshire/Western Station and does not serve a major north south intersection, as Crenshaw Boulevard terminates at Wilshire Boulevard and does not extend to the north. Because this is a comparatively lower ridership station with a cost of $153 million, eliminating this station from the LPA improves the cost-effectiveness of Alternative 2. Furthermore, future connections from the Westside subway stations along Wilshire Boulevard to the planned Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit project to the south have been recommended to take place at La Brea, La Cienega, or San Vicente rather than at Wilshire/Crenshaw.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside
Your support for Alternative 5 (Santa Monica Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

The Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated a significant market for a subway serving Santa Monica and West Hollywood. However, there is not sufficient Measure R or other funding available to construct a Santa Monica or West Hollywood subway at this time. The Santa Monica and West Hollywood corridors are included in the Strategic Element of the 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan. Further study could occur should funding be identified and secured in the future. If the LPA is approved for implementation by the Metro Board, the LPA will also be designed so as not to preclude future westward extension of the subway.

Regarding your comment on the extension to Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, this was not included in the Project scope.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.

Your comment on the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station has been noted. In October 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). A Wilshire/Crenshaw Station was not included in the LPA. The Wilshire/Crenshaw Station would be located in the Park Mile section of Wilshire Boulevard, adjacent to lower density land uses that are not planned for future growth in the adopted Community Plan and Park Mile Specific Plan. This site is only 0.5 mile from the existing Wilshire/Western Station and does not serve a major north south intersection, as Crenshaw Boulevard terminates at Wilshire Boulevard and does not extend to the north. Because this is a comparatively lower ridership station with a cost of $153 million, eliminating this station from the LPA improves the cost-effectiveness of Alternative 2. Furthermore, future connections from the Westside subway stations along Wilshire Boulevard to the planned Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit project to the south have been recommended to take place at La Brea, La Cienega, or San Vicente rather than at Wilshire/Crenshaw.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process.

The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following
Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
The main thing I want to talk about though, is your ridership estimates on the E.I.R. are incredibly low. It's kind of strange that the Century City Station would generate lower ridership than Hollywood Highland currently generates. The average ridership for the existing subway per station is about 9300 boarding per station. Only one station would even match that. Think about it.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

Felicia. Where is Felicia? Followed by Owen Smith.

MS. FADALE: Fadale.

MS. LITVAK: Okay. Say it again in the microphone when you get there.

MS. FADALE: Hello. I'm Felicia Fadale. Can I be heard now?

MS. LITVAK: Stand closer to the microphone.

MS. FADALE: Okay. Hi, I'm Felicia Fadale. I'm interested in good transit. I'm glad our councilman is after a good plan. Has anyone ever ridden the 920? It's an express bus, and it stops smack at Vermont. But if you want to know how many people would take the subway from one place to another, ridership on that might be a good...
critical 600-foot and 1/4-mile walksheds. As a consequence, the 14,005 riders estimated to walk to the Century City Station along Constellation Boulevard is approximately 72 percent greater than the approximately 8,145 riders expected to walk to the Santa Monica Boulevard Station. The Constellation Boulevard Station has the best pedestrian environment, can be expected to attract the most transit riders, and is centrally located to help shape the redevelopment of Century City as an important transit-oriented destination on the Westside Subway Extension.

In addition to ridership studies, the geotechnical studies conducted during preparation of the Final EIS/EIR concluded that tunneling can be safely carried out beneath the Beverly Hills High School campus and the West Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood neighborhoods. However, these studies also determined that the Century City Santa Monica Station would cross the West Beverly Hills Lineament, a northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood Fault, which poses a significant safety risk to passengers at this station location. No evidence of faulting was found at the proposed Century City Constellation Station site.

Based on all of these factors, the Century City Station Location Report concluded by recommending that the Century City Station be located along Constellation Boulevard due to seismic safety concerns at the Santa Monica Boulevard Station and higher ridership projections with Constellation Boulevard Station.

Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your comments about transit ridership have been noted. Transit ridership projections for the forecast year of 2035 were developed using the travel forecasting model developed by Metro and the Southern California Association of Governments, which followed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance and meets FTA's goals: to have the model tell a coherent story about travel behavior, reliably reproduce current travel patterns, and ensure a rational response to change. Metro's travel demand model is a resident model stratified by three income levels and includes the three standard trip purposes of Home-Based Work, Home-Based Other, and Non-Home Based, plus the additional trip purpose of Home-Based University. The model does not include tourism or special events. The modeling effort included FTA's participation throughout the process and a final review was held in September 2009 during which FTA concurred that the model was ready for application to this Project. The model was calibrated with 2001 and 2006 on-board survey data and then validated against transit ridership information to ensure it properly represents travel activity for the Los Angeles County and regional transportation system.

