

**Transcript from Santa Monica Public Hearing and Responses**

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

1 PUBLIC MEETING  
 2 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
 3 CO-CHAIR: JODY LITVAK AND DAVID MIEGER  
 4

5 In the Matter of the: )  
 6 Westside Subway Extension )  
 7 Public Meeting )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

8  
 9

10  
 11  
 12

13 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
 14 Santa Monica, California  
 15 Wednesday, September 29, 2010  
 16

17  
 18  
 19

20  
 21  
 22 Reported by:  
 23 KIMBERLY ANTON  
 24 CSR No. 12881  
 25 Job No. :  
 B5721NCO

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

PUBLIC MEETING  
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
CO-CHAIR: JODY LITVAK AND DAVID MIEGER

In the Matter of the: )  
Westside Subway Extension )  
Public Meeting )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at  
601 Santa Monica Boulevard, Santa Monica,  
California, commencing at 6:15 p.m. on  
Wednesday, September 29, 2010, reported by  
KIMBERLY ANTON, CSR No. 12881, a Certified  
Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of  
California.

1	I N D E X	
2	PRESENTERS :	PAGE
3	MS. LITVAK	5
4		31
5	MR. MIEGER	14
6	PUBLIC COMMENTS :	
7	BARBARA LOTT-HOLLAND	36
8	PHILIP OBAZA	37
9	MONROE JONES	38
10	IAN CROSSFIELD	39
11	JOEL COVARRUBIAS	40
12	PETER DREMBELAS	42
13	ERIC ROMANN	43
14	JOANA GASPAR	44
15	ROSA MIRANDA	45
16	ESPERANZA MARTINEZ	47
17	MICHELLE LOPEZ	48
18	JAMES MC CORMICK	49
19	KEDAR IYER	51
20	ELAN GLASSER	53
21	LUCY DYKE	53
22	JOEL EPSTEIN	55
23	LAUREN COLE	56
24	IRWIN CHEN	58
25	JOHN TRAUTMANN	59

1	I N D E X (Continued)	
2	PUBLIC COMMENTS:	PAGE
3	JAYSON WARSUMA	60
4	ED MOFRAD	62
5	MICHAEL CLARK	63
6	GLENN BAILEY	65
7	JUAN MATUTE	66
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 Santa Monica, California, Wednesday, September 29, 2010

2 6:15 p.m.

3

4

5 MS. LITVAK: All right. Good evening, everyone. We're  
6 going to get started. My name is Jody Litvak. I'm with  
7 Metro, and I want to welcome you to our fifth and last  
8 public hearing for the Westside Subway Extension.

9 Before we get into talking about everything  
10 tonight, I want to let you know that we have simultaneous  
11 Spanish translation available for you tonight, and you just  
12 need to raise your hand and let us know that you need that,  
13 and we'll take care of you and we're going to repeat that  
14 message for you in Spanish right now.

15 (Spanish translation)

16 MS. LITVAK: Great. Thank you.

17 Now, because this is a public hearing, as opposed  
18 to our community meetings, we have to start off with a very  
19 formal statement, and so that's what I'm going to do. Oh,  
20 wait a minute.

21 Okay. The Westside Subway Extension Transit  
22 Corridor Extended Draft Environmental Impact Statement and  
23 Environmental Impact Report was released on September 3rd,  
24 2010, along with the notice of intent to hold the public  
25 hearings in compliance with the National Environmental

1 Policy Act, NEPA, and the California Environmental Quality  
2 Act, CEQA. The Federal Transit Administration, FTA, is the  
3 lead agency for the purposes of NEPA, and the Los Angeles  
4 County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Metro, is the  
5 lead agency for the purposes of CEQA. Both agencies  
6 prepared the draft EIS/EIR.

7 The notice of availability and intent to hold  
8 public hearings was published in the Federal Register,  
State  
9 of California Clearinghouse, Los Angeles Times, La Opinion,  
County  
10 Ni Tai Sun (phonetic), and filed with the Los Angeles  
11 Clerk. The notices were published on September 3rd, 2010.

12 Copies of the draft EIS/EIR are available for  
13 public review at the Beverly Hills Public Library,  
14 Donald Bruce Kaufman Brentwood Library, Fairfax Library,  
15 Felipe De Neve Library, Francis H.G. Hollywood Regional  
16 Library, John C. Fremont Library, Memorial Library, Metro's  
17 Transportation Library, Pio Pico Koreatown Library,  
18 Robertson Branch Library, Santa Monica Main Library,  
19 West Hollywood Public Library, West Los Angeles Regional  
20 Library, Westwood Library, Wilshire Library, and in the  
21 back, in the anteroom back there, for the duration of the  
22 time we're here this evening.

23 In addition, electronic copies of the documents,  
24 also known as CDs, were distributed by mail to 232  
agencies,  
25 listed owners of properties identified in the document,

1 local elected officials, and additional interested  
2 stakeholders.

3 In addition, display ads about the public hearing  
4 were published in the Beverly Hills Courier, Beverly Hills  
5 Weekly, Jewish Journal, Korea Times, Larchmont Chronicle,  
6 Park La Brea Beverly Press, Santa Monica Daily Press, and  
7 online at dailybruin.com and wehonest.com.

8 Copies of the press release about the release of  
9 the draft EIS/EIR were sent to a distribution list of over  
10 120 media organizations. The draft EIS/EIR and information  
11 about the hearings was posted on Metro's website.

12 Information about the release of the draft EIS/EIR  
13 and the hearings was also printed in brochure form and was  
14 distributed widely on Metro buses and trains, as well as  
15 hand-delivered at key locations in the study area.

16 Brochures were also sent by U.S. mail to a list of  
17 nearly 1,000 contacts in the project study area, and the  
18 same information was also sent electronically to a  
19 distribution list of 1,790. All of these materials  
included  
20 information about how to find the draft EIS/EIR as well as  
21 more information about the Westside Subway Extension  
Transit  
22 Corridor Study on the Web. Affidavits of publication and  
23 copies of detailed mailing lists are available upon  
request.

24 Thank you.

25 Okay. This -- as I mentioned, this is a public

you  
visually,

1 hearing -- hold on. Christian? Where's Christian? Can  
2 try and get this -- the image a little bit sharper  
3 maybe? We're going to try. I think it's pretty good. I  
4 just want to see if we can sharpen it up a little bit. Oh,  
5 otherwise it chops off the top. Okay. This is it. So can  
6 everybody see this okay? Okay. And can you hear me okay?  
7 Okay.

8 And this presentation is posted online, so you can  
9 go look at this at metro.net/westside all lowercase,  
please.

10 Okay. As I said, this is a public hearing. It is  
11 somewhat more structured and formal than when we do our  
12 public meetings. And, really, the first purpose of  
13 tonight's public hearing is to give you a brief summary of  
14 what is in those giant documents that we have out there in  
15 the back of the room, and it is a really brief summary.

16 There is no way, tonight, we can go through  
17 everything that's in there, nor go through the whole  
history  
18 of how we got to this point. So I really invite you to  
take  
19 a look at the documents.

20 I invite -- we also have available -- we have it  
21 available for you in this disk format tonight, and I invite  
22 you to start with the executive summary, which is a very  
23 brief overview, but it does touch on all of the points, and  
24 then if there's anything in there that is of particular  
25 interest to you or strikes you as interesting, you can then

1 delve into the document itself. There are -- there's the  
2 main document and all its chapters and appendices, and then  
3 online, there's a bunch of technical reports.

4 In addition, and I'll talk for -- actually, you  
5 know what? I'm going to move on. In addition to the brief  
6 overview of the draft EIS/EIR, we want to describe the  
7 decisions that are required to select the locally preferred  
8 alternative, the summary of the next steps, what's going to  
9 happen leading up to Metro Board action, and after the  
Board  
10 makes a decision, of course depending on what decision they  
11 make.

