

Transcript from West Hollywood Public Hearing and Responses

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
WEST SIDE SUBWAY EXTENSION PUBLIC HEARING
JODY FEERST LITVAK, MANAGER

In the Matter of:)
METRO WESTSIDE SUBWAY EXTENSION)
_____)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
Plummer Park Community Center,
7377 Santa Monica Boulevard, West Hollywood,
California, commencing at 6:15 p.m. on Wednesday,
September 22, 2010, reported by RUBEN GARCIA,
CSR No. 11305, a Certified Shorthand Reporter
in and for the State of California.

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 JODY LITVAK

4 Metro Community Relations

5

6 DAVID MIEGER

7 Project Director

8

9

10 PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

11 Abbe Land

12 Randy Paskal

13 Nate Zablen

14 Monroe Jones

15 William Scott Hutton

16 Alexander Freedman

17 Kevin Burton

18 Jeff Payne

19 Phyllis Coto

20 Jeff Jacobberger

21 John Heilman

22 Bart Reed

23

24

25

	I N D E X	
		PAGE
1		
2		
3	Opening by Jody Litvak	5
4	Presentation by David Mer	16
5	Public Comments	36
6	Adjournment	52
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 West Hollywood, California, Wednesday, September 22, 2010

2 6:15 p.m.

3

4

5 MS. LITVAK: We're going to start the public
6 hearing. My name is Jody Litvak with Metro and joining
7 me tonight is Dave Mieger from Metro. For those of you
8 who have been coming to our meetings throughout the
9 development of this planning effort, this is somewhat
10 different than those public meetings. This is a public
11 hearing, so it has to be somewhat more formal in nature
12 and more structured and official.

13 So I want to let you know that there's not
14 going to be the same kind of give and take that we would
15 normally have. We're here to listen to you. We're here
16 to take your comments and questions and get them on the
17 record. The responses to comments and the responses and
18 answers to your questions can't happen as a part of this
19 formal public hearing. Those will happen formally when
20 the final EIS/EIR comes out, but we do have staff and
21 consultants here in the room tonight, and we were able
22 to chat with you beforehand, and we will be with you
23 after we close the formal part of the public hearing and
24 we'll be glad to talk with you then.

25 Now, because this is a formal public hearing,

1 I need to start off by reading the official announcement
2 that goes along with it. So if you'll bear with me,
3 it's a little bit long. It's not the full both sides of
4 this page. But here we go.

5 The Westside Subway Extension Transit Corridor
6 Studies Draft Environmental Impact Statement and
7 Environmental Impact Report was released on
8 September 3rd, 2010, along with the notice of intent to
9 hold the public hearings in compliance with the National
10 Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, and the California
11 Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA.

12 The Federal Transit Administration, FTA, is
13 the lead agency for the purposes of NEPA, and the
14 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation
15 Authority, Metro, is the lead agency for the purposes of
16 CEQA. Both agencies prepared the draft EIS/EIR.

17 A notice of availability and intent to hold
18 public hearings was published in the Federal Register,
19 State of California Clearinghouse, Los Angeles Times,
20 La Opinion and filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk.
21 The notices were published on September 3rd, 2010.

22 Copies of the draft EIS/EIR are available for
23 public review at the following venues: The Beverly
24 Hills Public Library, the Donald Bruce Kaufman Brentwood
25 Library, Fairfax Library, Felipe de Neve Library,

1 Frances HG Hollywood Regional Library, John C. Fremont
2 Library, Memorial Library, Metro Transportation Library,
3 Pio Pico Koreatown Library, Robertson Branch Library,
4 Santa Monica Main Library, West Hollywood Public
5 Library, West Los Angeles Regional Library, Westwood
6 Library, Wilshire Library, and on the table in the back
7 of the room.

8 In addition, electronic copies of the
9 document, otherwise known as CDs, were distributed by
10 mail to 232 agencies, listed owners and properties
11 identified in the document, local elected officials and
12 additional interested stakeholders.

13 In addition, display ads about the public
14 hearing were published in the Beverly Hills Courier,
15 Beverly Hills Weekly, Jewish Journal, Korean Times,
16 Larchmont Chronical, Park La Brea Beverly Press, Santa
17 Monica Daily Press, and online at dailybruin.com and
18 wehnews.com. Copies of the press release about the
19 release of the draft EIS/EIR were sent to a distribution
20 list of over 120 media organizations.

21 The draft EIS/EIR and information about the
22 hearings was posted on Metro's website. Information
23 about the release of the draft EIS/EIR and the hearings
24 was also printed in brochure form and was distributed
25 widely on Metro buses and trains as well as hand

1 delivered at key locations in the study area.

2 Brochures were also sent by U.S. mail to a
3 list of nearly 1,000 contacts in the project study area.
4 The same information was also sent electronically to a
5 distribution list of 1,790. All of these materials
6 included information about how to find the draft EIS/EIR
7 as well as more information about the Westside Subway
8 Extension Transit Corridor Study on the web. Affidavits
9 of publication and copies of detailed mailing lists are
10 available upon request. Thank you.

11 Before I get into the presentation tonight, I
12 just want to let you know about the material that you
13 were given this evening. If you want to speak tonight,
14 we have these speaker cards for you. If you didn't pick
15 one up -- Clarissa, who is doing Rebecca's role tonight?

16 There's a staff member who will walk around
17 and give you a blank form if you want one. Just raise
18 your hand. And if you have a form and you didn't turn
19 it in, please fill it out now or whenever you're ready
20 and wave it about and somebody will come and get it from
21 you.

22 If you would like to leave us written comments
23 in addition to or instead of speaking this evening, we
24 have these forms available for you. Please fill them
25 out and turn it in to anybody with one of these badges.

1 Or you can take it with you and information is here
2 about how to send information to us. That information
3 about how to contact us is also available on this board.

4 In addition, we have -- I want to be clear
5 that the presentation tonight is not a substitute for
6 the draft EIS/EIR. There's no way it can be. You saw
7 how thick it was back there. It's intended to give you
8 a very, very brief high-level overview. Nor can it
9 really go through all of the material we've shared with
10 the public over the last three years.

11 In that regard, there's a series of stapled
12 papers that are frequently asked questions. The list is
13 big and growing longer by the moment. We have three
14 fact sheets. They all have the same picture on the
15 front, but the words in the purple bar are different.
16 We have a general information fact sheet. We have a
17 fact sheet dealing with the performance of the
18 alternatives we've been studying. And we have a fact
19 sheet on public safety. And all of these materials and
20 much more is available online.

21 Before I go any further, I do want to take a
22 moment, and we always like to thank when our elected
23 officials are represented in the room, and West
24 Hollywood councilwoman Abbe Land is here. Thank you for
25 coming.

1 And, oh, man, I forget your name. Tell me
2 your name.

3 MS. KIM: Heung Kim.

4 MS. LITVAK: Heung Kim. I'm so sorry. Heung Kim
5 is here and she's representing California Assemblymember
6 Mike Feuer.

7 Are there any other elected officials or
8 elected officials' representatives in the room? Who are
9 you pointing to? Him. I don't know him.

10 MR. KLEIN: Me?

11 MS. LITVAK: Yeah.

12 MR. KLEIN: Oh, I work for Councilmember Horvath.

13 MS. LITVAK: And your name is?

14 MR. KLEIN: Ira Klein.

15 MS. LITVAK: Hi, Ira. Thank you so much for
16 coming. We've never met before. I'm Jody.

17 So the purpose of tonight's meeting, as I
18 said, is to give you a brief summary of the draft
19 EIS/EIR. As I mentioned, this is no way a substitute
20 for the document itself, and I know it's big, and it's
21 all online, and it can be daunting. I invite you to
22 start with the executive summary, which touches on every
23 topic that is in the document itself. And if you see
24 anything in the executive summary that you know is --
25 that piques your interest and you want more information,

1 you can delve into the document more for that.

2 We're also going to go through the decisions
3 that are required to select the Locally Preferred
4 Alternative. That's an important next step. I'll talk
5 about that in a moment. I'll talk about the summary of
6 the next steps leading up to Metro board action and what
7 would happen following Metro board action. But most
8 importantly, as I said, we're here to listen to your
9 comments tonight. They will become part of the official
10 record. We have our court reporter here who's taking
11 everything down, and as I said, we cannot respond
12 formally tonight to your comments or questions. Those
13 will be in the final EIS/EIR.