The Metro forecasting model uses “best practices” for urban travel models in the U.S. and reflects changes in land use, socioeconomic conditions, trip flows and transportation network improvements. The model is based on a set of realistic input assumptions regarding land use and demographic changes between now and 2035 and expected transportation levels-of-service on both the highway and public transit system. Key data used by the model include the following:

- Southern California Association of Government (SCAG) forecasts of population and employment densities
- SCAG-forecasted socio-demographic characteristics of travelers
- Person-trip flows
- Characteristics of the roadway and transit systems, including travel times, costs, and capacity reflective of No Build, TSM, and Build Alternatives

Documentation is available in Section 3.2.1 of this Final EIS/EIR and in the Los Angeles Mode Choice Model: Calibration/Validation Report. Please refer to Section 3.2.1 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information on ridership forecasting methodology. In addition, the Los Angeles Mode Choice Model: Calibration/Validation Report provide detailed information about the ridership model and the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives provides a summary of the updated results prepared for the Final EIS/EIR. The Technical Report summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your comment on the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station has been noted. In October 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). A Wilshire/Crenshaw Station was not included in the LPA.

The Wilshire/Crenshaw Station would be located in the Park Mile section of Wilshire Boulevard, adjacent to lower density land uses that are not planned for future growth in the adopted Community Plan and Park Mile Specific Plan. This site is only 0.5 mile from the existing Wilshire/Western Station and does not serve a major north south intersection, as Crenshaw Boulevard terminates at Wilshire Boulevard and does not extend to the north. Because this is a comparatively lower ridership station with a cost of $153 million, eliminating this station from the LPA improves the cost-effectiveness of Alternative 2. Furthermore, future connections from the Westside subway stations along Wilshire Boulevard to the planned Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit project to the south have been recommended to take place at La Brea, La Cienega, or San Vicente rather than at Wilshire/Crenshaw.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Your comment regarding the Century City Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors decided to continue to study both station location options in Century City (Santa Monica Boulevard and Constellation Boulevard) to address concerns raised by the community regarding locating a station directly on a seismic fault and the safety of tunneling under homes and schools.

In response to the Metro Board of Director’s request for more information, further analysis was undertaken to focus on the engineering and environmental aspects of the two options during the preparation of the Final EIS/EIR to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that prior to conducting the comparative study, the Santa Monica Boulevard Station location was shifted slightly to the east from the location in the Draft EIS/EIR to avoid the Santa Monica Fault zone.

The geotechnical studies conducted during preparation of the Final EIS/EIR concluded that tunneling can be safely carried out beneath the Beverly Hills High School campus and the
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West Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood neighborhoods. However, these studies also determined that the Century City Santa Monica Station would cross the West Beverly Hills Lineament, a northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood Fault, which poses a significant safety risk to passengers at this station location. No evidence of faulting was found at the proposed Century City Constellation Station site.

In addition, the Century City Constellation Boulevard Station has the best pedestrian environment, can be expected to attract the most transit riders, and is centrally located to help shape the redevelopment of Century City as an important transit-oriented destination on the Westside Subway Extension. Further refinements to the ridership analysis concluded that the Century City Constellation Station would result in 3,350 more boardings along new Westside Subway Extension stations than the Century City Santa Monica Station due to proximity to jobs and residences within the critical 600-foot and 1/4-mile walksheds.

Based on all of these factors, the Century City Station Location Report concluded by recommending that the Century City Station be located along Constellation Boulevard due to seismic safety concerns at the Santa Monica Boulevard Station and higher ridership projections with Constellation Boulevard Station.

Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
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Your preference for the Off-Street location of the Westwood/ UCLA Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board decided to continue to study both Westwood/UCLA station location options (On-Street and Off-Street).

A comparative study of the two proposed Westwood/UCLA station locations, including engineering, costs, urban design, and environmental impact considerations, was conducted during the Final EIS/EIR phase to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the
The Off-Street Station and tunnels would need to be deeper than the On-Street Station to clear the underside of foundations for a future hotel on Gayley Avenue, which makes the station and tunnels riskier and more expensive to construct, and requires more time for transit riders to travel between the platform and the station entrance. Additionally, the Westwood/UCLA Off-Street Station location would require approximately 13 additional permanent underground easements.

The On-Street Station location would provide at least one of entrance at the corner of Wilshire and Westwood Boulevards. This entrance location would provide better access to bus connections along Westwood Boulevard and would be closer to the major office buildings and Westwood Village than the entrances for the Off-Street Station. Furthermore, one of the station entrance options for the On-Street Station is a split entrance between the north and south sides of Wilshire Boulevard, providing access to both sides of busy Wilshire Boulevard. However, the Westwood/UCLA On-Street Station option is also expected to have greater traffic impacts during construction due to in-street construction along Wilshire Boulevard.

