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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The draft EIS/EIR and information about the hearings was posted on Metro's website. Information about the release of the draft EIS/EIR and the hearings was also printed in brochure form and was distributed widely on Metro buses and trains as well as hand
delivered at key locations in the study area. Brochures were also sent by U.S. mail to a list of nearly 1,000 contacts in the project study area. The same information was also sent electronically to a distribution list of 1,790. All of these materials included information about how to find the draft EIS/EIR as well as more information about the Westside Subway Extension Transit Corridor Study on the web. Affidavits of publication and copies of detailed mailing lists are available upon request. Thank you.

Before I get into the presentation tonight, I just want to let you know about the material that you were given this evening. If you want to speak tonight, we have these speaker cards for you. If you didn't pick one up -- Clarissa, who is doing Rebecca's role tonight? There's a staff member who will walk around and give you a blank form if you want one. Just raise your hand. And if you have a form and you didn't turn it in, please fill it out now or whenever you're ready and wave it about and somebody will come and get it from you.

If you would like to leave us written comments in addition to or instead of speaking this evening, we have these forms available for you. Please fill them out and turn it in to anybody with one of these badges.
Or you can take it with you and information is here about how to send information to us. That information about how to contact us is also available on this board.

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

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

Before I go any further, I do want to take a moment, and we always like to thank when our elected officials are represented in the room, and West Hollywood councilwoman Abbe Land is here. Thank you for coming.
And, oh, man, I forget your name. Tell me your name.

MS. KIM: Heung Kim.

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

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

MR. KLEIN: Me?

MS. LITVAK: Yeah.

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

MS. LITVAK: And your name is?

MR. KLEIN: Ira Klein.

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

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

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

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

Do you have any additional questions that you would like answered in the final EIS/EIR? Is there additional information you would like? Please let us know about that. And your comments on the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative, our selection of the alternative choice. In some cases we have station options, alignment options, and myriad other details, so
whatever your opinions are on that, we want to have
them; and if you have any suggestions beyond the Locally
Preferred Alternative.
And all of your official comments at this
stage, if you want us to address them in the final
EIS/EIR, if you want them to be formally part of the
record, we need to have them by October 18th.
As I mentioned, we've really been on this path
for about three years. Starting in late 2007 we began
our alternatives analysis study. That looked at a great
deal of material and information and began to focus this
effort. And all of the material from the alternatives
analysis study is online. And then in early 2009 we
began the current --
(Interuption.)
MS. LITVAK: Sorry, guys. What I was going to say
is in 2007 we began the draft -- in 2009 we began the
draft EIS/EIR, and we're heading towards this second key
decision -- those yellow diamonds that you see there --
the second key decision by the Metro board of directors.
They will be selecting what's known as a Locally
Preferred Alternative, because this is a project that
will seek federal funds, that is a determination that
the Metro board has to make, and that we will then
continue to pursue federal funding for and take it to
the final environmental analysis.

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

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

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

Last fall we were out with meetings where in each area people got to chime in and give us their opinions on the stations being considered in their
areas. And so if you want to understand about some of those issues, please go take a look at that presentation.

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

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

Then there's "Transportation Systems Management," which is the alternative that says if we don't build rail, what are the best, most robust improvements we can make to the road system and the traffic signals and the bus system, and that's TSM.
And then we have five rail alternatives that we're looking at, two that are within the funding umbrella currently available as a result of Measure R, which was passed by the voters of Los Angeles County almost two years ago now, and assume a federal match and are in the adopted long-range transportation plan. Those two go down Wilshire to Westwood ending either at UCLA or the VA. And then there's three that are beyond that, one where we would extend to Santa Monica and two others that include the West Hollywood alignment. There are boards in the back with maps of that, and they're also in your general information fact sheet.

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

So based on the funding we have now, and remember two years ago we had absolutely exactly $0 for this. This is planned right now, based on the funding availability, to be built in three phases over the next quarter century. But there's a lot of effort going on to try and accelerate that to ten years. We're working hard in Washington to make that happen. Nobody's done that before. So while we get a lot of positive rhetoric
in D.C., I'm not sure anybody knows what the mechanisms are, but we're working hard to try and make that happen.

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

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

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

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

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

And then the second one is the CEQA, the EIR part, which is what everybody who wants to build a project in California has to do, and that's really to 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
impacts during construction and the longer term impacts
after the project is built.

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

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

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

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

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

So, again, during the construction phase, I
wanted to show -- I'm going to go back and show one
picture here. This picture on the right, this is
Hollywood Boulevard right at Vine Street. And when we
built the Hollywood and Highland substation a number of
years ago right where the Kodak Theater is right now
where the Academy Awards take place, a lot of traffic on Hollywood Boulevard. This is actually a concrete deck that was put in. When we excavated, we went in over a series of weekends, dug down a few feet below the street and put in this temporary deck. And then while the project was being built, the traffic was running on the surface just as it would normally. And then underground, under that deck, the construction of the subway station was taking place. And so that's an example of a mitigation measure that we came up with to keep the traffic flowing during construction while we were building the station and the kind of impacts and mitigation measures that are identified in the document.

