

Transcript from LACMA Public Hearing and Responses

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
 2 WEST SIDE SUBWAY EXTENSION PUBLIC HEARING
 3 JODY FEERST LITVAK, MANAGER
 4
 5
 6

7 In the Matter of:)
 8 METRO'S WEST SIDE SUBWAY)
 EXTENSION)
 9 _____)

10
 11
 12
 13
 14

15 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
 16 Los Angeles, California
 17 Monday, September 20, 2010
 18

19
 20
 21

22 Reported by:
 23 SOPHIA C. WASHINGTON
 CSR No. 13408
 24 Job No. :
 25 B5622NCO

1 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
 2 WEST SIDE SUBWAY EXTENSION PUBLIC HEARING
 3 JODY FEERST LITVAK, MANAGER
 4
 5
 6

7 In the Matter of:)
 8 METRO'S WEST SIDE SUBWAY)
 9 EXTENSION)
 _____)

10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
 L.A.C.M.A. West, 5905 Wilshire Boulevard,
 Terrace Room, 5th Floor, Los Angeles,
 California, commencing at 6:15 p.m.
 on Monday, September 20, 2010, reported by
 SOPHIA C. WASHINGTON, CSR No. 13408,
 a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for
 the State of California.

1 APPEARANCES :

2

3 JODY FEERST LITVAK
4 MANAGER
5 REGIONAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAMS

6

7 DAVID L. MIEGER, A.I.C.P.
8 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER
9 WEST SIDE PLANNING

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	I N D E X	
1		
2	PUBLIC COMMENTS	PAGE
3	Ms. Litvak	5
4		22
5	Mr. Mieger	14
6	Mr. Rasmussen	34
7	Mr. Fields	35
8	Mr. Twining	37
9	Mr. Holm	38
10	Mr. Zablen	39
11	Mr. Deegan	40
12	Ms. Ramsay	42
13	Ms. Spencer	42
14	Mr. Brown	44
15	Mr. Warsuma	45
16	Mr. Walsh	47
17	Mr. Thompson	48
18	Ms. Ibanez	49
19	Mr. Jones	51
20	Mr. Weisenhaus	52
21	Mr. Pass	53
22	Mr. Adelman	54
23	Ms. Fadale	55
24	Mr. Smith	56
25		

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

7 The West Side Subway Extension Transit Corridor
8 Studies Draft Environmental Impact Statement and
9 Environmental Impact Report was released on September 3rd,
10 2010, along with a notice of intent to hold public
11 hearings in compliance with the National Environmental
12 Policy Act, N.E.P.A., and the California Environmental
13 Quality Act, C.E.Q.A.

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

19 A notice of availability and intent to hold public
20 hearings was published in the Federal Register, State of
21 California Clearing House, Los Angeles Times, La Opinion,
22 Ne Con Sahn (phonetic), and filed with the Los Angeles
23 County Clerk. The notices were published on September 3rd,
24 2010. Copies of the draft E.I.S./E.I.R. are available for
25 public review at the following venues:

1 The Beverly Hills Public Library, the Donald Bruce Kaufman
2 Brentwood Library, the Fairfax Library, the Felipe de Neve
3 Library, the Frances H. G. Hollywood Regional Library,
4 the John C. Fremont Library, the Memorial Library, the
5 Metro Transportation Library, the Pio Pico Koreatown
6 Library, the Robertson Branch Library, the Santa Monica
7 Main Library, the West Hollywood Public Library, the West
8 Los Angeles Regional Library, the West Woods Library, and
9 the Wilshire Library.

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

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

25 Information about the release of the draft

1 E.I.S./E.I.R. and the hearings was also printed in brochure
2 form and distributed widely on Metro buses and trains as
3 well as hand delivered at key locations in the study area.

4 Brochures were sent by U.S. Mail to a list of
5 nearly 1,000 contacts in the project study area. The same
6 information was sent electronically to a distribution list
7 of 1,790. All of these materials including information
8 about how to find the draft E.I.S./E.I.R. as well as more
9 information about the West Side Subway Extension Transit
10 Corridor Study remain available on the Web. Affidavits
11 of publication and copies of detailed mailing lists are
12 available upon request. Thank you.

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

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

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

25 If you want to find out what's in the document,

1 I invite you. We have copies of the document on this
2 table in the back here, hard copies. We ask you to leave
3 them here. It is a big thick document, and it has a lot
4 of appendices, and it even has many more technical
5 reports, which are not included here.

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

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

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

23 But mostly, as I said, we're here to that listen
24 to your comments. They become part of the official record
25 at this point, but we cannot respond to your questions or

1 comments tonight as part of the public hearing. I know
2 many of you were talking to the staff or consultants
3 individually around the board, and we're happy to do that
4 at the end of this evening when we close the public
5 hearing. But we can't respond to you in a formal way.
6 And the official responses will happen in the final
7 E.I.S./E.I.R.