12 But mostly we're here tonight to listen to your  
13 public comments. They will become part of the official  
14 record. We cannot respond to your questions or comments  
15 tonight. I know we were able to talk to you beforehand  
16 informally outside, and we're glad to do that after, but,  
17 really, any of the responses to your comments or questions  
18 will be developed during the final EIS/EIR, and will be  
19 provided when that becomes available.

20 There's a number of things we'd especially like to  
21 hear from you tonight, although you're welcome to comment  
on  
22 anything. Do you have any comments on the impacts or the  
23 mitigation measures that are discussed in the draft  
EIS/EIR?  
24 Are there any additional questions you have? Is there more  
25 information you need that you would like us to look into

about 1 during the final EIS/EIR and give you more information  
2 it?

3 In selecting the locally preferred alternative,  
do 4 which I'll talk about in just a moment, we call that LPA,  
5 you have comments on the choice of the alternative? We  
have 6 various station options and alignment options that we're  
7 going to speak about. Any other things. Do you have  
8 suggestions above and beyond the locally preferred  
9 alternative?

10 And, remember, all of the comments must be  
received 11 by October 18th and information -- I had a comment -- is  
12 over here. I know it's probably hard for you to see it  
13 while I'm standing here, but it is up here, and it's  
14 available for you to look at. It's also in the handout  
15 material and online.

16 And just a note, and I should have said this  
17 earlier, if you want to comment tonight, I think you were  
18 all handed these forms when you came in. Please fill them  
19 out. I need -- I need someone from the team in here.  
20 People are holding up forms. Katherine? Somebody from the  
21 team. We'll pick them up.

22 We'll bring you a blank one. If you need one,  
just 23 raise your hand, we'll bring you a blank form, and if you  
24 need -- and if you filled it out, just wave it about, and  
25 we'll come get it from you.

1           In addition, you were handed these forms tonight.  
2    You can use them to turn in written comments. You can do  
3    that tonight. Please write legibly. If you took the time  
4    to write your comments down, we really want to understand  
5    them the way you meant them.

6           On the bottom is also the different ways you can  
7    submit them to us. You certainly -- you can write them to  
8    us in any format you want. So if you take this with you  
9    tonight and you think of something brilliant you forgot to  
10   say, go ahead and send us your comments, just get them to  
11   by the 18th.

us

12           So we've been out there a while doing a lot of  
13   work. We've been about a year-and-a-half in the draft  
14   EIS/EIR. A lot of information and material has been  
15   developed and has been shared with the public, and I'll  
16   about that in just a bit, and we're getting up to another  
17   one of those yellow diamonds you see on the chart here,  
18   which is a Board decision point.

talk

19           Prior to the current draft EIS/EIR in 2007 and -8,  
20   we did the Alternatives Analysis. So there's a lot of work  
21   that's gone on, and, as I said, there's no way tonight we  
22   can summarize all of this for you, but we're not done. As  
23   we move forward into the final EIS/EIR, there will be much  
24   more analysis that will take place about whatever the  
25   locally preferred alternative is that the Board selects and

1 how they direct us to move forward.

2 So we've had a lot of public involvement to date  
3 and covered a lot of things. We had 1,200 people  
4 participate in '07 and '08 during the Alternatives

Analysis.

5 All of the material from the Alternatives Analysis is  
6 available online. I invite you to take a look at that.

7 And in early 2009, when we started the draft  
8 EIS/EIR, we had a series of meetings out in the community.  
9 If you're really interested, for instance, in understanding  
10 how subways are constructed, the tunnels and stations and  
11 what some of the issues and impacts are, I invite you to  
12 take a look at our presentation from a year ago summer.

13 We were out last fall talking about the various  
14 stations and gathering public input. Those were meetings  
15 where we focused on the particular stations in the area  
16 where we were and people stood around tables, and that  
17 information is available to you.

18 This spring and summer, we were out with  
19 information about how the various alternatives were  
20 performing. Again, that information is online.

21 Although we have -- these fact sheets all have the  
22 same picture on the cover, but if you read in the purple  
23 bar, it will tell you what it's about. Some of that's  
24 summarized in the facts sheet that says, "Performance of  
25 Alternatives Under Study."

1           We've also had some very focused meetings.  
2           Crenshaw Station, tunnelling and alignments, we also have a  
3           fact sheet on tunnelling. I invite you to take a look at a  
4           new one and, again, wide participation.

5           Throughout this whole effort, we have developed an  
6           ever-growing list of frequently asked questions, and I  
7           invite you to take a look at that as well.

8           Hold on one moment.

9           (Pause in the proceedings)

10          MS. LITVAK: Okay. So anyway, so there are seven  
11          alternatives under study. One is what's called, "No-  
Build."  
12          That's sort of the baseline, which is, what do we do if we  
13          don't build anything? What does growth and travel and  
14          traffic look like? And that gets compared, and we compare  
15          to that.

16          Then, as the transportation systems management,  
17          that is, if we don't build rail, what is the most robust,  
18          most effective set of improvements we can make to the roads  
19          and the buses and the highways.

20          And then there's our five rail alternatives that  
21          we've looked at. There are two that are within the funding  
22          umbrella for what we have available that go out, basically,  
23          from Western along Wilshire through the Miracle Mile area  
24          and into Beverly Hills and Century City and out to  
Westwood.

25          The first one ends at Westwood/UCLA, and the  
second

two  
1 one goes just a tad further to the V.A. Hospital, and then  
2 we have three others that go -- that are beyond the funding  
3 scenario, extending all the way to Santa Monica and then  
4 versions that include the West Hollywood extension.

you,  
5 We have now put those available on a slide for  
6 and they're also available in this general information fact  
7 sheet that you were handed.

8 Based on the -- okay. Basically, two years ago  
9 there was no money to do any of this. With the passage of  
10 Measure R, there's money allocated over 30 years or so to a  
11 series of projects and programs and -- all over the county.  
12 There's about -- there's \$4.2 billion for this  
13 project to be built in three phases out to Westwood in  
2036.

can  
14 We're working very hard to try and accelerate that so we  
15 get everything done in ten years, which would put us in  
16 Westwood by the end of the decade, and we would build it in  
17 one phase rather than three phases.

18 I'm going to turn it over to David now, and then  
19 I'll be back up to talk to you about it more.

20 MR. MIEGER: Okay. Well, thanks very much for coming  
21 tonight. We're out in Santa Monica. This is our fifth of  
22 five public hearings. I see some familiar faces, but I'm  
23 just going to give you a really high-level overview of the  
24 environmental document, and -- and, basically, to tell you  
25 that there's a couple of things we're trying to do with  
that

1 document.

County

2 It's a joint document between Metro and L.A.

3 MTA and the Federal Transit Administration, who is our  
4 federal lead agency for this. And the reason for that  
5 partnership is that we have a half-cent sales tax that was  
6 approved here in Los Angeles County that's applied to our  
7 transit system for bus, rail, and highways.

8 We have a component of that to fund the transit  
9 projects for the subway, but we also are going for matching  
10 funds from the federal government, who is our partner  
11 agency, in funding this project.

12 So the EIS has to conform with the federal  
13 environmental laws as well as the California environmental  
14 laws. So when you read the document, you might see two  
15 different sets of standards in there, and that's because we  
16 have to accommodate both of those requirements.

we

17 But the purpose of the environmental -- a lot of  
18 you may read environmental documents for all kinds of  
19 different projects, but the first bullet up there is that  
20 have to evaluate how they perform in terms of how well they  
21 provide transit benefits, because part of this is, we're  
22 competing with all the other cities around the country that  
23 also want to build these same types of projects, and the  
24 competition for subway money, for light rail, for bus rapid  
25 transit is very competitive around the country, and we have

1 to show that our projects are as good or better than other  
2 projects in other cities that are also competing for those  
3 funds.

4 So there's a number of criteria in there, when you  
5 see cost-effectiveness, or travel/time savings, some of  
6 these measures, those are the measures we need to show that  
7 this is a worthwhile project that should be funded with  
8 federal money.

9 We also, in terms of the environmental impacts,  
10 have to identify the impacts, and these are both adverse  
and  
11 beneficial. I'll talk a little bit about those in a  
minute.