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

During the long-term operation, the tunnels are going to be quite deep. In this case a typical
tunnel depth is about 50 to 70 feet below the surface. That's deep enough in most cases where you wouldn't feel any vibration or any sense of the train going below you. In some cases, however, when it comes up near the stations and closer to the surface where there's some ventilation grates in the sidewalk, you might be able to hear it. And so what we do then is have mitigation measures to put some dampeners under the track level so that that would dampen any vibration and reduce the noise.

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

Just a couple of strategies. I have one or two slides to wrap up, and then I'll give it back to Jody. During the design phase some of the things that we've identified in the document, the construction techniques and standards are continually advancing. The
tunnels that we've just built in east L.A., we built a
two-mile subway tunnel out there with no settlement
whatsoever. Some people have fears that when the subway
gets built, it might cause the ground to settle. We've
actually built two subway projects, the North Hollywood
extension, Hollywood -- North Hollywood and Eastside,
with no measurable settlement for those projects, so
we're trying to use the most up-to-date geological
techniques to reduce any risks of that.
The tunnel depths, again, might reduce any
potential noise and vibration. During the construction
phase we are using new pressure-balanced tunnel boring
machines, which, again, are the -- is a new type of
technique, which actually replace -- when you dig the
dirt out, it replaces it with concrete wedges so that
there's no removal of dirt that causes settlement. It
actually replaces and keeps the balance in the earth so
you never actually create an opportunity for the dirt to
sink.

We have, in terms of over near the La Brea Tar
Pits we have methane and hydrogen sulfide underground.
Westside is a gassy area with underground oil wells and
whatnot, so we're putting in double liners and extra
ventilation to make sure the gases are ventilated out
quickly. So these are special mitigations that we do in
L.A. that other people wouldn't have to do because of different geological conditions.

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

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

I want to talk -- one last slide for me is on the benefits of the project, the beneficial effects of the project. And probably the highest and best benefit, any of us who drive in the westside or try to take buses or transit know how slow it's getting, how much slower it's getting each year as the traffic increases, and we don't add any new freeways and don't widen any roads. We have more development. People are growing, have larger families, and people move in.
But I wanted to show an example of if you're in downtown and you're going to UCLA on a Wilshire bus, that's about a 54-minute trip today to take that travel from UCLA to downtown. And if you built the subway, that's about a 24-minute trip, so that's a half-hour time savings. One of the things this project is doing, both the West Hollywood branch and the Wilshire branch is getting people to those major job centers in Westside, which is Beverly Hills, Century City and Westwood, UCLA campus where a huge amount of jobs are located. It's the largest job center on the west coast outside of downtown L.A. and downtown San Francisco. So we have almost 200,000 people coming in to the west side every day coming from all over the region, and if we could get some of those trips off of the surface roadways and into the underground, it really helps to relieve that traffic that we're all dealing with on the surface.

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

Jody is going to talk a little bit about we have some decisions in addition to the EIS that we're going to be trying to make at our board next month, and
there's six major decisions that have to be made, so --
five major decisions that have to be made, and Jody is
going to talk to you about what those are.

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

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

So what I want to talk about are the key
decisions as we move forward. One, of course, is
selecting the best alternative within the funding
constraints, within that how far west we should extend
the subway. Wilshire/Crenshaw is an optional station.
Areas where we have more than one location for the
stations we're considering and some multiple alignments.
And I will spend a little more time on the issues that I
think are of greatest interest in this community. But
all of this is really informed by the technical analysis
in the document and the input we've been getting from
you over the past year and a half and, of course,
tonight and through this comment period.

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

Santa Monica Boulevard, we looked at it, and
if you were with us in June and the earlier spring
presentation, we presented some information, it's a
really good rail corridor. It really is. And it would
probably perform as well, if not better, than any of our
existing light rail corridors. But Wilshire is the
800-pound gorilla in L.A. It just is. And it's nothing
bad about Santa Monica. It's a great rail corridor.
Wilshire just is Wilshire. It has better land use and
transit connections than the Santa Monica Boulevard
corridor. It serves more key regional destinations with
mid Wilshire, Beverly Hills, Century City once you get
west of the Wilshire/Santa Monica intersection, and
Westwood. It has higher population and employment
concentrations than Santa Monica. Not that they're bad
here. This is just a whole really dense area.