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

19 If you have comments on what the locally
20 preferred alternative is going to be, which alternative
21 we choose, we have multiple station options in some cases.
22 We have alignment options, other things. And, again, we
23 have other aspects, and if you have any suggestions beyond
24 the locally preferred alternative, we want to hear about
25 that.

1 And comments are due -- they must be received by
2 October 18th to be considered a part of this. Again, if
3 you want to comment tonight verbally, we invite you to
4 fill out these forms. Some of you may have already done
5 that. If you didn't, and you -- some of you may have
6 already filled it out and turned it in. Rebecca is in the
7 back with extras. If you need a form, raise your hand,
8 and she'll give it to you. If you filled a form out and
9 you haven't turned it in yet, or you decide to in the
10 course of the evening, wave it about, and I'll have
11 someone come get that. And I'll keep reminding you as
12 we move on.

13 So where we are in the process, we've been
14 working on this for about three years, beginning in late
15 2007. We did an alternative analysis. There was a Board
16 decision made in January 2009 that kicked off the draft
17 E.I.S./E.I.R. We've been working on that for about the
18 last year and a half, and we're heading up to a Metro
19 Board decision on selecting the L.P.A.

20 This is not the end of the analysis. There will
21 be some decisions made, some narrowing of options, and
22 we'll talk about that as we move forward. But the Board
23 will have the option to select the local alternative at
24 the end of October, and based on what they select, we will
25 take that into final environmental review and clearance.

1 I mentioned that's when we'll be developing the responses
2 to your comments and questions and hopefully get this
3 project ready to go.

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

14 If you're especially interested in issues
15 relating to how a subway is built, please look at our
16 presentations from last summer. If you want to see
17 information about how the various alternative perform,
18 most recent summer -- I'm skipping around. I apologize.
19 Last fall, winter, we held meetings where in each
20 locations we talked about the stations in that area. So
21 if you want to see, kind of, what we brought in and how
22 things evolved out of that, you can look at that.

23 We've also had focus meetings on tunneling and
24 alignments, and whether or not there should be a Crenshaw
25 station. But about over 2500 of you have participated all

1 along the way. Again, that's our Web address, Metro dot
2 net slash Website, and it's all available online.

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

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

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

22 Those are the two that go down Westwood -- go
23 down Wilshire to U.C.L.A. ending either at Westwood
24 U.C.L.A. or going one station further to Westwood V.A.
25 Beyond what we have funding anticipated for, would be

1 continuing all the way to Santa Monica or adding in the
2 West Hollywood extension.

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

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

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

24 MR. MIEGER: Thanks for those of you who have really
25 borne with us for the last year and a half to two years.

1 It's like a reunion each time we come back to these
2 meetings. And I appreciate your endurance. All of those
3 meetings we've been saying for the last year and a half,
4 "At the end of this process, we're going to have to draft
5 E.I.S." And that's where we're going to pick the locally
6 preferred alternative. So we actually are here, and it's
7 a big accomplishment we've gotten this far.

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

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

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

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

25 Just briefly, the purpose of the draft E.I.S.,

1 what it's doing, first of all, we evaluate the performance
2 of the alternatives against the required criteria. This
3 is a set of measurements we have to use when we talk about
4 the ridership, the cost, the cost effectiveness. We have
5 to evaluate the adverse and beneficial impacts of the
6 alternatives, the options. We have to look at not just
7 the long term effects, what happens after we build the
8 project, but also during the construction phase.

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

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

1 that we're going to fund, and pay for out of the project.

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

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

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

24 We have two slides, one about construction
25 impacts, and one about long term operating impacts. And

1 in terms of time, they said just focus on one or two
2 just to give people a highlight of one or two of these
3 categories so that -- as you're going into them. So since
4 we're here at Fairfax tonight, the two that are probably
5 nearest and dearest to this neighborhood's heart are
6 underground gases, the hydrogen sulfate and methane gases
7 that we have bubbling up at the La Brea Tar Pits and the
8 Page Museum and historic archaeological and
9 paleontological.

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

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

25 Paleontological. When the museum recently built

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

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

24 So those are the two examples I was going to give
25 on when we build the project. But, again, these carry

1 through to the long-term operation of the project. Once
2 the subway is built, and we have a subway portal down
3 here, you can walk in down at the subway, and get on
4 the trains and continue on.

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

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

19 During the construction phase, we can also design
20 it in such a way that, for example, if there's an issue
21 of vibration, if you're too close to the surface of the
22 tunnels and perhaps on the surface, you might be able
23 to feel it in the basement of some buildings. We can
24 actually move the tunnels a bit deeper, or we can put
25 mitigation measures under the track to dampen the

1 vibration so you won't feel it. That's what we've done
2 on our other projects where we essentially eliminated the
3 vibrations in the projects by doing that.

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

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

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

25 In terms of those job centers we're going to on

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

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

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

19 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. Before I get into that, I
20 just want to let you know this is a long narrow row, and I
21 see some people who just came in late in the back. There
22 are a number of seats up front, and I invite you to move
23 up front. If you've got an empty seat next to you, please
24 raise your hand. And, please, people in the back -- see.