Based on these factors, the recommendation is to locate the Westwood/UCLA Station On-Street as this location could accommodate an entrance at the Wilshire Boulevard and Westwood Boulevard intersection, providing better pedestrian access to Westwood Village and connections along Westwood Boulevard.

Please refer to Section 8.8.6 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Westwood/UCLA Station. Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Westwood/UCLA Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Westwood/UCLA Station and the Westwood/VA Hospital Station Locations Report for a comparison of the two Westwood/UCLA locations. In addition, the Westside Subway Extension Station Entrance Location Report and Recommendations provides a comparison of the potential entrance locations at Westwood Boulevard, Gayley Avenue and Veteran Avenue for both the On-Street and Off-Street Stations. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your comment on the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station has been noted. In October 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). A Wilshire/Crenshaw Station was not included in the LPA.

The Wilshire/Crenshaw Station would be located in the Park Mile section of Wilshire Boulevard, adjacent to lower density land uses that are not planned for future growth in the adopted Community Plan and Park Mile Specific Plan. This site is only 0.5 mile from the existing Wilshire/Western Station and does not serve a major north south intersection, as Crenshaw Boulevard terminates at Wilshire Boulevard and does not extend to the north. Because this is a comparatively lower ridership station with a cost of $153 million, eliminating this station from the LPA improves the cost-effectiveness of Alternative 2. Furthermore, future connections from the Westside subway stations along Wilshire Boulevard to the planned Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit project to the south have been recommended to take place at La Brea, La Cienega, or San Vicente rather than at Wilshire/Crenshaw.

Cost savings achieved by deleting this station are insufficient to pay for a further westward extension of the subway to Santa Monica. Deleting the Crenshaw Station reduced the overall project costs by approximately $153 million. However, the construction of Alternative 3 would have cost an estimated $1.8 billion more than Alternative 2.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

Your comment regarding noise and vibration during operation has been noted.

Subway tunnels are typically at least 50 to 70 feet below the surface to the track depth. As a result, noise and vibration are not typically noticeable at the surface. In the Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood areas, the proposed subway tunnels would generally be deeper than this in the areas where it would pass beneath homes and schools. For example, at Beverly Hills High School, the track depth would be 75-80 feet below the first floor of the school buildings. In Westwood, the track depth is more than 100 feet deep in most places. Since the first segment of the subway opened in 1993, Metro has received no complaints about noise or vibration due to subway operations.

Additional detailed geotechnical studies were conducted during the Final EIS/EIR phase to
assess soil conditions and determine the potential for noise or vibration impacts on the surface along the refined alignments. This included measurements at the Beverly Hills High School site and in its buildings, as well as in the residential area between the Century City and Westwood/UCLA Stations.

These studies concluded that the predicted vibration and noise levels are within the FTA requirements, and tunnel operation is not anticipated to have adverse impacts with the implementation of mitigation. Noise from operation of the LPA from such sources as station ventilation system fans, emergency ventilation fans, traction power substations, and emergency generators will be designed to meet the noise-level limits specified in Metro Rail Design Criteria and will not result in any noise impacts. There are no vibration-sensitive receivers along the LPA that are predicted to exceed the FTA ground-borne vibration criteria.

Three locations along the LPA were identified where exceedance of the FTA ground-borne noise criteria will occur due to train operations along tangent track or through crossovers, if mitigation measures are not implemented. These locations are the Wilshire Ebell Theatre, an apartment building on Wilshire Boulevard at Orange Drive, and the Saban Theatre. To mitigate the potential for ground-borne noise impacts at these three locations, the following mitigation measures will be implemented:

- **VIB-1**—High compliance direct-fixation resilient rail fasteners will be incorporated into the design of the trackwork at the Wilshire Ebell Theatre and the Saban Theatre, which will reduce ground-borne noise by 5 to 7 dBA.
- **VIB-2**—A low impact crossover such as a moveable point frog or a spring-loaded frog will be used in the design of Wilshire/La Brea No. 10 double crossover for the apartments, which will reduce ground-borne noise by 5 to 6 dBA.

With these mitigation measures, there are no vibration-sensitive receivers that are predicted to exceed the FTA ground-borne vibration criteria during operation. Mitigation measure VIB-2 was added subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR due to the additional studies conducted during preparation of this Final EIS/EIR.

Should future underground construction be considered that would place a school building foundation closer to the tunnel, mitigation measures could be implemented to reduce ground-borne noise and vibration impacts. To mitigate such noise impacts, a high-compliance direct-fixation resilient rail fastener can be incorporated into the track work.

Results of these additional noise and vibration analyses and mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.6 of this Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Noise and Vibration Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
you guys think you're going to have. And I gotta tell you,
there's enough steel in there to withstand any earthquake.
Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you. All right. Are there any
other speaker cards for tonight? Okay. With that, I'm
about to close the public hearing, not just yet. I want
to remind you of a number of things. Remember a lot of
the historical information is online. Our past
presentations, our fact sheets, our F.A.Q.'s. We have
information on the back.