14 There are some things we'd especially like to
15 hear from you this evening. They relate to what your
16 comments might be on the draft EIS/EIR, especially as we
17 talk about impacts that might have been identified or
18 mitigations that go with them.

19 Do you have any additional questions that you
20 would like answered in the final EIS/EIR? Is there
21 additional information you would like? Please let us
22 know about that. And your comments on the selection of
23 the Locally Preferred Alternative, our selection of the
24 alternative choice. In some cases we have station
25 options, alignment options, and myriad other details, so

1 whatever your opinions are on that, we want to have
2 them; and if you have any suggestions beyond the Locally
3 Preferred Alternative.

4 And all of your official comments at this
5 stage, if you want us to address them in the final
6 EIS/EIR, if you want them to be formally part of the
7 record, we need to have them by October 18th.

8 As I mentioned, we've really been on this path
9 for about three years. Starting in late 2007 we began
10 our alternatives analysis study. That looked at a great
11 deal of material and information and began to focus this
12 effort. And all of the material from the alternatives
13 analysis study is online. And then in early 2009 we
14 began the current --

15 (Interruption.)

16 MS. LITVAK: Sorry, guys. What I was going to say
17 is in 2007 we began the draft -- in 2009 we began the
18 draft EIS/EIR, and we're heading towards this second key
19 decision -- those yellow diamonds that you see there --
20 the second key decision by the Metro board of directors.
21 They will be selecting what's known as a Locally
22 Preferred Alternative, because this is a project that
23 will seek federal funds, that is a determination that
24 the Metro board has to make, and that we will then
25 continue to pursue federal funding for and take it to

1 the final environmental analysis.

2 But by no means is this the end of the
3 evaluation. Depending on what the decision is that the
4 board makes about the Locally Preferred Alternative,
5 whatever decision they make, there will be much more
6 analysis about that alternative as we move forward into
7 the final stage.

8 As I said, we've had a lot of public
9 involvement to date. Nearly 1200 of you showed up in
10 2007 and 2008 during the alternatives analysis. All of
11 the material from the alternatives analysis, including
12 the alternatives analysis report and all the
13 presentations is available online.

14 During the draft EIS/EIR we've had, oh, God,
15 sort of a series of about a half dozen meetings,
16 specially focused meetings. I cannot get into the
17 details of that here tonight, as I mentioned. Over 2500
18 of you have participated up until now. Last summer we
19 had meetings focused on construction, how you build a
20 subway. If you're curious about that, especially if you
21 want to know about the impacts of construction, I invite
22 you to go take a look at that presentation online.

23 Last fall we were out with meetings where in
24 each area people got to chime in and give us their
25 opinions on the stations being considered in their

1 areas. And so if you want to understand about some of
2 those issues, please go take a look at that
3 presentation.

4 In the spring and the summer we were out
5 initially with some preliminary ridership information on
6 the five alternatives, and then in the summer with
7 performance information. And again, much more details
8 about all of that is online. And we've had some
9 specially focused meetings as well on tunneling in the
10 Crenshaw Station. And, again, that's all available for
11 you. And I just want you to know that, if you're new to
12 this effort, because, as I said, this is a very quick
13 overview of work that really has taken three years to
14 produce.

15 There are seven alternatives that we are
16 looking at, one of which is called "No Build," which
17 looks at growth over the coming years or couple decades.
18 And what if we don't do anything, what will that mean?
19 And that becomes the base by which we compare
20 everything.

21 Then there's "Transportation Systems
22 Management," which is the alternative that says if we
23 don't build rail, what are the best, most robust
24 improvements we can make to the road system and the
25 traffic signals and the bus system, and that's TSM.

1 And then we have five rail alternatives that
2 we're looking at, two that are within the funding
3 umbrella currently available as a result of Measure R,
4 which was passed by the voters of Los Angeles County
5 almost two years ago now, and assume a federal match and
6 are in the adopted long-range transportation plan.
7 Those two go down Wilshire to Westwood ending either at
8 UCLA or the VA. And then there's three that are beyond
9 that, one where we would extend to Santa Monica and two
10 others that include the West Hollywood alignment. There
11 are boards in the back with maps of that, and they're
12 also in your general information fact sheet.

13 By the way, this presentation has not yet been
14 put up online as best as I know, but it should be up
15 online by the end of this week. If you signed in and
16 gave us an e-mail address, we will send you out a
17 notification when it goes up.

18 So based on the funding we have now, and
19 remember two years ago we had absolutely exactly \$0 for
20 this. This is planned right now, based on the funding
21 availability, to be built in three phases over the next
22 quarter century. But there's a lot of effort going on
23 to try and accelerate that to ten years. We're working
24 hard in Washington to make that happen. Nobody's done
25 that before. So while we get a lot of positive rhetoric

1 in D.C., I'm not sure anybody knows what the mechanisms
2 are, but we're working hard to try and make that happen.

3 The local elected officials, Senator Boxer,
4 Senator Feinstein, Congressman Waxman for this area, if
5 we're successful in making that happen, the top half of
6 this slide won't matter anymore. Our goal will be to
7 get to Westwood by the end of the decade, and it will be
8 built all in one phase instead of in three phases.

9 I'm going to turn it over to David now, who is
10 going to talk a little bit about some of the findings in
11 the draft EIS/EIR. I just want to remind anyone who
12 came in late if you didn't sign in, to please do so. We
13 do want to get an accurate count of everybody who is
14 here tonight, and we do have some information available
15 to you at the back table. So please take a moment to do
16 that.

17 MR. MIEGER: So this is the EIS/EIR. It's a pretty
18 formidable document. And for people to kind of look at
19 it and say, "What I do with this? It's just hard to
20 understand. How do I even start to look at a document
21 like this," and I think Jody had the suggestion is if
22 you just look at the executive summary, it's kind of
23 brief. It's short. It summarizes everything in the
24 document. Read through that and then if you have an
25 area that you want to go into more detail and then go

1 into the fatter document.

2 And for those of you that might really be
3 super experts, we have technical reports in the document
4 too and online. So if you want more information you can
5 even go into a deeper level of detail, but I just wanted
6 to orient people so that they don't feel too
7 intimidated. We want this document to be readable and
8 understandable so that you can use it to help make your
9 own decisions about what you think should happen for
10 transportation in this corridor.

11 But the one thing I wanted to emphasize, and
12 particularly in West Hollywood, is that this document is
13 a two-part document. It's a federal document and a
14 local document. The top one, the Federal Transit
15 Administration, is the lead agency for this, for the
16 federal document, for the NEPA document. And we have
17 one set of requirements that we have to do to satisfy
18 the federal requirements, and that mainly has to do with
19 being eligible for -- doing the environmental to be
20 eligible for federal funding, which is there's a whole
21 set of requirements for getting federal funding.

22 And then the second one is the CEQA, the EIR
23 part, which is what everybody who wants to build a
24 project in California has to do, and that's really to
25 satisfy all the local environmental requirements in the

1 State of California.

2 So there's two parts to the document, and the
3 importance to West Hollywood is that the federal
4 document is for the funding. And a lot of the issues
5 we've had with being able to fund the West Hollywood
6 line have to do with eligibility for federal funding,
7 and there's some very strict requirements about what you
8 have to do to qualify for that federal funding.

9 So that's why -- the purposes that we're
10 trying to achieve with this document. We've got five of
11 them here. And the first one is that federal
12 requirement, "Evaluate the performance of the
13 alternatives against the required criteria." And this
14 is things like the cost, the ridership, the
15 cost-effectiveness, these measures that when we go out
16 to seek funding, we have to compete against other cities
17 around the country that are also looking for this
18 funding, and we have to show that we're as good or
19 better than those other projects because it's a very
20 competitive process to get funding.

21 The second one is that we actually do the
22 environmental analysis. The adverse and beneficial
23 effects of the project, so the impacts can be good and
24 bad. So we have to talk about both types of impacts in
25 the document. And then we break that into the temporary

1 impacts during construction and the longer term impacts
2 after the project is built.