25 See how many nice welcoming people we have? So

read.

1 everybody please move up front. I know this is hard to
2 As I said, we're going to have this posted online hopefully
3 by the middle of the week. And if you gave us your E-mail,
4 we'll let he you know when that's up there.

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

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

19 So, obviously, with a project this complex,
20 there's a myriad of decisions, but I want to talk about
21 five key areas of decision making that we're focusing on.
22 Although, of course there's many more. And I'm going to
23 go through each one of these. I have a slide on each.
24 But we want to talk about how we pick what that best
25 performing alternative is within those funding

1 constraints. We have two options for how far we go west
2 within those funding constraints. We will talk a little
3 bit about the Wilshire, Crenshaw Station tonight. We know
4 that that's important here.

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

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

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

25 It has high population and employment

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

7 However, only alternatives one and two, the two
8 that go to one of the two locations in Westwood, are
9 currently fundable through Measure R and the anticipated
10 new starts. And those are what's adopted to the long
11 range transportation plan. However, over the last
12 18 months, we had a lot of support for all five of them.

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

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

25 Let me just back up a little bit. I just want

1 to compare that to what's estimated at Westwood U.C.L.A.
2 That's the end of the line station, which would be the
3 highest boarding station. So it's a significantly
4 different number.

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

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

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

21 In addition, while some earlier preliminary
22 studies did indicate that if and when that line ever does
23 come north of Expo to connect up to the Wilshire corridor,
24 it would probably be best not to bring it north to
25 Wilshire at Crenshaw. That it should connect someplace

1 else. Again, there's been a lot of input on this and I
2 know the community is split on whether this station should
3 be there.

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

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

19 And because we're here, I just want to talk about
20 these two. Here at Wilshire, Fairfax, some of you know
21 we've looked at two station locations. One where the
22 station would be located under Wilshire all the way on the
23 west side of Fairfax. And the public said very clearly
24 that they would also like us to look at a station located
25 spanning Fairfax which would allow more access to the east

1 side of Fairfax.

2 There are some construction issues with each of
3 those two options that have to do with how we can build
4 and where we can get construction staging because of the
5 gassy ground in this area. Everywhere you go, it gets
6 slightly different to deal with. So there's some
7 engineering issues. Again, how we locate property for
8 portals becomes important.

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

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

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

1 are all online.

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

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

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

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

24 Many of options that go with these alternatives,
25 they may select one of the locally preferred alternatives,

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

14 Very quickly, during the final E.I.S./E.I.R.,
15 2011 will be a busy year. There will be much continued
16 public involvement. As I said, we'll be developing the
17 responses to the comments we get during this stage. There
18 will be much more geotechnical investigation. We have a
19 board somewhere over there that talks about the geotech
20 work we've done up until now and then what will be done
21 in the final.

22 Engineering will be refined. The cost estimates
23 will be finalized. We're going to have to really work
24 out the details of the stations and the alignments.
25 Preliminary engineering, determine the construction

1 locations, and really develop the mitigation program,
2 and commit to those mitigation measures.

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

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

24 Tomorrow night, we'll be in Westwood. Wednesday,
25 we'll be in Plummer Park in West Hollywood. A week from

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

6 So here's how things are going to go tonight.
7 Can I get the speaker cards we have so far up here?
8 Thank you.

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

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

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

25 I want to repeat again, what we'd especially like

1 to hear from you tonight, what are your comments on the
2 draft E.I.S./E.I.R., the impact it discusses, or the
3 mitigation measures. Do you have additional questions, or
4 issues, or information you would like us to look into, or
5 provide in the final E.I.S./E.I.R.? Please let us know
6 that.

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

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

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

22 MR. FIELDS: Yes.

23 MS. LITVAK: Okay. So while the three of you are
24 coming up -- are you going to be our microphone assistant
25 tonight?

34

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

2 MS. LITVAK: Okay. We'll try and adjust the

3 microphone for you. So if you're short like I am, or if

4 you're tall like somebody else, you can get up high.

5 Please get up close to the microphone like this, like an

6 ice cream cone. Don't hold it way down here, or talk with

7 it this way down here (indicating). Don't start talking

8 or moving your head around because as you talk, it goes

9 away. So get really close to it. Speak right into it.

10 We're having trouble with the microphone stand.

11 We need your help. It's not the volume. It's the

12 microphone stand. Okay. Great.

13 So David West took himself out. So we have

14 Tom Rasmussen, Ron Fields, and Steve Twining.

15 Are you Tom?

16 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yes.

17 MS. LITVAK: Come on up. State your name. Get up

18 close to the microphone.

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

20 I'm here to suggest a better alternative route through

21 Beverly Hills going through all those houses and two

22 schools. The far better alternative route would be to

23 run the subway tunnel underneath Wilshire, past

24 Santa Monica Boulevard, the Beverly Hilton Hotel, the

25 Robinson's Department Store building, and the gas station,

218-1

218-1

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

35

1 and then angle it underneath the Los Angeles Country
 2 Club to a station that Santa Monica Boulevard and
 3 Avenue of the Stars.