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

However, of those three Wilshire-only
alternatives, only 1 and 2 are currently fundable, as I
mentioned in the -- through Measure R and the
anticipated local funds and the long-range
transportation plan. And when we move into the federal
New Starts process officially, they will not allow us to bring something into that process for which there is not realistic funds available. So that is one of the key limitations at this point. That restriction did not apply all throughout this process up until now. Once we switch into the final that becomes critical.

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

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

There are five areas, Wilshire/Fairfax, Wilshire/La Cienega, Century City, Westwood/UCLA, and Westwood VA where we have different locations we're evaluating for the subway. I am not going to spend a lot of time on that here because none of those are in
the West Hollywood area, but if you go back and look at
this presentation online, there's a series of criteria
or factors across the top, ridership, construction
issues, et cetera. All of those are important no matter
what. But where you see a check mark, it means where we
have a choice of stations, it makes a difference for
that issue. Where there isn't a check mark, it's sort
of a -- it's an issue in that area, but it's an issue
sort of equally for the station options we have there.
Likewise, as we move between Wilshire/Rodeo
and Century City and Century City and Westwood/UCLA, we
have a series of different alignments. We have some
detailed boards off on my right over there that show
them in greater detail. And, again, there's some
differentiating factors and how we choose those
alignments. And there was obviously a lot of interest
in that last night when we were in Westwood, and I
suspect that will be the focus of a lot of discussion
Monday night in Beverly Hills.
This a little more information about those
alignments. The depth of the track, the number of
residential easements would be required from Rodeo to
Century City and then from Century City into Westwood.
So what happens next? October 18th is the
close of the public comment period. As I said, if there
are issues you want us to consider as we move into the
final and that are part of this official record, we have
to hear from you by October 18. We will be developing
our recommendations and summarizing the public comments
to the board. On October 28 we will go to the board.
It's their opportunity to really consider all of this.
They will have our recommendations on the Locally
Preferred Alternative. We will ask them to adopt that
LPA. They may narrow -- in addition to selecting the
LPA, all of those things where we have multiple choices
to make, it's possible that they may make a single
choice for each one of those things or they may keep
some of those options open as we move forward.

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

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

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

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

I think David mentioned to you that we talk about areas that might need mitigation, and we identified some potential mitigations, but it's really in the final that we lock in that mitigation program and
the board will adopt that at the end of the final. So if you want to comment and -- this is the time to bring up the comment cards to me, please, whatever you have. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And I think -- yes, that's the last slide. So with that, we're going to start with Councilwoman Abbe Land from West Hollywood. Come on up over here. Followed by, and please line up, Randy Paskal. And if I butcher your name, I do so apologize.
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.
we have a strong ridership today and there will be a
strong ridership in the future.

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

MR. PASKAL: As you heard, Randy Paskal is my name.
I represent a company called Moviola. We've been in
Hollywood since 1924. We're real close, within walking
distance of the La Brea and Santa Monica alternative.

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

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

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

Ms. LITVAK: Thank you very much, Nate Zablen.
Then Monroe Jones and after Mr. Jones will be William
Scott Hutton.

Mr. ZABLEN: I’m Nate Zablen. I’m a member of

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.

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

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

The geotechnical studies conducted during preparation of the Final EIS/EIR concluded that
tunneling can be safely carried out beneath the Beverly Hills High School campus and the
West Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood neighborhoods. However, these studies
also determined that the Century City Santa Monica Station would cross the West Beverly
Hills Lineament, a northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood Fault, which poses a
significant safety risk to passengers at this station location. No evidence of faulting was
found at the proposed Century City Constellation Station site.
In addition, the Century City Constellation Boulevard Station has the best pedestrian environment, can be expected to attract the most transit riders, and is centrally located to help shape the redevelopment of Century City as an important transit-oriented destination on the Westside Subway Extension. Further refinements to the ridership analysis concluded that the Century City Constellation Station would result in 3,350 more boardings along new Westside Subway Extension stations than the Century City Santa Monica Station due to proximity to jobs and residences within the critical 600-foot and 1/4-mile walksheds.

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

Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Southern California Transit Advocates, but I’m speaking only for myself. I support Alternative 5 because I think the subway has a lot of support here in West Hollywood. It would really be helpful to people not only in West Hollywood, but people in the east valley who would like to go to the medical center, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center the Beverly Center. It’s almost impossible. You should see the traffic on Beverly Canyon, on Coldwater Canyon and on Laurel Canyon. It’s unbelievable. And it gets worse every day.

Now, the building of the subway is not going to eliminate traffic. It may not even be a decrease in traffic, but it will give those people in West Hollywood, in the valley, in west L.A., options so they can take the subway so they can enjoy the whole city. It’s almost impossible. You should see the traffic on Beverly Canyon, on Coldwater Canyon and on Laurel Canyon. It’s unbelievable. And it gets worse every day.

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

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.

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 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.