3 And with a subway project, once it's built,
4 it's underground. It's covered. The only thing you see
5 on the surface is just the stairs and the escalators
6 that come up to the surface. Everything else is really
7 not visible from the surface. So there's a very limited
8 number of impacts once it's finally built.

9 But the subway, the hard part is building the
10 subway and actually digging the hole in the ground where
11 the stations go, excavating the dirt, constructing that
12 station in the middle of a city street, and then digging
13 the tunnels in between those stations. And that's the
14 hard part that goes on for a four- to five-year period.
15 And that's where a lot of the impacts are that are
16 discussed in the impact. How do we build this in a way
17 that's not disruptive.

18 And I know, West Hollywood, those of you who
19 lived through the building of the Santa Monica Boulevard
20 reconstruction, that was a difficult process, but it's a
21 beautiful, beautiful street now that it's completed. So
22 when you think of the subway, it's a little bit the
23 same. You have construction you have to go through to
24 get to a very good thing at the end.

25 The third bullet, the draft EIS provides

1 locations and other details of the impacts, again,
2 getting into more specifics about it. It identifies
3 potential mitigation measures. So when we have an
4 adverse impact, we find a way to provide an offsetting
5 mitigation to offset the negative effect of that impact.
6 And then we develop mitigation plans. And once we have
7 proposed mitigations in the draft, we're looking for
8 comments from people about maybe that's the right kind
9 of mitigation, maybe it's not. Maybe there's things
10 that we should be aware of, and those kinds of comments
11 would be very helpful for us.

12 But in terms of when you open that document
13 and look at the table of contents, there's about 20
14 different categories of impacts that you can read about
15 in terms of the project. I'm not going to go into those
16 tonight. I just wanted to show you the map. But I'm
17 going to just talk about one or two in the construction
18 and in the operations to give you an idea about them
19 without going into the full depth.

20 So, again, during the construction phase, I
21 wanted to show -- I'm going to go back and show one
22 picture here. This picture on the right, this is
23 Hollywood Boulevard right at Vine Street. And when we
24 built the Hollywood and Highland substation a number of
25 years ago right where the Kodak Theater is right now

1 where the Academy Awards take place, a lot of traffic on
2 Hollywood Boulevard. This is actually a concrete deck
3 that was put in. When we excavated, we went in over a
4 series of weekends, dug down a few feet below the street
5 and put in this temporary deck. And then while the
6 project was being built, the traffic was running on the
7 surface just as it would normally. And then
8 underground, under that deck, the construction of the
9 subway station was taking place. And so that's an
10 example of a mitigation measure that we came up with to
11 keep the traffic flowing during construction while we
12 were building the station and the kind of impacts and
13 mitigation measures that are identified in the document.

14 Other types of impact during construction, the
15 construction equipment, any time you go to a job site
16 for a major construction site, there's backhoes, there's
17 various types of heavy-duty construction equipment that
18 creates noise, creates dust. There's mitigation
19 measures, some the City requires, some that we impose
20 ourselves. Some we put in as new mitigation efforts to
21 try to minimize those impacts. A lot of discussion in
22 the EIS about how you mitigate those type of
23 construction impacts.

24 During the long-term operation, the tunnels
25 are going to be quite deep. In this case a typical

1 tunnel depth is about 50 to 70 feet below the surface.
2 That's deep enough in most cases where you wouldn't feel
3 any vibration or any sense of the train going below you.
4 In some cases, however, when it comes up near the
5 stations and closer to the surface where there's some
6 ventilation grates in the sidewalk, you might be able to
7 hear it. And so what we do then is have mitigation
8 measures to put some dampeners under the track level so
9 that that would dampen any vibration and reduce the
10 noise.

11 And that's, again, an example of a mitigation
12 measure we put in to reduce the noise impact. So these
13 are just some examples of the types of things in the
14 document. We do the best we can with this. We hire
15 some of the best consultants we can find to write these,
16 who do these on projects around the country, but the
17 local knowledge is always something that we need input
18 on, and the Cities are usually very good about reviewing
19 these and giving us better ideas of how we can build the
20 project.

21 Just a couple of strategies. I have one or
22 two slides to wrap up, and then I'll give it back to
23 Jody. During the design phase some of the things that
24 we've identified in the document, the construction
25 techniques and standards are continually advancing. The

1 tunnels that we've just built in east L.A., we built a
2 two-mile subway tunnel out there with no settlement
3 whatsoever. Some people have fears that when the subway
4 gets built, it might cause the ground to settle. We've
5 actually built two subway projects, the North Hollywood
6 extension, Hollywood -- North Hollywood and Eastside,
7 with no measurable settlement for those projects, so
8 we're trying to use the most up-to-date geological
9 techniques to reduce any risks of that.

10 The tunnel depths, again, might reduce any
11 potential noise and vibration. During the construction
12 phase we are using new pressure-balanced tunnel boring
13 machines, which, again, are the -- is a new type of
14 technique, which actually replace -- when you dig the
15 dirt out, it replaces it with concrete wedges so that
16 there's no removal of dirt that causes settlement. It
17 actually replaces and keeps the balance in the earth so
18 you never actually create an opportunity for the dirt to
19 sink.

20 We have, in terms of over near the La Brea Tar
21 Pits we have methane and hydrogen sulfide underground.
22 Westside is a gassy area with underground oil wells and
23 whatnot, so we're putting in double liners and extra
24 ventilation to make sure the gases are ventilated out
25 quickly. So these are special mitigations that we do in

1 L.A. that other people wouldn't have to do because of
2 different geological conditions.

3 And then utilities, Santa Monica Boulevard,
4 Wilshire Boulevard, have major utilities under those
5 streets, so when we build this, we have to keep all
6 those utilities in place. So we have a fairly detailed
7 utility plan to keep those utilities going and build
8 around them and keep them in place.

9 Finally, ongoing, once the tunnels are built,
10 subway stations are open, we have all kinds of electric
11 monitoring equipment to preserve safety, alarms for any
12 gas intrusion. We operate the trains with electronic
13 controls and train controls to make sure they operate
14 safely, so these things are also mitigation measures
15 that we have to have in the document to talk about how
16 we maintain that ongoing safety.

17 I want to talk -- one last slide for me is on
18 the benefits of the project, the beneficial effects of
19 the project. And probably the highest and best benefit,
20 any of us who drive in the westside or try to take buses
21 or transit know how slow it's getting, how much slower
22 it's getting each year as the traffic increases, and we
23 don't add any new freeways and don't widen any roads.
24 We have more development. People are growing, have
25 larger families, and people move in.

1 But I wanted to show an example of if you're
2 in downtown and you're going to UCLA on a Wilshire bus,
3 that's about a 54-minute trip today to take that travel
4 from UCLA to downtown. And if you built the subway,
5 that's about a 24-minute trip, so that's a half-hour
6 time savings. One of the things this project is doing,
7 both the West Hollywood branch and the Wilshire branch
8 is getting people to those major job centers in
9 Westside, which is Beverly Hills, Century City and
10 Westwood, UCLA campus where a huge amount of jobs are
11 located. It's the largest job center on the west coast
12 outside of downtown L.A. and downtown San Francisco. So
13 we have almost 200,000 people coming in to the west side
14 every day coming from all over the region, and if we
15 could get some of those trips off of the surface
16 roadways and into the underground, it really helps to
17 relieve that traffic that we're all dealing with on the
18 surface.

19 So that's the major reason, to serve those job
20 centers, to create faster travel through this very
21 congested area. And because of that, we do compete
22 fairly well in terms of the federal criteria.

23 Jody is going to talk a little bit about we
24 have some decisions in addition to the EIS that we're
25 going to be trying to make at our board next month, and

1 there's six major decisions that have to be made, so --
2 five major decisions that have to be made, and Jody is
3 going to talk to you about what those are.

4 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. As I mentioned, the next
5 step for this project is choosing the Locally Preferred
6 Alternative, that is the alternative that will go into
7 the final environmental review. And I know all of
8 you -- many of you have read the EIS/EIR cover to cover
9 and memorized it the way I have; right? And what you
10 will find in there is a lot of analysis and no
11 recommendations. So what is the staff recommendation
12 going to be? That's what will go to the board at the
13 end of October. And in developing our recommendation,
14 we have to come up with the best alternative utilizing
15 the federal criteria.