4 And from there, run it underneath Santa Monica
 5 Boulevard to Westwood Boulevard, north to Wilshire, and
 6 west on Wilshire to Santa Monica. That way, you're not
 7 going under any housing. You're not going under any
 8 schools at all. And it's a lot less chance of there
 9 being any litigations. The best route still would be
 10 under Wilshire to Santa Monica, and Santa Monica
 11 Boulevard west.

12 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

13 Are you Mr. Fields? Come on up. There's
 14 Steve Twining and after Steve Twining, it will be
 15 Chris Holm.

16 Let me just say something. In the interest of
 17 time tonight, to have the maximum amount of time for
 18 people, you don't have to take your full two minutes.
 19 You're welcome to, but if somebody has said what you want
 20 to say, you're welcome to repeat it. But if you want to
 21 say, "Ditto what so-and-so said," that's fine, too.

22 Mr. Fields, go right ahead.

23 MR. FIELDS: Thank you. My name is Ron Fields. I'm
 24 a native of Los Angeles. By profession, I'm an interior
 25 designer and a writer. I write stories about Los Angeles.

218-1

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

218-1

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.

36

1 I write mainly about our architecture, our people, our
 2 places, our buildings. So that's a bit of background
 3 about who I am.

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

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

19 What did happen is, we're choked. We're choked
 20 with this gridlock. That is a two syllable word, but any
 21 of us that live in it and have to be in it, it's miserable.
 22 It costs us time, frustration, money, et cetera.

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

219-1

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.

219-1

37

1 tell you about my passion for it.

2 So -- and last, I'll end with this. That I spoke
3 to one of the consultants who said it's a 30-year as you
4 all possibly know by now, and possible a ten-year. Well,
5 I'd like to ride that car when I'm 80 instead of a
6 hundred. So I hope it happens a little sooner.

7 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

8 Steve Twining, followed by Chris Holm, and then
9 Nate Zablen.

10 MR. TWINING: I'm Steve Twining. I'm on the
11 leadership committee of W.R.A.C., which is the West Side
12 Regional Alliance of Neighborhoods, and three community
13 councils, a total of 13 neighborhood and community
14 councils.

15 Speaking as chair of the Transportation Mobility
16 Committee, I personally support Alternative Five.
17 Although, that seems to be out of the question because
18 more users of the subway at Hollywood and Highland go west
19 as opposed to going downtown. The west side is drowning
20 in traffic. The delays caused by President Obama's last
21 visit were unconscionable. He should use helicopters to
22 get to his fundraisers.

23 The traffic is emblematic of our future. Where
24 is 3010? If the majority party becomes the minority
25 party, what will happen? We badly need the subway. Expo

220-1

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.

220-1

38

1 too because of street crossings at Westwood over Sepulveda
 2 will cause significant traffic delays.
 3 Above all, what is needed is a form of rapid
 4 transit from the north valley to the airport by way of
 5 U.C.L.A. and connection to Century City. In terms of the
 6 stations, I support the Westwood station, the V.A.
 7 station, the Constellation Avenue, Century City where the
 8 bulk of the pedestrian traffic is, and my choice would be
 9 Alternative Two, as opposed to Alternative One. Thank
 10 you.

220-2
 220-3
 220-4
 220-5

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

220-3

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.

220-4

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*

220-4

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.

220-5

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.

38

221-1

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.

11 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.
 12 Are you Chris Holm?
 13 MR. HOLM: I am.
 14 MS. LITVAK: Come on up. Followed by Nate Zablen, and
 15 then Tim Deegan; is that correct?
 16 MR. DEEGAN: That's right.
 17 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Step up close. And if anybody
 18 has a speaker card to turn in, let us know.
 19 MR. HOLM: I'm Chris Holm. I'm a native here of this
 20 area. I grew up here. I'm a professional magician, an
 21 illusionist.
 22 I do like this alternative number five,
 23 connecting Hollywood and Highland, coming off from the
 24 West Hollywood area, coming down to here. Because with me
 25 being a performer, I'm always down at the beach, going up

221-1

39

1 to Universal City Walk, going to the Grove, going to the
 2 Beverly Center. I don't like to drive. The traffic here
 3 is crazy. So eventually, I know you guys aren't going to
 4 do this right away, but this is the best alternative to
 5 do. It makes a lot of sense.

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

11 Again, I appreciate everybody coming to these
 12 meetings, as I'm a rider. I don't know how many people
 13 here actually riding the bus actually came. I hope more
 14 of them do come because if we don't speak up as riders,
 15 nothing gets done. Thank you very much.

221-2

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

221-2

221-2

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

221-2

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.

222-1

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.