12 And in the subway project, they're the temporary impacts  
13 that happen when you're building the project, and then the  
14 long-term impacts when it's actually in operation.

15 We talk about the locations. Here in Santa  
Monica,  
16 this is an alternative that shows up on not all five of the  
17 alternatives. Two of them stop at Westwood, and three of  
18 them come all the way out here to Santa Monica.

19 So there's identifications of issues relating to  
20 the four stations that are -- would be located here in --  
21 three in Santa Monica and one at Bundy in West Los Angeles,  
22 and then it identifies mitigation measures.

23 And this is very important, too, because if  
there's  
24 an impact, we have to have a mitigation measure, and those  
25 mitigation measures have to be paid for as a part of the

1 project. So it's very, very important, if there's a  
2 mitigation measure, that we find the funding to pay for it  
3 as part of the project, and that's part of the outreach  
4 process, is to identify whether those impacts are being  
5 mitigated.

6 Just to talk a little bit, the document's pretty  
7 big when you look at the Table of Contents, and one of the  
8 suggestions we have is that, rather than start with a big,  
9 fat document or the CD or online, is look at the Executive  
10 Summary.

11 That first chapter, it summarizes the entire  
12 document. If you read through that, it's about 20 pages  
13 with some tables at the end, that gives you a pretty good  
14 idea of what's in the whole document, and then if you see  
15 particular areas that you have interest in, then go read  
the  
16 actual chapter in the EIS, either online or in the document  
17 or on the CD, and that it will save you having to go  
through  
18 a lot of information you may not be interested in, if you  
19 start with the Executive Summary.

20 But these are all the categories that we're  
21 required to look at. I'm going to talk just a little bit  
22 about a few of them, in the interest of time.

23 In terms of the construction impacts, the main  
24 difference between a subway and a light rail or a bus rapid  
25 transit is the subway is completely underground and, as a

1 result of that, most of your impacts are building it.  
2 That's the time when you have to dig the -- the street up  
3 and the areas where the stations are, build the subway  
4 station.

5           When the tunnels are going underground, we have a  
6 lot of construction equipment. A lot of  
7 construction-related impacts that we need to evaluate and  
8 mitigate, hours of construction, types of equipment, haul  
9 routes, all of those types of things that have to do with  
10 construction.

11           But then when the project is finished, the subway  
12 is -- all you see from the surface is just the entrances,  
13 just the escalators and elevators where you go in and out  
of  
14 the subway.

15           Other than that, the street and the aboveground  
16 looks exactly the way it did before it was built. So  
17 there's many, many fewer impacts in the long term, there's  
18 more in the short term.

19           If you're building a light rail or a bus rapid  
20 transit project, you have ongoing impacts of traffic,  
21 congestion trying to cross streets, things like that that  
22 continue that wouldn't with the subway, but constructing a  
23 BRT or an LRT is an easier project, has fewer construction  
24 impacts. So that's a summary of the construction.

25           This is just a typical cross-section of the  
typical

about  
Westwood,

1 depths of the tunnels that we have. They are normally  
2 50 to 70 feet below the surface. In some areas in  
3 Beverly Hills, they get down to 100 or 130 feet deep.

they're

4 They're not at all like the tunnels that you might  
5 see in New York, where they were built 80 to 100 years ago  
6 and you were -- just excavated from the surface, and  
7 just below the city street. These are deep-bore tunnels  
8 that go very, very deep, and they're generally down below  
9 all the utilities and other things that happen in the first  
10 10 to 20 feet below the surface. At the station areas,  
11 though, they do come closer to the top.

12 Just in terms of long-term impacts, the major  
13 issues that people have, I'll just highlight.  
14 Displacements, we normally don't take property for the  
15 tunnels, because they do go under, but we do have to take  
16 easements when we go under properties.

17 Even -- no matter how deep it is, we still have  
18 to -- if there's a property above it, we have to buy an  
19 easement from those properties in the cases where we go off  
20 street or we're not under the city streets.

enough

21 In the station areas, we have to have a place for  
22 the entrance, and those usually aren't -- there's not  
23 room on the sidewalk, so we have to work with property  
24 owners in adjacent properties to find the location for that  
25 entrance to the subway.

a

1           And for those of you who have been into downtown  
2 Los Angeles and visited, you'll see examples of this where  
3 the subway entrance is built into the existing building or  
4 new building. Up on Hollywood Boulevard where the  
5 Kodak Theatre is on Hollywood and Highland, we actually put  
6 the entrance into an existing building. So it's part of  
7 that building and not a separate structure.

8           The things we can do and things we're looking for  
9 suggestions on, during the design phase, there's a lot of  
10 things we can do during the design that could help the  
11 project.

12           One of the most important is, we're using the  
13 latest structural and geological and seismic standards for  
14 this. We've just -- the last two subway projects we've  
15 built in North Hollywood, and recently we finished the  
16 Eastside Light Rail Project, which has a two-mile subway.

17           By using the more modern techniques or the more  
18 modern standards, we've had no settlement at all in the  
19 Eastside project, and that was able to be built on time, on  
20 budget, without the types of concerns that people had when  
21 these subways were being built 20 to 30 years ago. So  
22 they're much safer, we're using those new standards.

23           The tunnel depths. People are concerned, "Are we  
24 going to hear it? Is it going to be noisy? I've been to  
25 New York. I've felt that vibration from the subways."

1 Again, we're very deep. The soil here is very porous and  
2 soft. It absorbs it like a sponge. But in some cases  
where  
3 the tracks get closer to the surface and there might be  
some  
4 vibration, we put dampeners on the track, and there's  
5 mitigation measures to put dampeners in to soften that to  
6 make sure that there is no vibration on the surface.

7 We use these new pressure-balance tunnel-boring  
8 machines, which actually -- you don't create any loss of  
9 ground. You basically -- when you dig the tunnel, you  
10 replace it with wedges to reinforce the earth so that there  
11 won't be settlement.

12 We're trying to use all of the latest techniques  
13 and technologies that are used in these tunnels throughout  
14 the world for all of the other cities that are building  
15 these types of subway systems.

16 Utility relocation plans. Again, we have a lot of  
17 stuff under the street out here. We need to map all of  
18 those, identify them, and work with all of the providers to  
19 make sure that we keep all of the utilities going. And  
then  
20 once we're open, we have a lot of different safety devices  
21 in the tunnels that we want to put in.

22 Adverse impacts, I want to say there's also the  
23 beneficial impacts, and one of the main reasons why the  
24 voters of L.A. County voted, by over two-thirds, to fund  
25 this project and others is because of the types of  
benefits.

1 If you're going from Pershing Square to UCLA today, either  
2 driving or by our rapid bus, that's about a 54-minute trip.  
3 And because of the traffic we have on Wilshire and Santa  
4 Monica Boulevards, it's very slow driving, whether you're  
in  
5 a car or bus.

6 We're trying to improve that. We have a Wilshire  
7 BRT project where we're trying to get bus signal priority  
8 for the buses. We're trying to put in bus lanes. We're  
9 trying to do things to speed up the buses, but all that  
10 we're doing, we still have 150 intersections to get through  
11 between downtown Los Angeles and Santa Monica, with lights  
12 and stopping and going and stopping and going.

13 And so that trip is 54 minutes by the bus. It's  
14 about 24 minutes by the subway. So it's about a 30-minute  
15 time savings over that trip, and we can carry a lot more  
16 people to help get some folks off the surface who would be  
17 sitting there in that traffic.

18 So the benefits are that we can really speed up  
the  
19 trip on public transportation and, basically, take the  
buses  
20 that are serving that same trip and redeploy them to  
provide  
21 feeder service to the subway and provide better service to  
22 the connecting routes that would feed into the subway.

23 Little bit about some choices that we have to make  
24 when we build this. There's a few choices in the EIS.  
25 Basically, we have to pick one of those five alternatives.

1 There's five that Jody mentioned on the maps. We have to  
2 make a recommendation in October to our Board about which  
3 one of those five should go forward.