16 It's a very competitive process, as David
17 talked about. So we want to make sure we're in the best
18 position possible to get those federal matching funds.
19 And, of course, considering local input. But then there
20 are decisions. Once the LPA is selected among the five
21 alternatives, there are decisions within that
22 alternative to make. Is it five or is it six? No, it's
23 five. Yeah.

24 So what I want to talk about are the key
25 decisions as we move forward. One, of course, is

1 selecting the best alternative within the funding
2 constraints, within that how far west we should extend
3 the subway. Wilshire/Crenshaw is an optional station.
4 Areas where we have more than one location for the
5 stations we're considering and some multiple alignments.
6 And I will spend a little more time on the issues that I
7 think are of greatest interest in this community. But
8 all of this is really informed by the technical analysis
9 in the document and the input we've been getting from
10 you over the past year and a half and, of course,
11 tonight and through this comment period.

12 The best performing alternative, and there is
13 a fact sheet that talks about this a little bit, the
14 three alternatives that are just on Wilshire come
15 closest to meeting the federal cost effectiveness target
16 for performance of heavy rail. I have to tell you that
17 the target for heavy rail is really, really high and
18 really hard to meet, and there are likely very, very few
19 places anywhere in the country that can meet that
20 target.

21 Santa Monica Boulevard, we looked at it, and
22 if you were with us in June and the earlier spring
23 presentation, we presented some information, it's a
24 really good rail corridor. It really is. And it would
25 probably perform as well, if not better, than any of our

1 existing light rail corridors. But Wilshire is the
2 800-pound gorilla in L.A. It just is. And it's nothing
3 bad about Santa Monica. It's a great rail corridor.
4 Wilshire just is Wilshire. It has better land use and
5 transit connections than the Santa Monica Boulevard
6 corridor. It serves more key regional destinations with
7 mid Wilshire, Beverly Hills, Century City once you get
8 west of the Wilshire/Santa Monica intersection, and
9 Westwood. It has higher population and employment
10 concentrations than Santa Monica. Not that they're bad
11 here. This is just a whole really dense area.

12 It also has more direct transit connections
13 from a greater area of Southern California because it
14 connects through Union Station. It makes it easy for
15 people to connect to that alignment who come in to Union
16 Station from the Antelope Valley or Ventura or the
17 San Gabriel Valley or the Inland Empire, the southeast
18 portion of the county, Long Beach, up on the blue line
19 out into Orange County. It just opens it up to a
20 greater portion of the county.

21 However, of those three Wilshire-only
22 alternatives, only 1 and 2 are currently fundable, as I
23 mentioned in the -- through Measure R and the
24 anticipated local funds and the long-range
25 transportation plan. And when we move into the federal

1 New Starts process officially, they will not allow us to
2 bring something into that process for which there is not
3 realistic funds available.

4 So that is one of the key limitations at this
5 point. That restriction did not apply all throughout
6 this process up until now. Once we switch into the
7 final that becomes critical.

8 However, over the last year and a half and the
9 year and a half prior to that with the Alternatives
10 Analysis Study, there was support for all of the
11 alternatives. Everybody on the westside wants all of
12 these things.

13 Very quickly, there's some issues about within
14 those two fundable alternatives how far west we want to
15 go. Do we want to end at UCLA or do we want to try to
16 get a little further west just across the 405 to the VA
17 Hospital? Wilshire/Crenshaw continues to be an optional
18 station. That community is somewhat split about whether
19 they want it. It's a low-density area. It's not a high
20 ridership station.

21 There are five areas, Wilshire/Fairfax,
22 Wilshire/La Cienega, Century City, Westwood/UCLA, and
23 Westwood VA where we have different locations we're
24 evaluating for the subway. I am not going to spend a
25 lot of time on that here because none of those are in

1 the West Hollywood area, but if you go back and look at
2 this presentation online, there's a series of criteria
3 or factors across the top, ridership, construction
4 issues, et cetera. All of those are important no matter
5 what. But where you see a check mark, it means where we
6 have a choice of stations, it makes a difference for
7 that issue. Where there isn't a check mark, it's sort
8 of a -- it's an issue in that area, but it's an issue
9 sort of equally for the station options we have there.

10 Likewise, as we move between Wilshire/Rodeo
11 and Century City and Century City and Westwood/UCLA, we
12 have a series of different alignments. We have some
13 detailed boards off on my right over there that show
14 them in greater detail. And, again, there's some
15 differentiating factors and how we choose those
16 alignments. And there was obviously a lot of interest
17 in that last night when we were in Westwood, and I
18 suspect that will be the focus of a lot of discussion
19 Monday night in Beverly Hills.

20 This a little more information about those
21 alignments. The depth of the track, the number of
22 residential easements would be required from Rodeo to
23 Century City and then from Century City into Westwood.

24 So what happens next? October 18th is the
25 close of the public comment period. As I said, if there

1 are issues you want us to consider as we move into the
2 final and that are part of this official record, we have
3 to hear from you by October 18. We will be developing
4 our recommendations and summarizing the public comments
5 to the board. On October 28 we will go to the board.
6 It's their opportunity to really consider all of this.
7 They will have our recommendations on the Locally
8 Preferred Alternative. We will ask them to adopt that
9 LPA. They may narrow -- in addition to selecting the
10 LPA, all of those things where we have multiple choices
11 to make, it's possible that they may make a single
12 choice for each one of those things or they may keep
13 some of those options open as we move forward.

14 So within the selected LPA they may decide at
15 a certain area to keep two station options alive or to
16 keep, you know, only pick one alignment or to keep two
17 around for us to study further in the final EIS/EIR. We
18 don't know that. That will be up to them.

19 We will ask them to authorize us to prepare
20 the final EIS/EIR to enter into preliminary engineering
21 and, of course, to allow us to have continued
22 significant outreach in the final. We'll be asking the
23 Federal Transit Administration for approval to enter New
24 Start preliminary engineering. And then there may be
25 additional recommendations beyond the Locally Preferred

1 Alternative.

2 As I said early on, this is not the end of the
3 analysis. There will be much more analysis on whatever
4 the Locally Preferred Alternative is that the board
5 selects. We don't exactly know what those details are
6 right now. But there will be a significant continued
7 public involvement. As I said, we will be developing
8 the responses to the comments we've received and we will
9 receive during this formal comment period.

10 There will be much more geotechnical
11 investigation. We actually have a board back in the
12 corner over there that talks a little bit about what's
13 been done during the draft and what's likely to happen
14 in the final with the geotech work. We'll be refining
15 the engineering, getting the cost estimates really
16 solidified, getting the details of the stations and the
17 alignment design down. We'll be doing the preliminary
18 engineering. We're going to have to figure out where
19 we're going to do construction staging all along
20 whatever that Locally Preferred Alternative is. And
21 we'll be developing the mitigation measures.

22 I think David mentioned to you that we talk
23 about areas that might need mitigation, and we
24 identified some potential mitigations, but it's really
25 in the final that we lock in that mitigation program and

1 the board will adopt that at the end of the final.

2 So if you want to comment and -- this is the
3 time to bring up the comment cards to me, please,
4 whatever you have. Thank you.

5 You can testify tonight at the public hearing
6 or at any of our two remaining public hearings. You can
7 turn in written testimony tonight. You can send a
8 letter with written comments on it to David Mieger.
9 That board is there so you don't have to copy this down
10 right now. We have an online comment form. Go to
11 metro.net/westside. Please keep it all lower case. You
12 will be frustrated if you don't. And you can go to
13 "contact us" and we have an online comment form. You
14 can send us an e-mail to WestsideExtension@Metro.net.
15 That is not case sensitive. Don't ask me why.

16 We've had a lot of interaction throughout this
17 project via Facebook and Twitter and we are tweeting
18 tonight. And we have over 1700 fans on Facebook. And
19 we love you all and we love those of you who talk to us
20 and each other via Facebook, but that is not going to be
21 a forum during this official public comment period for
22 public comments. And, again, comments must be received
23 by October 18th.