39

16 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Let's give people a chance to
17 talk. We're not doing that tonight, cheers or boos.
18 Nate Zablen, followed by Tim Deegan, and then
19 Carolyn Ramsay.
20 MR. ZABLEN: Good evening. I'm Nate Zablen. I'm a
21 member of the Southern California Transit Advocates, but
22 I'm speaking as an individual.
23 I definitely support the first segment to
24 Fairfax. I think that's the most important segment
25 because if we don't get this completed, we'll never have

222-1 |

40

1 any other segments. This is the basic one that we've been
 2 waiting for probably 50 years. And I really hope that we
 3 can accelerate the project.

222-2

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

222-3

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

21 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

22 Tim Deegan, followed by Carolyn Ramsay and
 23 Carol Spencer.

24 MR. DEEGAN: Thank you. My name is a Tim Deegan.
 25 I've live and work in the Miracle Mile for the past

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

222-3

Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

223-1

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.

41

1 15 years. Thirteen years ago, I gave up three automobiles,
2 a B.M.W., a Thunderbird, and a Honda as an experiment to
3 see if I could take the bus and public transportation for
4 a year, and I've had no need to go back and purchase a
5 car, even though I have a driver's license. I rent a car
6 when I need it, which is rarely. So Metro, you're doing a
7 good job of getting me where I need to be. Thank you.

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

14 "I'm speaking on the behalf of the station
15 option, and I'm asking that you please consider locating
16 the Wilshire Fairfax station and station portal east of
17 Fairfax as close to Hancock Park as possible to provide
18 access and entry to the park, the cultural institutions
19 in and near the park, such as L.A.C.M.A., the Page Museum,
20 the Tar Pits, the Craft and Folk Art Museum, and Peterson
21 Automobile Museum. These institutions represent Museum
22 row. Thank you.

23 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

24 And that reminds me, because Tim had filled out
25 a written form. Please, if you have one, feel free to

223-1

1 turn in written comments to anyone with a badge, or you
2 can mail them in, too. Thank you.

3 Carolyn Ramsay, followed by Carol Spencer, and
4 then Russel Brown.

5 MS. RAMSAY: Hi. I'm Carolyn Ramsay. I'm here on
6 behalf of Councilmember Tom LaBonge, who represents this
7 area right here. He supports the Subway to the Sea and
8 has from the beginning and is thrilled that we're at this
9 point in the process.

10 There's are a couple points he'd like to make.

11 One is that on the west side, not in his district, he is
12 wondering if you guys looked at going up San Vicente from
13 Wilshire, and then taking Burton Way to avoid acquiring
14 expensive property, and going under Beverly Hills
15 High School, and other tricky places, tricky situations.

16 So he is asking that you look into that, and use the
17 existing right of ways under the streets, and also using
18 long portals with people movers like they do in European
19 cities. That's it. Thank you. And he's a big supporter
20 down Wilshire.

21 MS. LITVAK: Thank you, and thank the councilman for
22 us.

23 Carol Spencer, followed by Russel Brown, and then
24 Jayson Warsuma.

25 MS. SPENCER: Hi. I'm Carol Spencer, and I'm here

224-1

224-2

224-3

224-1

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.

224-2

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.

224-3

Please see the response to comment 224-2 above.

225-1

Your comment regarding 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

225-1 | 1 representing both myself and my neighborhood, and that's
2 Comstock Hills. We're a little bit west of Beverly Hills.
3 I haven't had a lot of time to review the E.I.S.,
4 as it was released while I was in Europe. I'm interested
5 in the safety of both riders on the subway train, and the
6 areas above and along the sides in the stations and
7 tunnels. I'd like to understand some of the findings.

225-2 | 8 Why do you need to remove so many trees, number
one?

225-3 | 9 Is it correct that no oil is being pumped on the oil well
at

225-4 | 10 Beverly Hills High School? It also shows that all the oil
11 wells in that area have been abandoned. And regarding the
12 earthquake faults, specifically the Santa Monica fault,
13 which lies within your criteria time line, I'd like to
14 know if it is possible to build a subway station
15 perpendicular to the fault, when in fact the station is --
16 MS. LITVAK: Hang on. Hang on. Stop the clock. Back
17 up. Why don't you give her another full minute? Can you
18 do that? I'm sorry. You got interrupted by a cell phone.
19 All right. Go ahead.
20 MS. SPENCER: Here I'm back on the Santa Monica fault,
21 which affects the Santa Monica Boulevard Station, if that
22 is in fact the one those chosen in that particular Century
23 City area. And according to your appendix where they have
24 all the detail, it said that the only way to cross a fault
25 line that is active within that time period is to do it

225-1

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 projections with Constellation Boulevard Station.

225-1

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.

225-2

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.

225-3

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

225-3

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.

225-4

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

225-4

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

225-4

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 be 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.

225-5

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

44

1 perpendicular. And I'm just wondering, are you going to
2 be able to if you do choose that one?

225-5

3 Also when the subway station is built, I would
4 assume that it is at the shortest belt. And the
5 surrounding area, are you planning on protecting the
6 houses and places like Beverly Hills High School, which
7 have theaters, they have laboratories, and so on, to the
8 highest degree of protection from any vibration or any
9 problems? I'm just asking a lot of questions. I now
10 solve --

11 MS. LITVAK: And you know what? That's the end of
12 your two minutes. So will you send those in writing,
13 Carol?

14 MS. SPENCER: Will do.

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

225-5

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.