4 As she mentioned, the funding is limited. We  
can't  
5 afford to build the projects that come all the way to  
6 Santa Monica and include all of West Hollywood, about 17  
7 miles of subway. We can afford to build about 8 or 9  
miles.

8 And so the only two alternatives that are fundable  
9 now are the ones that go to either Westwood/UCLA or to the  
10 V.A. Hospital, which are Alternatives 1 or 2, but we have  
to  
11 make that recommendation.

12 We also have to say what happens to the other  
13 alignments, and we have a strategic element of our  
14 long-range plan, which are projects that we can't afford to  
15 build today, but are worthy projects that, if new funding  
16 becomes available, we would look to fund, and so we have to  
17 talk about what happens to those alternatives.

18 How far west should it go? The two choices we  
have  
19 right now are to stop right at Wilshire, Westwood Boulevard  
20 in Westwood Village, or to come a half-mile further west to  
21 the Veterans Administration Hospital in the V.A. campus.

22 There's a lot of benefits if we can go one more  
23 station west, particularly for those of you who live out  
24 here on the far Westside. Getting across the 405 freeway,  
25 it's a real barrier to traffic, because not all the streets

would  
to

1 go through. And so a lot of people in our scoping meetings  
2 said, "Look, if you -- rather than just stopping at  
3 Westwood Village, if you can go one more station, that  
4 really help us out. If we don't get the line all the way  
5 Santa Monica, at least we can take a bus or get to the V.A.  
6 and get on there before a lot of the traffic backup that we  
7 have." So the question is, you know, which one -- where  
8 would that station be?

9           There's a question about the Wilshire/Crenshaw  
10 station. This station has some supporters and some  
11 opponents. It's only about a half a mile from our Western  
12 station, Wilshire/Western. We normally like to have the  
13 stations about a mile apart, and Crenshaw, also, is not a  
14 through street north/south. It dead-ends at Wilshire.

15           So there -- the Crenshaw Light Rail Project from  
16 the south is looking for where it would connect at  
17 Wilshire,  
18 and should it connect at Crenshaw or La Brea or La Cienega  
19 or San Vicente.

20           And they've basically determined that Crenshaw,  
21 because it doesn't go through to the north, that they would  
22 rather see the Crenshaw line connect in farther west. So  
23 the question is, "Should we still build the Crenshaw  
24 station  
25 in a relatively low-density area or should we not?"

26           I'm sorry. Okay. Move it along. Move it along.  
27 Multiple station locations. I'll flip through. There's

1 five locations where we have alternate locations. Fairfax  
2 near the County Art Museum, La Cienega in Century City, at  
3 Wilshire/UCLA and at Wilshire/V.A. and alignments between  
4 those. So I'll skip through that.

5 Just 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. This is 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, when I  
6 talked about competing for federal funds, the barrier for  
7 cost-effectiveness is basically the cost per hour of travel  
8 time savings. It's kind of a complex formula, but it  
9 basically says, when you build a project, the cost to build  
10 it and operate it, what's the benefit in terms of improved  
11 travel speed for the people using the transit system?

12 And then the equation comes out, if you can get  
13 below about \$30 per hour of travel time savings, then you  
14 have a project that's a worthy investment, it's providing a  
15 benefit that's worthy of taxpayer funding.

16 Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 are just right about at  
17 the bar, and we're working to see if we can get it just  
18 below that bar and qualify them. The ones that go up to  
19 West Hollywood are a little bit higher, not quite as  
20 competitive under that criteria. So we have to look for  
21 ways to either improve the ridership or reduce the cost to  
22 make those meet that standard.

23 This is, basically, Westwood. That's the  
24 V.A. Hospital. If we actually can -- I'll talk about this  
25 one -- because it's pretty close to Santa Monica -- a

little

1 bit more. If we stop at UCLA, we expect to have about  
2 46,000 boardings per day at each of those stations. If we  
3 go to the V.A. Hospital, we pick up about 6,000 more  
riders.

4 It goes up to about 53,000 per day. That's about an --  
5 8,000 boardings at the V.A. station, and a few -- about  
6 1,500 less at the Westwood.

7 It does two things. It actually gets a lot of  
8 people on the line farther west, and it relieves some of  
the  
9 boardings in Westwood Village, which is a very congested  
10 area and probably our highest ridership stations. So it  
11 provides some benefits if we can get there.

12 Crenshaw Station. Basically, just a summary.  
This  
13 is the cost. The daily boardings, it's about 42- to 4300,  
14 that's a relatively -- it's not really low, but it's at the  
15 low end of our range of ridership per station. So to spend  
16 that amount of money to get that ridership may not be  
17 cost-effective.

18 It's a low-density area that the Planning  
19 Department of the City of L.A. has said there's no forecast  
20 for growth in that area, that's it meant to stay as a  
fairly  
21 low-density residential area in the future, and the station  
22 spacing isn't optimal.

23 But there is a very, very good bus line at  
24 Crenshaw Boulevard, a lot of transfers at Wilshire and  
25 Crenshaw. So if there weren't a station there to transfer

1 to, you'd have to -- where would those station transfers be  
2 accommodated? Would the bus, at the Crenshaw one, go over  
3 to Western and transfer there, or would it transfer farther  
4 west at La Brea? So there are some plusses and minuses of  
5 having a Crenshaw station.

6 Multiple station locations. I think I'll talk,  
7 maybe, about the last two at -- at Westwood/UCLA and  
8 Westwood/V.A. At Westwood/UCLA, the station would either  
be  
9 under Wilshire Boulevard at Westwood, right at that major  
10 intersection under the street, or there's a UCLA property,  
a  
11 lot between Veteran and Gayley, which is a surface parking  
12 lot today right where the BruinGo Shuttle is and the L.A.  
13 FlyAway Bus, and we can pop the station off street.

14 The big advantage of putting it off street is the  
15 construction all happens outside of the city streets so  
that  
16 the traffic can continue to operate and all the  
construction  
17 is behind a construction wall.

18 If we build it in the street, we have to deck over  
19 the street and keep the traffic flowing while the building  
20 under that street creates many more construction impacts  
21 that we have to mitigate. So there's a lot of trade-offs  
22 between which station it's going to be.

23 UCLA's been working with us really cooperatively.  
24 They'd like to help us get it on their property. They want  
25 to keep the rights to develop that property at some point  
in

1 the future, so they would like to be able to build over the  
2 subway to help that happen. They also have their own bus  
3 system that takes people up to campus.

4 They're interested in bikes that could get people  
5 from the buses on Wilshire and from trains up to the campus  
6 and creating some sort of bike and bus shuttle system. So  
7 there's a lot of opportunities for -- depending on where we  
8 put the station.

9 At the V.A. Hospital, there's one station location  
10 on the parking lot in front of the V.A. Hospital on the  
11 south side of Wilshire, and another one, which would be on  
12 the north side next to the Wadsworth Theater, the chapel.

13 The Veterans Administration want a station that's  
14 going to serve the veterans. The main concern they have is  
15 that their veterans come from all over the region, these  
16 people who have served in wars that need to come in for  
17 medical care. It's very, very hard for them to get there  
18 today. It's a long trip by bus to get there. They're  
19 looking for a station that could get people quickly to the  
20 hospital, get their treatment.

21 They also are concerned that the station may be  
22 popular, and there may be a lot of people coming into the  
23 V.A. who aren't going to the V.A. and create congestion on  
24 their campus and make it harder for them to treat the  
25 veterans and people who need care there.

1                   So there's a lot of decisions about which station  
2 would be optimal and better from the point of view of the  
3 V.A. Hospital.

4                   I'll touch on these quickly. Depending on which  
5 station we have in Westwood, we have two different  
6 alignments, and getting from Westwood to Century City,  
7 that's the one area where we don't have a street to run  
8 under. We basically have to go cross country under homes  
9 and businesses between Santa Monica Boulevard and  
10 Wilshire Boulevard.

11                   We have three different alignments to get there,  
12 and so there's some trade-offs. The main one is how many  
13 properties do we go under, either homes or businesses.