24 We are in -- next Monday we'll be in Beverly
25 Hills. We are going to have a live web stream of that

1 meeting, so you can tune in at Metro.net/westside and
2 you will be able to link to that. I'm actually going to
3 post -- I have on our website and on Facebook, post the
4 link to where you can go back in after the fact and view
5 those meetings if you'd like. And then next Wednesday
6 will be the Santa Monica Library. Both meetings are at
7 6:00 o'clock. And, again, we'll only be web streaming
8 in Beverly Hills, but we'll be tweeting throughout.

9 So here's how things are going to go tonight.
10 There are two minutes per speaker, four if you need
11 translation. I will invite you to come to the
12 microphone over on the right. We have assistance with
13 the microphone if you need it raised or lowered. If any
14 of you have mobility issues and have trouble coming up
15 to the microphone, we have these handheld, and we're
16 happy to bring them to you. We have our countdown clock
17 here, which will give you two minutes. Everybody gets
18 two minutes. We've been able to give somewhat of a
19 leeway during the public meetings, but during the public
20 hearings we have to keep it clear like that.

21 I'm going to call three names at a time so you
22 can line up and get ready and we can minimize the amount
23 of time between speakers so we have maximum time to hear
24 from as many of you as possible.

25 Please state your name clearly for the court

1 reporter. We'll begin the countdown then, and, of
2 course, speak clearly for the court reporter. We ask
3 you to be respectful of all the speakers, whether you
4 agree or disagree. Let's not bring that into the room
5 tonight. That also takes away from the speaker's time
6 and the time between speakers. Again, we are not
7 responding to the comments tonight. And that will be
8 addressed in the final EIS/EIR.

9 I want to remind you again of some of the
10 things we'd especially like to hear from you. Your
11 comments on the impacts and mitigation measures that
12 have been discussed in the draft document itself; any
13 additional questions you'd like us to answer and the
14 final additional information you may need; your comments
15 on the Locally Preferred Alternative; the alternative
16 choice. If you have opinions about the station options
17 or widen options or other things, and any suggestions
18 beyond the Locally Preferred Alternative you'd like us
19 to consider as we move forward to the board, and, again,
20 we have to hear from you by October 18th.

21 And I think -- yes, that's the last slide.

22 So with that, we're going to start with
23 Councilwoman Abbe Land from West Hollywood. Come on up
24 over here. Followed by, and please line up, Randy
25 Paskal. And if I butcher your name, I do so apologize.

1 And Nate Zablen.
 2 I know the councilwoman knows this because as
 3 an elected official she's a seasoned public speaker, but
 4 for those of you who aren't, I want you to get really up
 5 close to the microphone so we can hear you. If you
 6 stand back, we're not going to hear you. And if you
 7 start talking and moving your head around, we're not
 8 going -- we're going to miss every third word. So get
 9 really close to the microphone and we'll assist you, and
 10 please go ahead.

11 MS. LAND: Thank you. My name is Abbe Land. I am
 12 a resident of the city of West Hollywood and serve on
 13 the City Council. And the City will be submitting
 14 formal comments to you to talk about our concerns with
 15 this.

16 We've been coming to all the meetings and
 17 definitely have a bias on Alternative 5. We think at
 18 the end of the day that this area where there is
 19 unparalleled support for this that there will be the
 20 ridership we need. And overall, we all know that the
 21 impact on our streets is incredible, and that we on the
 22 west side want as many rail opportunities as possible.

23 The people of West Hollywood want to see
 24 something here in West Hollywood. As you go through the
 25 EIR and look at the information, we are convinced that

237-1

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.

237-1 |

1 we have a strong ridership today and there will be a
2 strong ridership in the future.

3 And I will say, as you continue this process
4 and you look, I think it's really important that you
5 actually keep all the alternatives alive, and that you
6 do the Environmental Impact Reports, you include that
7 because really, Jody, it's something you said earlier,
8 two years ago we didn't think there would be any
9 funding. No one thought this was possible. So we don't
10 know what the future holds. And if for some reason West
11 Hollywood isn't the first choice, something might happen
12 with that first choice and it can't get done. And if we
13 aren't continuing the process and making sure that that
14 line is an alternative, that we're doing everything we
15 can to keep it viable, then at the end of the day,
16 everybody loses out.

17 So again, thank you. And I know we'll be
18 hearing from other folks in West Hollywood and the City
19 will be submitting formal comments as well.

20 Thank you very much.

21 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Randy Paskal,
22 followed by Nate Zablen and then Monroe Jones.

23 MR. PASKAL: As you heard, Randy Paskal is my name.
24 I represent a company called Moviola. We've been in
25 Hollywood since 1924. We're real close, within walking

238-1

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.

238-2

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.

238-1

1 distance, of the La Brea and Santa Monica alternative.
2 As you call it, the Local Preferred Alternative through
3 West Hollywood really would be beneficial to Hollywood,
4 the entertainment industry altogether. If you miss that
5 route, it makes it very difficult for people traveling
6 from Universal through Hollywood and Highland, that
7 whole area over there, and then traveling to the whole
8 Hollywood media district that starts right at Santa
9 Monica and La Brea and continues eastward all the way
10 down to Vine.

11 By bypassing this area, you would find it
12 would be very difficult. So I just think it's
13 important, at least as far as the Hollywood prospective
14 and media side, that this alternative going through West
15 Hollywood would be very beneficial to going to Century
16 City as well as Beverly Hills.

238-2

17 And then one other comment having to do with
18 the Hollywood industry, Century City, I think, is really
19 important that when you do decide to go through there,
20 it's closer to Fox Studios rather than going all the way
21 down to Santa Monica Boulevard. Thank you.

22 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Nate Zablen.
23 Then Monroe Jones and after Mr. Jones will be William
24 Scott Hutton.

25 MR. ZABLEN: I'm Nate Zablen. I'm a member of

238-2

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.

239-1

1 Southern California Transit Advocates, but I'm speaking
 2 only for myself. I support Alternative 5 because I
 3 think the subway has a lot of support here in West
 4 Hollywood. It would really be helpful to people not
 5 only in West Hollywood, but people in the east valley
 6 who would like to go to the medical center, Cedars-Sinai
 7 Medical Center the Beverly Center. It's almost
 8 impossible. You should see the traffic on Beverly
 9 Canyon, on Coldwater Canyon and on Laurel Canyon. It's
 10 unbelievable. And it gets worse every day.

239-2

11 Now, the building of the subway is not going
 12 to eliminate traffic. It may not even be a decrease in
 13 traffic, but it will give those people in West
 14 Hollywood, in the valley, in west L.A., options so they
 15 can take the subway so they can enjoy the whole city.
 16 It's almost like there's a barrier between the city and
 17 the valley, and I think the subway connection at
 18 Hollywood and Highland will open up the whole city to
 19 everybody.

239-3

20 And, also, I hope that there's a way they can
 21 connect that subway, the West Hollywood subway to the
 22 valley. I know there's some constraints because of the
 23 station, but I think they should look into it to see if
 24 it's possible to go all the way through to North
 25 Hollywood by any possibility. That would be important.

239-1

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.

239-2

Your comments about the traffic congestion reduction related to the Project have been noted.

The Westside Extension Study Area contains some of the most congested arterial streets in the County. Any approach to resolving the significant traffic congestion in the County, and for purposes of this study of congestion in the Study Area, needs a multi-modal approach. While there are freeway, arterial, and bus improvement projects planned within the Study Area to address mobility, no one project alone can reduce the extraordinary levels of congestion in the Westside and each has trade-offs and environmental consequences in its implementation.

Chapter 1 of this Final EIS/EIR details the Purpose and Need of the Project. As described, a major purpose of the Westside Subway Extension is to improve transit speed and reliability for the Study Area and, in particular, to provide enhanced mobility that will not be affected by freeway and arterial congestion levels. The improved capacity, speed, and reliability that will result from the subway's exclusive guideway, offer the best solution to improve travel times, generate the projected 29 percent increase in transit riders in the study area between 2006 and 2035 (from 286,200 to 370,500), and provide an environmentally sound transit alternative.

Given the future conditions of the freeways, arterials, and travel speeds, the Westside Subway Extension provides benefit. Significant increases in travel are expected in the

239-2

future and no major new highways or arterial widenings are planned. Without the subway, traffic congestion will be worse in the future. The Westside Subway Extension Project will provide significant new capacity to accommodate increases in travel demand but it will not, by itself, be sufficient to significantly reduce surface traffic congestion on the Westside.