44

15 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.
 16 Okay. Russel Brown, followed by Jayson Warsuma
 17 and John Walsh.
 18 MR. BROWN: Russ Brown, with the Historic Downtown
 19 Business Improvement District, also Downtown Neighborhood
 20 Council. I'm very involved with the downtown streetcar.
 21 Thanks for doing these. They have been very well
 22 organized and your, outreach has been very good.
 23 Personally, I'm for Alternative Five, but I
 24 understand the cost constraints. And it looks like
 25 alternative number two probably is the best way to go with

226-1

45

1 the 3010 caveat.

226-2

2 Looking at the numbers, it seems very inconclusive
3 of whether Crenshaw actually makes a whole lot of sense,
4 and deleting Crenshaw would get your numbers down closer
5 to the federal guidelines. It does seem that the
6 Century City Station in the center of Century City at
7 Constellation Avenue of the Stars makes a lot more sense
8 for both ridership and for the fault issues.

226-3

9 Also, at U.C.L.A., having it at the U.C.L.A.

226-4

10 parking lot and extending it at Westwood to V.A., I think
11 it makes sense to master plan for a north, south connection
12 through that station, and eventually, all of the stations
13 if you could plan for Alternative Five for being able to
14 be incorporated. I think that would make a lot of sense.

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

226-3

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.

226-4

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

226-4

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.

227-1

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.

45

15 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

16 Jayson Warsuma, John Walsh, and then Craig
Thompson.

17 MR. WARSUMA: Good evening, everybody. How's it going
18 today? Yes, the plan, you know this a good idea for the
19 Santa Monica extension. And you know what, I was thinking
20 maybe they should make it elevated because I'm afraid that
21 if they do it underground, all the stations underground,
22 what if it's an earthquake?

23 It's just scary, you know. I think they should
24 do it above ground, top, like the Blue Line and stuff.
25 Yes, they should. And also, by the way, I got this in

227-1

227-2

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.

46

1 the year 2001.

2 I have a question for you Jody. Do you know
3 about this?

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

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

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is it?

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

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

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

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

227-2

228-1

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

47

1 guys can do it because you can do it before 2030. Thank
2 you.

3 MS. LITVAK: Thank you, Jayson.

4 John Walsh, followed by Craig Thompson, and then
5 Tania Ibanez.

6 MR. WALSH: John Walsh, known as the freak who stopped
7 the subway. Remember, I warned you before. I live two
8 blocks from Hollywood and Vine. The same people came to
9 our neighborhood, and they said you won't even notice the
10 tunneling. Cinco, quarter of a billion dollars in cost
11 overruns. How many of you have been on Hollywood and Vine
12 station in the last week? Four, five, six. Hey, that's
13 what it is. It's mostly minority people. It's mostly
14 poor minorities who take it. It's falling apart.

15 How about the ridership? Same people promised us
16 300,000 riders by the year 2000 on the Red Line. You want
17 to know what the ridership is? 150,000, ten years later.

18 This is about money. This is about spurring development.
19 The only point in building a subway is to increase traffic
20 if you want to know what's happening.

21 And the most insane part of it, they're going to
22 tunnel through the La Brea Tar Pits. Oh, they tunneled in
23 other cities. There's no place on planet earth where
24 dinosaur bones are bubbling up. This is unique.

25 Trust them. They're smooth. They're something

228-1

228-2

228-3

228-4

228-1

estimate and the financial plan.

228-2

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.

48

1 like the visitors. Remember the visitors that came on
 2 television. "We're here to help you. We'll cure cancer.
 3 Just follow us." And they pulled it off, and they were
 4 gigantic ugly vicious lizards. Now, you want to believe
 5 them, go ahead and believe them.
 6 I'm telling you, you want the truth?
 7 HollywoodHighlands.org, my Website, one half million
 8 visits. "All right. Come to our Twitter." If you want
 9 to find out what's happening here, look, they skulk when I
 10 talk about it. There's enough, "And look at the Expo
 11 Line, the light rails to the sea. How are you doing? Oh,
 12 it's only a hundred million dollars over budget and a year
 13 behind schedule." And no one gives a damn because it's in
 14 a black neighborhood. No one cares about it. Only when
 15 it comes to a white neighborhood --
 16 MS. LITVAK: John, your time is up. Thank you.
 17 Craig Thompson, followed by Tania Ibanez. And
 18 I'll take some more comment cards if you've got them.
 19 Raise them about, and someone will get them to you, or
 20 Rebecca will hand them to you. Okay.
 21 Go ahead.
 22 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. I'm Craig Thompson from Citizens
 23 for Better Mobility, and our organization is dedicated to
 24 improving public transportation here in the southland.
 25 Now, for example, I've seen on these maps, the

228-3

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.

228-4

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.

229-1

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.