Please, this is not the only way we're accepting
comments. We know it's hard for people to come to these
meetings. Please send your comments and questions in.
Get them in by October 18th. Thank you all very much for
coming.

I'm going to close the public hearing, but we're
going to hang around and be able to talk to you one on one
after that. And come see Melody's museum.

(Hearing adjourned at 7:26 p.m.)

Your comment about seismic safety has been noted. The LPA, as with most sites in
southern California, is susceptible to strong ground shaking generated during earthquakes
by nearby faults. At least one segment of the Santa Monica Fault crosses the LPA. In
addition to the Santa Monica Fault, the West Beverly Hills Lineament (WBHL)/Newport-
Inglewood Fault Zone crosses the LPA in the vicinity of Moreno Drive in the Century City
area. However, many underground facilities—subway tunnels, sewers, and storm
drains—have been built in Los Angeles and throughout California near and across active
fault lines.

The hazards from an earthquake include fault rupture (cracking/fracturing of the ground
where one side of the fault moves relative to the other), shaking, and other secondary
effects. While the hazard due to shaking can be designed against, the hazard due to fault
rupture is potentially much more severe, but is also much more limited in area, being
confined to the specific zone of rupture. Because surface fault rupturing is generally
confined to a relatively narrow zone of tens to several hundred feet wide, avoidance is often
a practical means of avoiding surface fault rupture hazards for facilities such as stations.
Furthermore, since subway stations are structures for human occupancy, they should not
be built on active fault/deformation zones because of life/safety concerns expressed in
state regulations and in Metro Design Criteria.

However, for linear facilities such as tunnels, avoidance may not be possible. Design will
allow for the tunnels to cross the faults as perpendicular as possible to the fault line to limit
the area of potential damage. Tunneling or building stations along an active fault in a
parallel direction is generally not recommended and is in some instances prohibited by
State law. Depending on the predicted fault off-set and area over which the movement is
distributed, some distortion may be accommodated by the structure. Special designs, such
as larger tunnel diameters and enhanced tunnel linings, are employed when crossing fault
zones to reduce the risk of damage and allow for a relatively swift return to regular
operations should fault displacement take place at a tunnel crossing. The Metro Red Line
tunnels cross the Hollywood Fault north of the Highland Station and were built to these
heightened standards.

During the Final EIS/EIR phase, Metro conducted further geotechnical studies to
supplement the studies conducted during the Draft EIS/EIR, which concluded that both the
Santa Monica fault zone and the WBHL in the Century City vicinity are active fault zones
and each fault zone is capable of generating earthquakes of M7 or greater with average
surface displacements of 3 to 6 feet. Moreover, there is no knowledge of where either of
these faults resides in their respective seismic cycles.

Santa Monica Boulevard effectively lies within the Santa Monica Fault zone from west of
Century Park West to east of Avenue of the Stars. The originally proposed Santa Monica
Boulevard Station at Avenue of the Stars would be directly within the fault zone. The WBHL
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is a wide fault zone with several well-defined strands situated along the eastern margin of Century City. It is the inferred northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood fault zone. The WBHL terminates the active Santa Monica Fault to the east. The refined location of the Santa Monica Station at Century Park East would straddle the WBHL. No evidence of faulting was found on the Constellation Boulevard Station site.

In summary, both of the Santa Monica Boulevard Station options are located within active fault zones, but the Constellation Boulevard Station site is located outside zones of active faulting and can be considered a viable option. The LPA will cross fault zones and will require special designs to accommodate fault movement. These mitigation measures, which are detailed in Section 4.8 of this Final EIS/EIR include:

• GEO-2—Fault Crossing Tunnel, Fault Rupture, Tunnel Crossing
• GEO 7 – Tunnel Advisory Panel Design Review

With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts will reduced to less than significant. During subsequent design phases, explorations will continue to more precisely locate the fault zones with respect to the tunnel alignment selected and the fault characteristics for design.

All tunnels, stations, shafts and all other project facilities and infrastructure are designed and built with due consideration and a strict adherence to earthquake design requirements, building codes and conformance to Metro Design Standards for the ground motions of the design level earthquakes.

• GEO-1—Seismic Ground Shaking
• GEO-3—Operational Procedures During an Earthquake
• GEO 7 – Tunnel Advisory Panel Design Review

By compliance with these regulations and requirements, potential seismic ground shaking impacts will be minimized and impacts will be reduced to less than significant.

Please refer to Section 4.8 and Section 4.15 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed discussion of seismic safety both during operation and construction. The results of further geotechnical investigations conducted during the Final EIS/EIR can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.