This Final EIS/EIR presents a detailed examination of the travel-demand projections for 2035, which provide further insights on potential impacts of the LPA, specifically in terms of reduced auto trips during the seven-hour peak period. It is recognized that the LPA will result in a relatively small percentage decrease in trips. But, under the LPA, approximately 12,000 auto trips occurring in the seven-hour peak period will be eliminated. In addition, the Project will provide a highly attractive and viable public transportation alternative for Westside residents, workers, and visitors; particularly in terms of travel times and reliability.

Please refer to Section 8.8.9 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more detailed response to traffic congestion reductions. Information on how the LPA would affect travel in the region and Study Area is presented in Section 3.4, Section 3.5 and Chapter 7 of the Final EIS/EIR. The *Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives* provides a summary of the updated travel forecast results for the Final EIS/EIR. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

239-3

Your support of a connection to North Hollywood 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. There is not adequate funding available in Measure R or other sources to construct a connection to Hollywood/Highland at this time. However, 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 and the LPA selection process.

239-4

Your comment in support of the Westside Subway Extension Project has been noted.

40

1 So I would say what strikes me about West
2 Hollywood, you don't have a lot of people opposing the
3 subway. I think in Beverly Hills there are some --
4 there is a great deal of opposition unfortunately. So
5 maybe instead of being the Alternative 4 or Alternative
6 5, maybe if there's so much opposition elsewhere, they
7 can make this Alternative Number 3 because they deserve
8 it and they had so much support for Measure R here in
9 West Hollywood. I think they had the highest proportion
10 of people supporting Measure R.

239-4

11 And, okay, you hear a lot of people talking
12 about bus lanes. Well, think about a bus lane on Santa
13 Monica Boulevard. It's not that wide of a street. Bus
14 lanes may be better than nothing at all, but I don't
15 think it would take care of the capacity that really the
16 subway has. And I don't think it gives you that much
17 comfort. I mean, take the Rapid Bus on Wilshire
18 Boulevard. I mean, it's probably better than local bus,
19 but it's not very comfortable. I really think the
20 westside and West Hollywood deserves a subway.

21 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Monroe Jones
22 followed by William Scott Hutton and then Alexander
23 Freedman.

24 MR. JONES: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
25 What I want to talk about is the Alternative 5 going

240-1

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.

41

240-1

1 down Santa Monica Boulevard to Santa Monica. I think
2 that the subway should be extended to Westwood and
3 heading down towards Santa Monica. Because I know some
4 of you work at UCLA and the VA, and some of you guys are
5 driving down Wilshire Boulevard sometimes. And there's
6 a lot of traffic going through that corridor and
7 sometimes a lot of horrendous traffic. I know you guys
8 like driving in it, but sometimes it can be very, very
9 frustrating to some of you.

10 And I know that people don't drive -- don't
11 drive very well on the streets, and sometimes there are
12 a lot of pedestrians who are getting injured or killed
13 on the streets because of the drivers. And I think that
14 people who drive should consider taking the bus and the
15 rail system because they would greatly cut down their
16 time in traffic and travel and everything.

17 Most people should be able to ride a bus or a
18 rail system, but they don't want to do it because they
19 probably have no other way to get to their destination.
20 So I think that the more people get out of their cars
21 and trucks and all of the heavy stuff that -- heavy
22 vehicles that they're driving and get on the bus and
23 rail system, it would greatly make this city a better
24 place. And I think that all the alternatives that we're
25 talking about tonight will greatly benefit all of you.

1 So I think that all of you should get out and
2 ride the bus and rail system and it will impact your
3 life forever. Thank you.

4 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. William Scott
5 Hutton followed by Alexander Freedman and then Kevin
6 Burton.

7 MR. HUTTON: Hi. I'm William Scott Hutton,
8 resident of the city of West Hollywood. And I'm one of
9 the persons who opposes Alternatives 1 and 3 strongly,
10 Alternate 2 I oppose, and support Alternates 4 and 5.

11 My greatest concern about all of these
12 alternates that don't provide any relief to the city of
13 West Hollywood and the greater West Hollywood area is
14 that the TSM is already stating that there are no other
15 improvements that can be made to our area to provide
16 better rail service and easier commute times. With the
17 subway going on 1, 2 and 3 alternatives, suddenly there
18 will be more development to our west in both
19 Los Angeles, possibly Beverly Hills, and definitely in
20 Santa Monica, which has caused most of the trouble on
21 the west side. I just do not support that development
22 without some relief for our city.

23 The other thing is that with the 1030 we won't
24 get anything until 2045 because all the funds will be
25 used.

241-1

Your support for Alternatives 4 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) and 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.

241-2

Your comment has been noted. There is not adequate funding available in Measure R or other sources to construct a West Hollywood Extension at this time.

However, 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 and the LPA selection process.

241-3

The 30/10 Initiative is intended to accelerate the delivery of projects in Metro's long range plan that will be funded out of Measure R Revenues. The 30/10 Initiative will not divert Measure R funds to other projects, nor will it result in the deferral of projects in the approved long range plan.

241-1

241-2

241-3

241-4

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*

43

241-4

1 And last but not least, I'd say I want to
2 support between the Century City stations, the
3 Constellation Station, at the very least, because that
4 shows more ridership and may help West Hollywood easing
5 further traffic growth. Because come on, folks, traffic
6 is not going away. We're just trying to prevent growth
7 here more than anything else and at least give
8 alternatives to people.
9 And the problem is that 1, 2 and 3 do not
10 offer anyone communicating through the West Hollywood
11 area up to the valley, Burbank area, an alternative.
12 Thank you.

241-4

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.

43

242-1

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.

242-2

Your preference for a modified Westwood/VA Hospital Station location has been noted.

During the Draft EIS/EIR scoping, the public suggested that an additional station should be provided west of I-405 because of the large distance between a Westwood/UCLA and a Wilshire/Bundy Station, as well as a desire to serve communities west of the I-405 more effectively. In response, five proposed stations west of I-405 were studied—two at Westwood/VA Hospital (one north of Wilshire and one south of Wilshire), Wilshire/Federal, Wilshire/Barrington, and Wilshire/Bundy. In analyzing the proposed stations, the potential to serve as a terminus station was an important consideration. In addition, all of the stations except for the stations at Westwood/VA Hospital are located too far west to be funded as part of Measure R and beyond the adopted LRTP.

The Wilshire/Federal Station would have been located on a site currently used by the U.S. Army Reserve, and the site was determined to be too small to accommodate the subway station without impacting adjacent historic homes in the VA property. From an engineering perspective, this also would have been a challenging site to construct a subway station because of the sharp curve of Wilshire Boulevard. Therefore, the Wilshire/Federal Station

13 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Alexander
 14 Freedman followed by Kevin Burton and then Jeff Payne.
 15 MR. FREEDMAN: Yes, good evening. Alexander
 16 Freedman. I live in Hollywood. First of all, about the
 17 Alternative 1, as far as the Crenshaw Station, I
 18 probably support not building it because the ridership
 19 is not going to be that high, and it will save a lot of
 20 costs.
 21 At the west end, I think the Wilshire line
 22 should go beyond UCLA. I think it should go as close as
 23 possible to the Wilshire and Barrington intersection
 24 because this is where you connect to the city of Santa
 25 Monica, you connect to the Big Blue Bus, so stopping

242-1

242-2

242-2

was eliminated from further consideration.

The Wilshire/Barrington Station would be located slightly west of the proposed Wilshire/Federal Station. While the Wilshire/Barrington Station is in a high density area with high ridership potential, comments were received from the community during scoping in opposition to locating a terminus station at Wilshire/Barrington due to traffic congestion and dense development concerns. Furthermore, the Wilshire/Barrington Station was not as evenly spaced between the Westwood/UCLA Station and the Wilshire/Bundy Station as is the Westwood/VA Hospital Station.

The Wilshire/Bundy Station is the farthest west of the terminus station considered and provided better potential transit connections as it aligns with the future planned Expo station at Olympic/Bundy. However, it is beyond Measure R funding.