14                   We have an earthquake fault that runs along  
15 Santa Monica Boulevard. It's the dividing line between  
16 little Santa Monica and big Santa Monica. We want to avoid  
17 that fault as much as possible and build in mitigations to  
18 make it a safe crossing when we do cross that fault.

19                   We have crossed earthquake faults before. The red  
20 line to North Hollywood crosses a fault just north of  
21 Hollywood Boulevard and we've -- that survived the  
22 Northridge earthquake very well and kept the line running.  
23 So we want to use that type of design.

24                   And so those are all the types of choices we have  
25 to make between these different alignments. So we're

1 looking for input between the three different alignments  
2 between Century City and Westwood, and we also have three  
3 alignments between Century City and Beverly Hills.

4 This is just a -- if you're in -- this is at  
5 Wilshire and Beverly, Wilshire/Rodeo Drive, and all along  
6 Wilshire Boulevard. This is the Century City station. We  
7 have one station that could be up on Santa Monica Boulevard  
8 and Avenue of the Stars, another down in the middle of  
9 Century City, in the middle of all the development.

10 You could either stay on Wilshire Boulevard and  
11 turn down Santa Monica and go to this station, or you could  
12 leave Wilshire Boulevard and go to the south and travel  
13 under some properties and get to the station more in the  
14 center of Century City.

15 Again, these are quite deep tunnels, but there's a  
16 lot of concern by folks that we might go under their  
17 properties, and so we heard a lot from folks in  
18 Beverly Hills about that the other night when we were  
there.

19 I think the last slide before I'm going to turn it  
20 back to Jody, this is Century City, this is Westwood  
21 Village, and these are the three alignments that we have  
22 that go under.

23 This one goes down to Westwood Boulevard and turns  
24 to come back to go west. The others are more direct routes  
25 that go directly across that area between Century City and

1 Westwood.

2           So that's just a high, high-level summary. We'll  
3 stick around afterwards if you have specific questions and  
4 invite you to look at the Executive Summary and read the  
5 chapters and submit your comments by the 18th, because  
we'll  
6 be back for another year after this. Once we make some of  
7 these alignment refinements, we'll be coming back to work  
8 out more specifics of these stations.

9           MS. LITVAK: Okay. So what happens next? We're going  
10 to hear from you in just a few moments, which is really why  
11 we're here.

12           I do want to take a moment. David said that this  
13 effort is a joint effort between Metro and the Federal  
14 Transit Administration. Ray Tellis, who runs our local FTA  
15 office, is here with us in the room tonight, and we welcome  
16 him and thank him very much for coming.

17           So as David said, we need to hear from you by  
18 October 18th for it to be included as a part of the  
official  
19 record in the draft EIS/EIR and to identify the issues you  
20 want us to look at in the final.

21           We will be developing our staff recommendations  
and  
22 summarizing the public comments. If you read the draft  
23 EIS/EIR right now, you -- the staff recommendation is not  
in  
24 there.

25           On October 28th, we will go to the Metro Board of

their  
Locally

1 Directors and ask them to consider this. This will be  
2 opportunity to do that. Our recommendations for the  
3 Preferred Alternative, we'll be asking them to adopt that.  
4 We will also be asking them to narrow the options for  
5 further analysis in the final EIS/EIR.

6 Some of these choices that have to be made along  
7 the way, it is possible that the Board will narrow those  
8 down to only one and ask us to continue to work on that in  
9 the final. In some cases, they may keep all the  
10 alternatives out there, or they may narrow it some. So  
11 we'll see what happens when we go to the Board in October.

final

12 We'll ask them to authorize us to go into the  
13 environmental review. Preliminary engineering will have  
14 continued outreach. We will go to the FTA and seek their  
15 approval to enter new starts preliminary engineering, and  
16 any additional recommendations we will ask them to  
consider.

the

17 During the final EIS/EIR, we will be completing  
18 environmental clearance process to get the project ready to  
19 go for construction. There will be significant continued  
20 public involvement.

provided

21 As I said, it is during this process that we  
22 will -- the final process that we will be developing the  
23 responses to the public comments, and those will be  
24 when the final EIS/EIR is published.

1 engineering will go on. We will get those cost estimates  
2 nailed down. A lot of the details about the station  
3 alignments and the station designs are -- will be worked  
4 out.

5 Preliminary engineering, obviously, figuring out  
6 the construction staging locations, and while the draft  
7 EIS/EIR has some preliminary identifications of mitigations  
8 that might be needed, it's really in the final EIS/EIR that  
9 we develop the mitigation program and commit to that in the  
10 final EIS/EIR.

11 So how to comment. You can talk tonight, but  
12 there's all of these other ways to comment, and -- I'm  
13 trying not to sneeze. It's not going to work. We'll see  
14 what happens.

15 This is all up here behind me, so I'm not going to  
16 talk about it right now other than to note two things. One  
17 is we've had a very active and robust involvement on the  
18 with social networking. We have over 1,700 people on  
19 Facebook. Please join us there, and we're tweeting  
20 tonight.

21 However, comments on Facebook or Twitter, which  
22 have been a part of the effort, we really can't include as  
23 part of the official record right now. So to get your  
24 comments on the record, take advantage of these other  
25 methods. And, again, that's on the board behind me, that  
will be here for you, and get your comments to us by

Facebook 1 October 18th. Please keep talking to each other on  
2 and to us. In fact, send us your comments anyway.  
3 Okay. We're done after tonight. We're all really  
going 4 tired, but thank you all for coming. So here's what's  
5 to happen. There's going to be two minutes per speaker,  
6 four if you need interpretation. If you didn't indicate on  
7 your form, when you come up, let us know.  
8 I'm going to call three names at a time. Please  
over 9 line up and be prepared. Do you all see the microphone  
10 here to my right, your left? That's where I'd like you to  
11 come. I'd like you to line up against that railing over  
12 there.  
13 Those of you in the front, if you're called,  
over 14 there's a middle aisle here, please walk around, and go  
15 there. Please state your name clearly. This lovely lady  
in 16 the front corner is our court reporter, and she is trying  
to 17 record everything you're saying for the transcript. So we  
18 want you to state your name clearly and speak clearly so we  
19 can accurately get your comments.  
20 We ask everyone to be respectful of all the  
21 speakers tonight. Are we going to turn the lights up,  
22 Christian? So whether you agree or disagree, we listen to  
23 everybody. Everybody has the right to express their  
24 opinions, and some of that public comment interaction

1           As I said, we're not responding to the comments  
2 tonight, and those comments will be addressed in writing in  
3 the final EIS/EIR.

I

4           Let me remind you, again, of what we really -- as  
5 said, you can comment on anything, but what we would really  
6 like to hear from you are your comments on the impacts for  
7 mitigation measures in the draft EIS/EIR, any additional  
8 questions you'd like us to answer during the final, more  
9 information you need, comments about the LPA, the  
10 alternative that's chosen, the station options, the  
11 alignment options, anything else about the LPA, or other  
12 suggestions beyond what's in the LPA.

to

13           And, again, you can speak tonight. You can get  
14 them to us any one of these other ways, and we'll be glad  
15 take your comments throughout, but please get them to us by  
16 October 18th if you want them on the record.

like

17           So -- okay. All right. So with that, I would  
18 to invite Barbara Lott-Holland. Okay. Philip, who told me  
19 how to pronounce his name, Obaza, and Monroe Jones to line  
20 up -- over here, Monroe. Please walk around -- to line up  
21 against the railing, and we'll take you one at a time, and  
22 you get two minutes each.

23           Barbara, please step right up. Get very close.  
24 Everyone get really close to the microphone. By the way,  
25 this is the countdown clock. Can you see the countdown

36

1 clock okay from over there?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

3 MS. LITVAK: Perfect. Okay. State your name, and then

4 we'll start counting down your two minutes. Go right

ahead.

5 MS. LOTT-HOLLAND: Okay. I am Barbara Lott-Holland,

6 co-chair of the Bus Riders Union. I am here today because

7 the MTA board is supporting the mayor's Subway to the Sea

8 Plan, which will continue to bankrupt the Agency.

9 Rail, as a mode of public transportation, is not

10 suited for the transit needs of people in Los Angeles.