49

229-1

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

50

1 work every day, five days a week. And what I usually end
 2 up having to do is, I will walk through to La Brea and
 3 Wilshire stop. And then I take the bus, which is the 720
 4 or the 20 to Western and Wilshire. And from there, I take
 5 the Purple Line and get off at Pershing Square or Civic,
 6 depending on whether or not I have a court appearance.

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

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

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

25 Another thing that I wanted to mention is that

230-1

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.

230-2

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.

230-1

230-2

231-1

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.

51

1 the Crenshaw stop would also assist commuters that work
2 along Highland Avenue. That would be much more convenient
3 for them than La Brea. Furthermore, I think you should
4 also consider that a lot of the people that are getting on
5 the Crenshaw stop sign from the 720 -- yes. Obviously,
6 the M.T.A. --

7 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. I'm sorry. Your time is up.
8 Send the stuff in.

9 Monroe Jones, it's your turn. Come on up.
10 Duane Weisenhaus, and then Gerald Pass.

11 Rebecca, did you have more speaker cards for me?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

13 MS. LITVAK: Okay. But we'll take them. Keep on
14 coming.

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

18 I would like to say that I think it would be a
19 good idea to extend the Red Line from North Hollywood all
20 the way to Wilshire and Western and then take it all the
21 way down, and take the Purple Line all the way down to
22 Santa Monica, and Lincoln. That way, those of you who work
23 in Santa Monica can take the Purple Line all the way into
24 the west side because the west side is very crowded with a
25 lot of people.

231-1

1 And some of you who work in the west side need a
2 way to get there instead of taking a bus and trying to get
3 there in a 10, 15-minute fashion. But sometimes you guys
4 want to get to your home or job on time, so you have to
5 take three or four buses just to get to where you're going.
6 So I think this alternative would be a good idea to take
7 the Purple Line all the way into Santa Monica.

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

12 Thank you.

13 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

14 Duane, is it Weisenhaus?

15 MR. WEISENHAUS: Weisenhaus.

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

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

23 As far as the Wilshire station, I agree with the
24 previous speakers. Too bad that even though it doesn't
25 get as high a ridership as the other stations, there is a

232-1 | 1 huge gap between Western and La Brea. And I think there
 2 | 2 is enough ridership in that area and on the Crenshaw line
 3 | 3 that it would be justified.

232-2 | 4 I'm in favor of the next station, the eastside
 5 | 5 location for Fairfax, the connection with the museums.

232-3 | 6 I'm in favor of putting the eastside for the La Cienega
 7 | 7 station because that's where all the businesses are, and
 232-4 | 8 I think you'll capture more ridership there. I would like
 9 | 9 to see the West Hollywood line go in. But if that's not
 10 | 10 going to happen, I would like the connector to happen for
 11 | 11 future expansion.

232-5 | 12 And I'd like to agree on the Constellation
 232-6 | 13 Station for the Century City and for the U.C.L.A. parking
 232-7 | 14 lot for Westwood. And wherever we get these alternate
 15 | 15 lines, if we could get it so it's easier, faster for the
 16 | 16 commuters, cheaper for the tax payers, I'm all for it.
 17 | 17 And if we could get around some of the mitigations issues,
 18 | 18 I think you just need to go for it and really push that
 19 | 19 hard. Those are my comments.

20 | 20 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.

21 | 21 Gerald Pass, followed by Charles Adelman, and
 22 | 22 then Felicia Fadale. That's the last card I have, but
 23 | 23 I'll take more, so please turn them in.

24 | 24 Gerald, step on up.

25 | 25 MR. PASS: Gerry Pass from Friends 4 Expo Rail. I

232-1

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.

232-2

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.

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.

232-3

Your preference for the East location for the Wilshire/La Cienega Station has been noted.

232-3

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.

232-4

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.

232-5

Your comment in support of the Century City Constellation Station has been noted. On

232-5

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*

232-5

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.

232-6

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

232-6

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.

232-7

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.

54

233-1

1 would like to say to the L.A. City Council and to the
 2 M.T.A., please do not say "subway to the sea" if you only
 3 mean "subway to the V.A.," because I'd like to see it go
 4 all the way to the ocean. So, false advertising.

233-2

5 I'm opposed to the Crenshaw station because
 6 eventually I think you're going to have to go south from
 7 that station either light or heavy rail to get to the
 8 airport, or what have you. To that guy who was really
 9 overly loud, please learn your paleontology. They're not
 10 dinosaurs bones. They're mammals and birds and so forth.
 11 Okay. I think that's about it, really. Thank you very
 12 much.

233-1

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.

233-2

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

233-2

Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

234-1

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.

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.

234-2

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*

13 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.
14 Charles Adelman and Felicia Fadale. I apologize
15 for butchering your names. And are there any more speaker
16 cards? Rebecca is walking up the aisle here. She'll take
17 care of you.
18 MR. ADELMAN: Hi. My name is Charles Adelman, and I'm
19 born and raised here in the L.A. area. And I'm living in
20 Hollywood for about 29 years now. And I regularly use the
21 existing Red Line subway, where by the way, I seem to run
22 into John Walsh an awful lot on the trains.
23 I favor Alternative Five with the eventual
24 extension from Hollywood Highland out to Burbank Airport.
25 And with the Crenshaw station, it does not make sense to

234-1

234-2

234-2

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.