Based on all of these considerations, and especially the fact that only the Westwood/VA Hospital Station is fundable within Measure R, the Wilshire/Federal, Wilshire/Barrington, and Wilshire/Bundy Stations were eliminated as potential terminus stations for the fundable Measure R alternatives. Both the North and South Options at the Westwood/VA Hospital Station were carried forward for further analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR. The Wilshire/Bundy Station was also carried forward into the Draft EIS/EIR as part of the Santa Monica Extension, which is beyond available Measure R funding, and would not serve as a terminus station.

Please refer to Section 8.8.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station and 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/VA Hospital 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/VA Hospital Station locations in the Final EIS/EIR. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

1 near the VA Hospital, yes, it's a great connection to
 2 the hospital, but it's almost like the middle of
 3 nowhere. So I think it should go all the way to like
 4 Wilshire and Barrington at least to get a connection.

242-3

5 So as far as the impact, I heard some concern
 6 from the City of Beverly Hills. Personally, I'm not
 7 concerned that the subway goes under my home. Actually,
 8 I would be happy to know that it goes under my home
 9 because I know I can get out and catch the subway train
 10 nearby.

242-4

11 As far as the West Hollywood option, first of
 12 all, I can't imagine, like Jody said earlier, that the
 13 West Hollywood extension looks like a light rail
 14 corridor. I think the ridership is much higher than a
 15 light rail because if you built a West Hollywood
 16 extension, imagine all those people flocking to the
 17 train from the Valley, from the east valley, from the
 18 Orange line. You're going to have tremendous ridership.
 19 So you guys heard tonight the -- you received the almost
 20 unanimous support for Alternative 5, and I'm one of
 21 those people.

22 Also, on Monday I attended the West Hollywood
 23 City Council meeting, who approved a great project which
 24 will be on the corner of Santa Monica and La Brea, which
 25 is the future site of a potential station of the West

242-3

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

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report* for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area*

45

1 Hollywood station. And there are actually three
 2 projects which will be happening in the city of West
 3 Hollywood. One of those is breaking ground any day
 4 right across the street, which is the Movie Town Plaza
 5 near the Trader Joe's.
 6 So West Hollywood will have a tremendous mix
 7 use development project. So I think that should be a
 8 great reason for MTA to consider Alternative 5 or
 9 Alternative 3 as a priority. Thank you.

242-3

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.

242-4

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.

243-1

Your support for Alternative 4 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) and 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.

45

10 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. And I do want to
11 welcome Councilman and Mayor, John Heilman from the City
12 of West Hollywood, who came in in the back. We'll get
13 to you, I promise.

14 Kevin Burton followed by Jeff Payne and then
15 Phyllis Coto. Go ahead, sir.

16 MR. BURTON: I'm Kevin Burton, a resident of West
17 Hollywood. And I want to state my strong support for
18 either Alternatives 4 or 5, which includes the route
19 through West Hollywood. And I would generally echo the
20 comments of the previous speakers in support of those
21 alternatives, especially those of Councilmember Abbe
22 Land.

23 I have one technical question, and that is
24 related to Question 8 of the frequently asked questions
25 handout you gave all of us, which is how much of the

243-1

243-2

As presented in the financial plan for the Westside Subway, Measure R funds and anticipated federal New Starts funds are sufficient to complete the project to the VA Hospital station in Westwood. If these New Starts funds do not materialize, the Metro Board would have several options to consider, including building a shorter extension.

46

243-2

1 proposed subway would this amount of funding build.
2 "This amount" referring to the Measure R funding along
3 with the anticipated matching federal funds from the New
4 Starts Program.
5 I would like to have added to that the answer
6 to a Question 8 B, which is the opposite extreme. If
7 disaster were to strike, such as a decision to balance
8 the federal budget after the next election, and the
9 federal funds were not forthcoming, what would the
10 repercussions be for the proposed project?

244-1

Your support for Alternative 4 (Westwood/VA Hospital 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. There is not adequate funding available in Measure R or other sources to construct Alternative 4 at this time.

However, 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.

The Westside Subway Extension would operate seven days per week, including holidays. Hours of service will be similar to those operated on the existing Metro Purple, Red, Blue, Gold, and Orange Lines. Service will be provided from approximately 4:30 a.m. to 1:30 a.m., seven days a week. Weekday service would operate during peak periods of 6:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 7:00 p.m. during the off-peak midday period between 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Off peak service early morning and late night periods will occur from 5:00 to 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m.

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

11 MS. LITVAK: Great. And you know we're not
 12 responding right now. Okay. Is that it?
 13 MR. BURTON: That's it. Thank you.
 14 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Jeff Payne
 15 followed by Phyllis Coto and then Jeff Jacobberger.
 16 MR. PAYNE: Hi, I'm Jeff Payne, resident of West
 17 Hollywood. And yes, I do support the extension through
 18 West Hollywood. I think it would be great for the city,
 19 for people that commute to work, and also there's a lot
 20 of people that come into West Hollywood for
 21 entertainment purposes on the evenings and on weekends
 22 and at night, so I think it would be great for them to
 23 have an alternative to driving into the city and then
 24 maybe have the subway open later than 2:00 a.m., like
 25 3:00 or 4:00 a.m. like most major cities.

244-1

244-2

Your comments regarding utilizing local labor and local contractors have been noted. Metro will be recommending the implementation of a jobs program in the next several months for large construction projects. The jobs program will be designed to maximize employment opportunities for residents living in the construction area, provide for apprenticeship opportunities, and reduce unemployment for Los Angeles County residents. Your comments about the traffic congestion reduction related to the Project have been noted.

The Westside Extension Study Area contains some of the most congested arterial streets in the County. Any approach to resolving the significant traffic congestion in the County, and for purposes of this study of congestion in the Study Area, needs a multi-modal approach. While there are freeway, arterial, and bus improvement projects planned within the Study Area to address mobility, no one project alone can reduce the extraordinary levels of congestion in the Westside and each has trade-offs and environmental consequences in its implementation.

Chapter 1 of this Final EIS/EIR details the Purpose and Need of the Project. As described, a major purpose of the Westside Subway Extension is to improve transit speed and reliability for the Study Area and, in particular, to provide enhanced mobility that will not be affected by freeway and arterial congestion levels. The improved capacity, speed, and reliability that will result from the subway's exclusive guideway, offer the best solution to improve travel times, generate the projected 29 percent increase in transit riders in the study area between 2006 and 2035 (from 286,200 to 370,500), and provide an environmentally sound transit alternative.

Given the future conditions of the freeways, arterials, and travel speeds, the Westside Subway Extension provides benefit. Significant increases in travel are expected in the future and no major new highways or arterial widenings are planned. Without the subway, traffic congestion will be worse in the future. The Westside Subway Extension Project will provide significant new capacity to accommodate increases in travel demand but it will not, by itself, be sufficient to significantly reduce surface traffic congestion on the Westside.

This Final EIS/EIR presents a detailed examination of the travel-demand projections for 2035, which provide further insights on potential impacts of the LPA, specifically in terms of reduced auto trips during the seven-hour peak period. It is recognized that the LPA will result in a relatively small percentage decrease in trips. But, under the LPA, approximately 12,000 auto trips occurring in the seven-hour peak period will be eliminated. In addition, the Project will provide a highly attractive and viable public transportation alternative for Westside residents, workers, and visitors; particularly in terms of travel times and reliability.

Please refer to Section 8.8.9 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more detailed response to traffic congestion reductions. Information on how the LPA would affect travel in the region and

47

244-2

1 And I also am wondering if the construction
2 would utilize local labor and local contractors, I think
3 it would be great for our local economy of the City of
4 Los Angeles. And I also want to know to what extent it
5 would decrease the traffic in the city. So thanks.

244-2

Study Area is presented in Section 3.4, Section 3.5 and Chapter 7 of the Final EIS/EIR. The *Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives* provides a summary of the updated travel forecast results for the Final EIS/EIR. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

245-1

Your support for Alternative 3 (Santa Monica Extension) or 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.

47

6 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Phyllis Coto
7 followed by Jeff Jacobberger and then Mayor Heilman, who
8 at the moment, Mayor Heilman's speaker's card is the
9 last one I have, but I will take more. So if you want
10 to speak, raise your hand or wave your speaker's card
11 around and we'll take care of you. Go ahead.