11 Evidence of the past projects have shown that rail has not

12 significantly reduced the amount of cars on the streets and

13 the highways, and it will consume more money -- more money

14 than a first-class bus system.

15 This is not New York or any of the other eastern

16 cities. L.A. is spread out, both in population and

economic

17 activity, and as such, it generates the complex pattern of

18 transportation that needs -- that needs -- calls for a

major

19 investment in the capital operations of a bus transit

system

20 to reduce the funds for the construction of new rail.

21 We support either the No-Build or the TSM

22 significant expansion of bus service. Thank you.

23 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Philip Obaza,

24 followed by Monroe Jones, and then Ian Crossfield. And by

25 the way, if I mispronounce or butcher your name, I do

**302-1**

Your preference for the No Build of the TSM Alternative 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). Alternative 2 was selected as the LPA because the analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated that the Build Alternatives would be more effective than the TSM Alternative in terms of enhancing mobility, serving development opportunities, and addressing other aspects of the Purpose and Need for the Project. Please refer to Chapter 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for information on this analysis.

Furthermore, the Project would not eliminate bus service along Wilshire Boulevard but rather would supplement it with rail. As explained in Chapter 2, Metro Local, Limited, Rapid, and Express bus service along Wilshire Boulevard will continue to operate in conjunction with the rail system, if approved and implemented. The Wilshire Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit project is also assumed to be in place. Maintenance of local bus service levels is an important component of the transit system serving the Westside Corridor. With the extension the Purple Line subway service to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station, it is estimated that one-third of demand would involve local bus access. Metro continues to seek to improve the region's transit needs and continually evaluates various transit corridors to achieve a more interconnected transportation system. To help guide design of subway stations, potential enhanced local bus service at stations was assessed and is discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS/EIR.

The Project will be funded primarily through a combination of Measure R local funds and Federal New Starts funds, with some other local, State, and Federal funds. Metro will continue to use a combination of local, State, and Federal funding sources to operate and maintain the system. In addition to these funding sources, Metro relies on fare revenues to fund about one-third of its operating costs. Bus operating funds will not be used to construct the Project, and no fare increases or service reductions are proposed to cover the Project's costs. The selection of the TSM Alternative would not have resulted in lower fares. The Metro Board of Directors establishes fares. Currently, the Base Fare for each boarding is \$1.50 and the Metro Day Pass is \$5.00. A transfer is the same as the Base Fare - \$1.50.

Furthermore, the Westside Subway Extension Project will increase transit options and improve mobility for residents across Los Angeles County, including low-income and minority residents who are transit-dependent. Transit service is meant to serve where the demand is greatest, and these areas are often within neighborhoods that have Environmental Justice (EJ) populations and communities of concern. Four of the seven stations are located in, or adjacent to the Environmental Justice populations identified in Section 4.2.6 of the Final EIS/EIR. Therefore, people living in EJ populations will have the same opportunity to access the transit and mobility improvements provided by the subway.

**302-1**

The increased connectivity would also reduce the number of transfers which would have a beneficial economic impact to elderly and low-income communities. The Project would also allow easier access to major employment centers. Transit user benefits associated with the LPA are anticipated both along the Project corridor as well as across the region. The transit benefits associated with the LPA are further detailed in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

37

1 apologize, but that's why we ask you to start by getting  
 2 really close to the microphone and stating it clearly.  
 3 Go ahead.

4 MR. OBAZA: My name is Philip Obaza. I've been a  
 5 transit rider for about three years now. I do not own a

car

303-1

6 in Los Angeles. I'm in full support of the Westside Subway  
 7 Extension. I can't wait for it, like many other people  
 8 I've spoken to.

whom

303-2

9 Major points that I wanted to make, I support the  
 10 station location in Century City at Constellation and  
 11 of the Stars, aside from the higher ridership and the fact  
 12 that it's not located along a fault line. I've heard a lot  
 13 of people talking about noise complaints, vibration, the  
 14 tunnelling, trains running, is that going to be a problem?  
 15 The red line runs under all kinds of public and  
 16 private property. I've never heard a complaint about  
 17 vibration or noise from trains from anyone that I know of.  
 18 So I'm really hoping that that becomes the final station  
 19 location.

Avenue

303-3

20 The only other point I think I'd really like to  
 21 comment on is the Wilshire/Crenshaw station. If -- I think  
 22 if we had unlimited amounts of funding, I think it would be  
 23 awesome to have a Wilshire/Crenshaw station, but with  
 24 limited funds, I think it would probably be a really good  
 25 idea if that station was left out of the project and that

**303-1**

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

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

**303-2**

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

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

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

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

**303-2**

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.

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

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

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

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

- VIB-1—High compliance direct-fixation resilient rail fasteners will be incorporated into the design of the trackwork at the Wilshire Ebell Theatre and the Saban Theatre, which will reduce ground-borne noise by 5 to 7 dBA.

1 extra money that would be spent towards that station be  
2 spent elsewhere. Thank you very much.

### **303-2**

- VIB-2—A low impact crossover such as a moveable point frog or a spring-loaded frog will be used in the design of the Wilshire/La Brea No. 10 double crossover for the apartments, which will reduce ground-borne noise by 5 to 6 dBA.

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

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

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

### **303-3**

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

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

**303-3**

Cost savings achieved by not including this station in the LPA are insufficient to pay for a further westward extension of the subway to Santa Monica. Deleting the Crenshaw Station reduced the overall project costs by approximately \$153 million. However, the construction of Alternative 3 would have cost an estimated \$1.8 billion more than Alternative 2.

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

38

3 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

4 All right. Monroe Jones followed by Ian

Crossfield

5 and then Joel Covarrubias.

6 MR. JONES: Good evening, Metro staff and bus riders.

7 My name is Monroe Jones, and I'm a Metro transit rider.

I'm

8 also an Access transit rider.

9 I think we should have a station at Wilshire and

10 Crenshaw, because there's a lot of people who have a lot of

11 disability and who are disabled, like myself. People

should

12 have a special location for -- for pickup at Wilshire and

13 Crenshaw, because there's a lot of people who are in

14 wheelchairs who are four times more disabled than myself,

15 and people shouldn't have to have to wait for 30 minutes

16 just for a bus or a train to show up.

17 And, also, the Locally Preferred Alternative at

304-1

18 Constellation and Avenue of the Stars should be -- should

be

19 taking place, and everybody should understand that every

20 time that there -- someone is waiting for a bus or a train

21 for 30 minutes, they tend to complain and get back in their

22 car and drive around to find another bus station or a bus

23 stop or anything.

24 So I think that what's going to happen is that if

a

25 station stop at Wilshire and Crenshaw takes place, then

**304-1**

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

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

Stations and station entrances would comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), the California Building Code, and the Department of Transportation Subpart C of Section 49 CFR Part 37.

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](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

**304-2**

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

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

**304-2**

location in the Draft EIS/EIR to avoid the Santa Monica Fault zone.

39

1 people wouldn't have to complain, and there will be less  
2 complaints. Thank you.

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](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

39

3 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

4 Ian Crossfield followed by Joel Covarrubias and  
5 then Peter Drembelas or Drembelas. Something like that.  
6 You'll say it when you come up.

7 All right. Ian, go right ahead. And that's Joel  
8 walking up there, and, Peter, if you could line up here,  
9 that would be great. Go ahead.

10 MR. CROSSFIELD: I'm Ian Crossfield. I'm a Santa  
Monica  
11 resident. I biked over here from Westwood to get to this  
305-1 | 12 meeting. I managed to stay ahead of the 720 Rapid Bus the  
13 whole time. So I don't know how much more speed  
improvement  
14 room there is for traditional bus service on that line.

15 Four main points. First, I would not support a  
305-2 | 16 station at the V.A. I think that there's -- this is not a  
17 very built-up area. Maybe a better idea would be to hold  
18 off on that station for now. Think about a station at  
19 Federal, maybe with portals toward the V.A. and toward the  
20 busier Barrington District.