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

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

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

MR. JONES: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

What I want to talk about is the Alternative 5 going
down Santa Monica Boulevard to Santa Monica. I think that the subway should be extended to Westwood and heading down towards Santa Monica. Because I know some of you work at UCLA and the VA, and some of you guys are driving down Wilshire Boulevard sometimes. And there's a lot of traffic going through that corridor and sometimes a lot of horrendous traffic. I know you guys like driving in it, but sometimes it can be very, very frustrating to some of you.

And I know that people don't drive -- don't drive very well on the streets, and sometimes there are a lot of pedestrians who are getting injured or killed on the streets because of the drivers. And I think that people who drive should consider taking the bus and the rail system because they would greatly cut down their time in traffic and travel and everything. Most people should be able to ride a bus or a rail system, but they don't want to do it because they probably have no other way to get to their destination. So I think that the more people get out of their cars and trucks and all of the heavy stuff that -- heavy vehicles that they're driving and get on the bus and rail system, it would greatly make this city a better place. And I think that all the alternatives that we're talking about tonight will greatly benefit all of you.
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So I think that all of you should get out and
ride the bus and rail system and it will impact your
life forever. Thank you.

241-2

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

241-3

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

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

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

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.
And last but not least, I’d say I want to support between the Century City stations, the Constellation Station, at the very least, because that shows more ridership and may help West Hollywood easing further traffic growth. Because come on, folks, traffic is not going away. We’re just trying to prevent growth here more than anything else and at least give alternatives to people.

And the problem is that 1, 2 and 3 do not offer anyone communicating through the West Hollywood area up to the valley, Burbank area, an alternative. Thank you.

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 Apppendix H - Response to Comments.
Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your comment on the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station has been noted. In October 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). A Wilshire/Crenshaw Station was not included in the LPA.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. COTO: Again, hi, my name is Phyllis Coto. I’m a resident of West Hollywood. I feel it’s important to have a light rail or a subway going all the way through Santa Monica because we have a very large population of tourists that come to the city like every day. And people work like in Century City, and also, you know, go through Westwood Boulevard to get to UCLA. And they’re definitely interested in shopping and buying in Santa Monica. And it just takes forever to go home from Santa Monica to try to get on the 405 or 404 bus.

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

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

MR. JACOBERGER: Jeff Jacobberger. I’m a member of the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Advisory Committee, and I wanted to make a comment about bicycle connections. Thus far, Metro and the City of Los Angeles have done a very poor job of making sure that there’s good bike access to any Metro subway station and that certainly needs to be looked at and given a focus.

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

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

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

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.
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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. This report is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your comments about transit ridership have been noted. Transit ridership projections for the forecast year of 2035 were developed using the travel forecasting model developed by Metro and the Southern California Association of Governments, which followed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance and meets FTA's goals: to have the model tell a coherent story about travel behavior, reliably reproduce current travel patterns, and ensure a rational response to change. Metro's travel demand model is a resident model stratified by three income levels and includes the three standard trip purposes of Home-Based Work, Home-Based Other, and Non-Home Based, plus the additional trip purpose of Home-Based University. The model does not include tourism or special events. The modeling effort included FTA's participation throughout the process and a final review was held in September 2009 during which FTA concurred that the model was ready for application to this Project. The model was calibrated with 2001 and 2006 on-board survey data and then validated against transit ridership information to ensure it properly represents travel activity for the Los Angeles County and regional transportation system.

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

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

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

Please refer to Section 3.2.1 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information on ridership forecasting methodology. In addition, the Los Angeles Mode Choice Model: Calibration/Validation Report provide detailed information about the ridership model and the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives provides a summary of the updated results prepared for the Final EIS/EIR. The Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives is available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your 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.
going to work on the west side, going to Century City, going to Cedars-Sinai, and we want to make sure that those people have real alternatives. The current bus service is overcrowded, oftentimes it isn't sufficient to serve the population that is looking for work in the area. So we think that this is certainly warranted. You have funded other projects with much lower projected ridership, and we think that this is the time to include West Hollywood in the program.

We also, of course, support service on the west side generally. And support the efforts to move Metro westward. But we want to be included as part of the alternatives. We also want to be included as part of the environmental analysis so if there is funding in the future available for a West Hollywood spur, we would be ready to go. Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Bart Reed.

Where did Bart go? Oh, there he is. Bart Reed and then is there anyone else who wants to speak after Bart?

Please get your speaker card in.

MR. REED: Hi. Bart Reed, executive director of the Transit Coalition. We definitely support the alternative that takes you into the center of Century City Constellation Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors decided to continue to study both station location options in Century City (Santa Monica Boulevard and Constellation Boulevard) to address concerns raised by the community regarding locating a station directly on a seismic fault and the safety of tunneling under homes and schools.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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