12 MS. COTO: Again, hi, my name is Phyllis Coto. I'm
13 a resident of West Hollywood. I feel it's important to
14 have a light rail or a subway going all the way through
15 Santa Monica because we have a very large population of
16 tourists that come to the city like every day. And
17 people work like in Century City, and also, you know, go
18 through Westwood Boulevard to get to UCLA. And they're
19 definitely interested in shopping and buying in Santa
20 Monica. And it just takes forever to go home from Santa
21 Monica to try to get on the 407 or 404 bus.

22 Once we get the subways going, you know,
23 people get home earlier, they have more time to spend
24 with their children and their families, and that's
25 another good way of looking at it.

245-1

1 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much. Jeff Jacobberger
2 and then Mayor Heilman, and I will gladly entertain more
3 speaker's cards after that. Go ahead.

4 MR. JACOBBERGER: Jeff Jacobberger. I'm a member
5 of the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Advisory Committee,
6 and I wanted to make a comment about bicycle connections
7 is, thus far, Metro and the City of Los Angeles have
8 done a very poor job of making sure that there's good
9 bike access to any Metro subway station and that
10 certainly needs to be looked at and given a focus.

11 With respect to the location of the Century
12 City station, you should not make the same mistake you
13 made with the Green line, which is just getting the line
14 to the perimeter of the airport rather than the middle
15 of the airport that actually maximizes ridership.

16 Third, one of the questions was whether you
17 should construct a box, say, at La Cienega to at least
18 keep the WeHo line alive for the future. If Option 4 or
19 5 are not picked, you should definitely do that.

20 As a resident of the Miracle Mile, I would
21 support not building the Crenshaw station for the purely
22 selfish reason that when you finally extend the Crenshaw
23 line north, it will probably connect near my house where
24 I could get it near La Brea or Fairfax where I could
25 actually take a train directly to the airport.

246-1

Convenient and safe access by pedestrians and bicyclists will be an important element of the Westside Subway Extension Project. Sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and other facilities along the Project corridor support non-motorized access. To assess potential future access improvements to subway stations, Project design efforts included a study of circulation needs in each station area. The results of this study are available in the *Westside Subway Extension Station Circulation Report* and Section 3.7 of this Final EIS/EIR. This study provided important guidance on potential station features, including those specifically relating to pedestrian and bicycle access. Areas explored by the study included the following:

- Provision of bicycle facilities at stations
- Enhanced bus shelters and lighting
- Making crosswalks more visible with crosswalk treatments and advance stop bars, increasing safety for pedestrians transferring from buses or traveling to other destinations on foot
- Improving the transit and pedestrian environment with the addition of sidewalk treatments

Results of the station circulation study helped direct further design of subway stations and supported station area planning for the Project. The station area planning examined access opportunities and potential improvements in the neighborhoods surrounding subway stations.

Section 3.7 of this Final EIS/EIR summarizes the findings of the *Station Circulation Report* and lists specific measures to be implemented at stations to improve pedestrian and bicycle access. These measures include the following:

- T-5 through T-8—Install Crossing Deterrents/Crossing Deterrents
- T-9—Provide consistency with General Plan Designation Sidewalk Width Adjacent to Metro-Controlled Parcels
- T-10—Provide consistency with General Plan Designation Sidewalk Width Coordination with Jurisdictions
- T-11—Provide High Visibility Crosswalk Treatments
- T-12—Meet Federal, State, and Local Standards for Crossing
- T-13—Meet Metro Rail Design Criteria Minimums for Bicycle Parking
- T-14—Study Bicycle Parking Demand and Footprint Configuration
- T-15—Determine Alternative Sites for Bicycle Parking

Metro is committed to working with local jurisdictions to improve the environment for pedestrians and bicyclists at all Project stations and will continue to assess and refine the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists as the Project progresses into Final Design.

Please refer to Section 8.8.8 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns

246-1

246-2

246-3

246-4

246-1

related to station connectivity. In addition, the *Westside Subway Extension Station Circulation Report* provides a comprehensive station access circulation study of Project stations and Section 3.7 provides an analysis of potential impacts to pedestrian and bicycle networks. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

246-2

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

246-2

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. 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.

246-3

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.

246-4

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.

246-4

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.

246-5

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.

49

246-5

1 And then, finally, just in terms of your
2 analysis, I'm not sure if your ridership projections on
3 the west side take into account all the different kinds,
4 if it's just sort of employment and population density
5 or if it actually takes into account, for example, in
6 West Hollywood the kind of riders who are going to the
7 Sunset strip, sort of Boys Town, the Beverly Center,
8 patients at Cedars-Sinai, all the people who are not
9 work riders. Because in this part of town on the west
10 side, that would be a fairly significant source of
11 ridership that might change your numbers. Thanks.

247-1

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.

49

12 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. Mayor Heilman. And
 13 followed by Bart Reed. And, again, I will take more
 14 speaker's cards after Bart Reed.
 15 MAYOR HEILMAN: Thank you, Jody. And thank you for
 16 everyone coming out tonight. We will be submitting
 17 formal comments within the deadline from the City, but I
 18 wanted to come in and say that we support Alternative 5.
 19 We support an alignment that serves West Hollywood, and
 20 it isn't just about West Hollywood and about being
 21 selfish for our own community. It's about maximizing
 22 the number of riders on any kind of Metro service that
 23 we would have.
 24 There are a lot of people, as you know, who
 25 come through West Hollywood, coming from the valley,

247-1

248-1

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*

50

1 going to work on the west side, going to Century City,
2 going to Cedars-Sinai, and we want to make sure that
3 those people have real alternatives. The current bus
4 service is overcrowded, oftentimes it isn't sufficient
5 to serve the population that is looking for work in the
6 area. So we think that this is certainly warranted.
7 You have funded other projects with much lower projected
8 ridership, and we think that this is the time to include
9 West Hollywood in the program.

10 We also, of course, support service on the
11 west side generally. And support the efforts to move
12 Metro westward. But we want to be included as part of
13 the alternatives.

14 If we are not included as part of the
15 alternatives, we should at a minimum be included as part
16 of the environmental analysis so if there is funding in
17 the future available for a West Hollywood spur, we would
18 be ready to go. Thank you.

19 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Bart Reed.
20 Where did Bart go? Oh, there he is. Bart Reed and then
21 is there anyone else who wants to speak after Bart?
22 Please get your speaker card in.

23 MR. REED: Hi. Bart Reed, executive director of
24 the Transit Coalition. We definitely support the
25 alternative that takes you into the center of Century

248-1

248-1

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.

51

1 City, and that's the one that's going to get the most
2 ridership.

248-2

248-3

3 We also support the options especially at
4 La Cienega and at Westwood. If there is another
5 north/south route, that there's directions to the staff
6 to make sure that there's planning to allow for the
7 future, whether it's the subway extension or a light
8 rail extension. But design it with the planning thought
9 out.

10 Same thing in Westwood, if there's the valley
11 to West L.A. rail tunnel, which is one of the Measure R
12 3010 alternatives, make sure that there's availability
13 to connect to the Purple line.

14 Anyway, that's my comments for the night.
15 Thank you.

16 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Thank you very much. Is there
17 anyone else who wants to speak on the record tonight?
18 Please let us know. We'll get you a card. Okay. With
19 that, I want to remind you that we need to get your
20 comments in by October 18th. These are all the ways you
21 can get your comments in to us if you want them on the
22 record. We will stay in the room tonight and are around
23 to answer any specific questions you have. Again, they
24 do not count as official responses. Those will happen
25 in the final EIS/EIR.

248-2

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

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Section 8.8.6 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Westwood/UCLA Station. Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives

248-2

Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/La Cienega and Westwood/UCLA 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 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.

248-3

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.

1 Please review some of the material we handed
2 you tonight. There's a lot more online. We'll let you
3 know when this presentation is available online, and
4 thank you all very much for coming this evening.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to ask where the
6 exact location of the Santa Monica/La Brea substation
7 is.

8 MS. LITVAK: Okay. You know what -- we're going to
9 shut down this portion of the evening and we'll have
10 people available to answer your questions.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When will we likely see you
12 again in our city with an update?

13 MS. LITVAK: We'll see what the board does on
14 October 28th. We'll be back out. I'm going to close
15 down this portion of the evening and we're around to
16 answer your questions. Thank you so much.

17 (Public Meeting concluded at 7:16 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24