21 Second, a Westwood station I support directly  
305-3 | under  
22 Wilshire, not off street, in the UCLA parking lot, just  
23 because that's a more central location, more convenient for  
24 the busier, more built-up area.

25 Similarly, for Century City, I support a station  
at

**305-1**

Your comment has been noted.

**305-2**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**305-2**

On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative, which includes a Westwood/VA Hospital Station. Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan, and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively. As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board decided to continue to study both Westwood/VA Hospital station location options (South and North).

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

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

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

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](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

**305-3**

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

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Section 8.8.6 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Westwood/UCLA Station. Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The *Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report* provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Westwood/UCLA Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the *Westside Subway Extension Westwood/UCLA Station and the Westwood/VA Hospital Station Locations Report* for a comparison of the two

**305-3**

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](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

40

305-4 | 1 Constellation, not under Santa Monica Boulevard, because  
 2 that's more centrally located in the Century City business  
 3 district.

305-5 | 4 Finally, I recommend no subway under  
 5 Santa Monica Boulevard up through West Hollywood. Instead,  
 6 maybe something to consider in future strategic planning  
 7 would be extending the under -- under-study Crenshaw line,  
 8 up San Vicente from its terminus at the line and maybe  
 9 eventually linking up through West Hollywood. Thank you.

**305-4**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**305-4**

*Fault Investigation Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report*. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study*. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: [www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

**305-5**

Your comment on future studies of the West Hollywood corridor have been noted. 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.

These further studies could include a northward extension of the Crenshaw/LAX Line as indicated in your comment. In November 2009, the Metro Board voted to approve the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor. The Crenshaw/LAX LPA includes an 8.5-mile light-rail line that would connect the Metro Green Line and the Expo Line along Crenshaw Boulevard. The Crenshaw/LAX LPA would not connect the line to Wilshire Boulevard.

A potential connection to Wilshire Boulevard was studied in a May 2009 Metro feasibility report. Although beyond the available project funding, this report determined that a connection at Wilshire/La Brea instead of Wilshire/Crenshaw would be more cost-effective and more compatible with existing land uses. Please refer to the Crenshaw Transit Corridor Project: Final Feasibility Study – Wilshire/La Brea Light Rail Transit Extension, available on the Crenshaw Transit Corridor Project page on the Metro website.

Keeping these recommendations in mind, the Westside Subway Extension Project, if approved for implementation, will be designed so as not to preclude future northward extensions of the Crenshaw/LAX line along La Brea, La Cienega, or San Vicente.

**306-1**

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

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

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

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

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

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

40

10 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.  
 11 Joel Covarrubias followed by Peter, who will tell  
 12 me how to pronounce his name, and then Eric Romann.  
 13 Go ahead. Get close up to the microphone.  
 14 MR. COVARRUBIAS: Hi. My name is Joel Covarrubias.  
 15 I've already spoken on the Westside Subway at a different  
 16 meeting, but given all the hysteria I'm hearing coming out  
 17 of Beverly Hills, I feel compelled to respond.  
 18 Century City station should be located at  
 19 Constellation Boulevard in the center of Century City. The  
 20 success of the subway depends upon the convenience of the  
 21 station. The Constellation option minimizes the average  
 22 distance to jobs, jobs, jobs, as well as hotels and  
 23 shopping. Santa Monica Boulevard option weighs half its  
 24 potential by being located near the country club to the  
 25 north.

306-1

**306-1**

*Fault Investigation Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report*. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study*. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: [www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

**306-2**

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

41

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

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

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

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

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

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

306-2

1            Claims that the Constellation option was recently  
2 sprung onto the public are utter nonsense. This option has  
3 been around since the alternatives analysis in 2007. The  
4 public documentation bears this out.

5            Claims that the Constellation routes north and  
6 south will cause excessive vibration and noise are also  
7 nonsense. The draft EIR deals extensively with issues of  
8 noise and vibration in Section 4.6. This section  
describes,  
9 in detail, the standardized methodology Metro used for  
10 testing and predicting noise and vibration.

11           It then lists its conclusions for 185 separate  
12 locations in the study area. On Page 4-128, the draft EIR  
13 states, "The build alternatives would not result in  
through  
14 operational noise impacts. As for ground-born noise  
peak  
15 the Constellation alignments, this means ground rumble,  
16 decibel levels are expected to range between 32 and 38  
17 decibels."

18           Scientists describe this decibel level as country  
19 house or quiet auditorium. By contrast, existing noise  
20 levels in central Beverly Hills average 64 decibels. The  
21 subway will be certainly quieter than any at grade and  
22 elevated rail that the rest of the county has to deal with.

23           In short, please remember, Metro is responsible  
for  
24 the continuous improvement of an efficient system for  
entire  
25 L.A. County. Consider the entire county, not just

**306-2**

conducted during preparation of this Final EIS/EIR.

42

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

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

- 1 Beverly Hills. Put the station where it will do the most
- 2 good. Thank you.

42

3 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.  
 4 Peter, who will tell me how to pronounce his last  
 5 name, and then Eric Romann, if you could line up over  
 there,  
 6 and then Joana Gaspar.  
 7 MR. DREMBELAS: Hi, I'm Peter Drembelas. I'm a  
 resident  
 8 of Los Angeles and a supporter of, I guess, the second  
 9 alternative, ultimately Alternative 5. I think it's really  
 10 important to use all of our resources, first with  
 11 Alternative 2, and I wanted to voice my support for the  
 307-2 12 Constellation station.  
 13 I agree with the previous speaker that the  
 14 Santa Monica location of the station would waste half of  
 its  
 15 area with residential -- specifically with residential that  
 16 clearly doesn't care about public transportation.  
 307-3 17 I also want to respond to the claim that rapid  
 18 transit doesn't reduce the -- what was it? Travel time for  
 purpose  
 19 cars in the city? Which I don't think is at all the  
 20 of rapid transit. It's to reduce the amount of time it  
 through  
 21 takes for an individual to get to another place, not  
 22 their car, but through an alternative. So thank you.  
 23 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.  
 24 Eric Romann followed by Joana Gaspar and then  
 25 Rosa Miranda.

**307-1**

Your support for Alternative 2 and ultimately 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.

**307-2**

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

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

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

**307-2**

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

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

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

**307-3**

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

**307-3**

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](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

43

1 MR. ROMANN: Good evening. Eric Romann from the  
2 Bus Riders Union, also, a daily bus rider. So a couple  
3 things.

4 This project, as I think we all know, will be the  
5 most expensive in Metro's history. Yet, according to the  
6 EIR, it's projected to run through -- all of the  
7 communities that it will run through are a majority white, and they're  
8 also, overwhelmingly, middle and upper income.

9 But the system-wide ridership, both bus and rail,  
10 is close to 90 percent people of color and overwhelmingly  
11 low income. So we have some obvious civil rights concerns,  
12 especially based on Metro's history.

13 So let's talk about the real alternatives to this  
14 project; right? I'm going to leave aside the, what I think  
15 options are, outrageous and also unfunded \$6- and \$9 billion  
16 through West Hollywood and all the way to Santa Monica,  
17 specifically focussing on Alternatives 1 and 2.

18 What can we do with \$4 billion instead of build a  
19 subway that's going to have a nominal or maybe a negligible  
20 impact on traffic and not draw in any riders? So here's  
21 what we can do; right? We can purchase 1,000 more buses;  
22 right? For just \$600 million; right?

23 We can run -- expand bus service by 20 percent  
24 county-wide and pay for that for 15 years. So 20 percent  
25 expanded county bus service all throughout the county

**308-1**

Your preference for the No Build or an expanded TSM Alternative 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). Alternative 2 was selected as the LPA because the analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated that the Build Alternatives would be more effective than the TSM Alternative in terms of enhancing mobility, serving development opportunities, and addressing other aspects of the Purpose and Need for the Project. Please refer to Chapter 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for information on this analysis.