234-3

Your comment regarding station access/ridership projections 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.

During preparation of the Final EIS/EIR, the ridership model from the Draft EIS/EIR was further refined to assess the LPA and incorporate any changes between the Draft EIS/EIR and the Final EIS/EIR. More than ten model runs were conducted to respond to changes, perform additional analysis, and answer questions that were raised during the project development process in the Final EIS/EIR phase. The main types of refinement included feeder bus service, balanced headways and some coding refinement, to determine what changes should be included in the Final EIS/EIR model runs. The refined model predicted boardings along the new Westside Subway Extension stations are approximately 49,300 with the Century City Constellation Station, which is about 3,350 more than the predicted 45,986 boardings with the Century City Santa Monica Station. The main difference in boardings at the Century City Station is the increased walk access trips in the Constellation Station over the Santa Monica Station. The walking time between the TAZ 738 (Century City)'s centroid node and the Century City subway station is 3 minutes in the Constellation Option and 13 minutes in the Santa Monica Option. The number of jobs and jobs per square mile in the 1/4-mile and 1/2-mile area around the Century City Stations is much higher in the Constellation Option than in the Santa Monica Option.

In addition to the refined ridership model, a supplemental ridership study was prepared to evaluate the relative accessibility of the Century City Station locations to surrounding commercial and residential development within a 1/2-mile walking distance. This data was then used to estimate the number of Westside Subway Extension riders who would walk to and from the stations. It should be noted that these ridership projections only consider those riders who walk to the station and these projections are intended to supplement the ridership forecasts. This analysis concluded that the Century City Constellation Boulevard Station attracts more Westside Subway riders compared to the station location along Santa Monica Boulevard. Based on both existing and projected future development in Century City, the Constellation Station has the highest concentration of jobs and residents within the

55

1 go two miles without a station, especially since your
 2 ridership estimates shows higher boarding from that
 3 Crenshaw Station than the La Brea Station.
 4 The main thing I want to talk about though, is
 5 your ridership estimates on the E.I.R. are incredibly low.
 6 It's kind of strange that the Century City Station would
 7 generate lower ridership than Hollywood Highland currently
 8 generates. The average ridership for the existing subway
 9 per station is about 9300 boarding per station. Only one
 10 station would even match that. Think about it.

234-3

234-3

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.

235-1

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.

55

11 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.
 12 Felicia. Where is Felicia? Followed by Owen
 Smith.
 13 Felicia, say your last name.
 14 MS. FADALE: Fadale.
 15 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Say it again in the microphone
 16 when you get there.
 17 MS. FADALE: Hello. I'm Felicia Fadale. Can I be
 18 heard now?
 19 MS. LITVAK: Stand closer to the microphone.
 20 MS. FADALE: Okay. Hi, I'm Felicia Fadale. I'm
 21 interested in good transit. I'm glad our councilman is
 22 after a good plan. Has anyone ever ridden the 920? It's
 23 an express bus, and it stops smack at Vermont. But if you
 24 want to know how many people would take the subway from
 25 one place to another, ridership on that might be a good

235-1

1 estimate.

2 I'm iffy on the stop at Crenshaw. I have to

3 think a little more, but I love the idea of the subway to

4 the sea. And, again, I'm iffy about the particular stop

5 in Century City. I'd have to be there and look at the

6 stops before I can make up my mind as to which will be

7 best.

8 I do think that having the stop at the U.C.L.A.

9 parking lot would make the most sense. But, again, one

10 can only dictate what seems more convenient. Thank you

11 very much. I'm sure they'll do a terrific job. I did

12 come to find the plans.

235-2 |

235-3 |

235-4 |

235-2

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.

235-3

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

235-3

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.

235-4

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

235-4

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.

56

236-1

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.

236-2

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

13 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. Owen Smith. Anybody going
14 to speak after Owen Smith? Okay. Step on up. Go ahead.

15 MR. SMITH: My name is Owen Smith. I'm opposed to
16 the Crenshaw station. I think it's a waste of money. I
17 prefer you take the money and push it farther west.

18 Now, I heard a number of comments about vibration
19 and so forth. I was one of the subcontractors on the Red
20 Line, the Green Line, the Purple Line, and the one going
21 down the freeway. My memory is that Western, there was
22 that same concern. And we dealt with it. As I remember,
23 there was some plates because I put the coatings on them.

24 And, you know, we also worked on the bar. And it
25 goes a lot of places. You don't have the problems that

236-1

236-2

236-2

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.

236-3

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 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

57

236-3

1 you guys think you're going to have. And I gotta tell you,
2 there's enough steel in there to withstand any earthquake.

3 Thank you.

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

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

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

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

20

21

22

23

24

236-3

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 be 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.