Furthermore, the Project would not eliminate bus service along Wilshire Boulevard but rather would supplement it with rail. As explained in Chapter 2, Metro Local, Limited, Rapid, and Express bus service along Wilshire Boulevard will continue to operate in conjunction with the rail system, if approved and implemented. The Wilshire Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit project is also assumed to be in place. Maintenance of local bus service levels is an important component of the transit system serving the Westside Corridor. With the extension the Purple Line subway service to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station, it is estimated that one-third of demand would involve local bus access. Metro continues to seek to improve the region's transit needs and continually evaluates various transit corridors to achieve a more interconnected transportation system. To help guide design of subway stations, potential enhanced local bus service at stations was assessed and is discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS/EIR.

The Project will be funded primarily through a combination of Measure R local funds and Federal New Starts funds, with some other local, State, and Federal funds. Metro will continue to use a combination of local, State, and Federal funding sources to operate and maintain the system. In addition to these funding sources, Metro relies on fare revenues to fund about one-third of its operating costs. Bus operating funds will not be used to construct the Project, and no fare increases or service reductions are proposed to cover the Project's costs. The selection of the TSM Alternative would not have resulted in lower fares. The Metro Board of Directors establishes fares. Currently, the Base Fare for each boarding is \$1.50 and the Metro Day Pass is \$5.00. A transfer is the same as the Base Fare - \$1.50.

Furthermore, the Westside Subway Extension Project will increase transit options and improve mobility for residents across Los Angeles County, including low-income and minority residents who are transit-dependent. Transit service is meant to serve where the demand is greatest, and these areas are often within neighborhoods that have Environmental Justice (EJ) populations and communities of concern. Four of the seven stations are located in, or adjacent to the Environmental Justice populations identified in Section 4.2.6 of the Final EIS/EIR. Therefore, people living in EJ populations will have the same opportunity to access the transit and mobility improvements provided by the subway.

308-1

**308-1**

The increased connectivity would also reduce the number of transfers which would have a beneficial economic impact to elderly and low-income communities. The Project would also allow easier access to major employment centers. Transit user benefits associated with the LPA are anticipated both along the Project corridor as well as across the region. The transit benefits associated with the LPA are further detailed in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

44

1 covered for 15 years, the operating expenses. We can build  
 2 15 bus-only lanes, not just on Wilshire Boulevard, bus-only  
 3 lanes or bus rapid transit, not just on Wilshire but on  
 4 major corridors throughout the county; right?  
 5 So we have to ask, in considering whether this is  
 a 6 wise project, let's look at the alternatives -- let's look  
 7 at the alternatives that will benefit the entire county,  
 8 because that's why we're here today.  
 9 So I echo what my colleague, Barbara Lott-Holland,  
 10 said. We support either a No-Build alternative or, really,  
 11 a significantly expanded, much more robust TSM alternative.  
 12 Thank you.  
 13 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.  
 14 Joana Gaspar followed by Rosa Miranda and then  
 15 Esperanza Martinez. Go ahead. Get up close to the  
 16 microphone.  
 17 MS. GASPAR: Hi. My name is Joana Gaspar, and I'm a  
 18 member of the Bus Riders Union, a student at Santa Monica  
 19 College, and a bus rider.  
 my 20 I use the 720 daily, a two-hour ride to and from  
 21 house. I have a 9:00 o'clock morning class, and I have to  
 22 get up at 5:30 in the morning to get ready, eat breakfast,  
 take 23 and get the 6:30 bus that gets me to school, and then I  
 24 the Big Blue Bus at 8:30 in the morning.  
 25 For me, prioritizing the public transit can be

45

309-1

1 done. There's no need for the Subway to the Sea when  
 2 there's the bus-only lanes in the works. This is  
 important.  
 3 It will reduce the traffic by restricting the space that  
 4 autos dominate and attract more riders to use bus service.  
 5 This would be less money than the Subway to the Sea. In  
 the  
 6 auto capital in the country, we need to reduce traffic now.  
 7 We support either the No-Build option or the  
 8 significant expanded TSM alternative. Thank you.

**309-1**

Your preference for the No Build or an expanded TSM Alternative 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). Alternative 2 was selected as the LPA because the analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated that the Build Alternatives would be more effective than the TSM Alternative in terms of enhancing mobility, serving development opportunities, and addressing other aspects of the Purpose and Need for the Project. Please refer to Chapter 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for information on this analysis.

Furthermore, the Project would not eliminate bus service along Wilshire Boulevard but rather would supplement it with rail. As explained in Chapter 2, Metro Local, Limited, Rapid, and Express bus service along Wilshire Boulevard will continue to operate in conjunction with the rail system, if approved and implemented. The Wilshire Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit project is also assumed to be in place. Maintenance of local bus service levels is an important component of the transit system serving the Westside Corridor. With the extension the Purple Line subway service to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station, it is estimated that one-third of demand would involve local bus access. Metro continues to seek to improve the region's transit needs and continually evaluates various transit corridors to achieve a more interconnected transportation system. To help guide design of subway stations, potential enhanced local bus service at stations was assessed and is discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS/EIR.

The Project will be funded primarily through a combination of Measure R local funds and Federal New Starts funds, with some other local, State, and Federal funds. Metro will continue to use a combination of local, State, and Federal funding sources to operate and maintain the system. In addition to these funding sources, Metro relies on fare revenues to fund about one-third of its operating costs. Bus operating funds will not be used to construct the Project, and no fare increases or service reductions are proposed to cover the Project's costs. The selection of the TSM Alternative would not have resulted in lower fares. The Metro Board of Directors establishes fares. Currently, the Base Fare for each boarding is \$1.50 and the Metro Day Pass is \$5.00. A transfer is the same as the Base Fare - \$1.50.

Furthermore, the Westside Subway Extension Project will increase transit options and improve mobility for residents across Los Angeles County, including low-income and minority residents who are transit-dependent. Transit service is meant to serve where the demand is greatest, and these areas are often within neighborhoods that have Environmental Justice (EJ) populations and communities of concern. Four of the seven stations are located in, or adjacent to the Environmental Justice populations identified in Section 4.2.6 of the Final EIS/EIR. Therefore, people living in EJ populations will have the same opportunity to access the transit and mobility improvements provided by the subway.

**309-1**

The increased connectivity would also reduce the number of transfers which would have a beneficial economic impact to elderly and low-income communities. The Project would also allow easier access to major employment centers. Transit user benefits associated with the LPA are anticipated both along the Project corridor as well as across the region. The transit benefits associated with the LPA are further detailed in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

**310-1**

Your preference for the No Build or an expanded TSM Alternative 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). Alternative 2 was selected as the LPA because the analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated that the Build Alternatives would be more effective than the TSM Alternative in terms of enhancing mobility, serving development opportunities, and addressing other aspects of the Purpose and Need for the Project. Please refer to Chapter 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for information on this analysis.

Furthermore, the Project would not eliminate bus service along Wilshire Boulevard but rather would supplement it with rail. As explained in Chapter 2, Metro Local, Limited, Rapid, and Express bus service along Wilshire Boulevard will continue to operate in conjunction with the rail system, if approved and implemented. The Wilshire Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit project is also assumed to be in place. Maintenance of local bus service levels is an important component of the transit system serving the Westside Corridor. With the extension the Purple Line subway service to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station, it is estimated that one-third of demand would involve local bus access. Metro continues to seek to improve the region's transit needs and continually evaluates various transit corridors to achieve a more interconnected transportation system. To help guide design of subway stations, potential enhanced local bus service at stations was assessed and is discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS/EIR.

The Project will be funded primarily through a combination of Measure R local funds and Federal New Starts funds, with some other local, State, and Federal funds. Metro will continue to use a combination of local, State, and Federal funding sources to operate and maintain the system. In addition to these funding sources, Metro relies on fare revenues to fund about one-third of its operating costs. Bus operating funds will not be used to construct the Project, and no fare increases or service reductions are proposed to cover the Project's costs. The selection of the TSM Alternative would not have resulted in lower fares. The Metro Board of Directors establishes fares. Currently, the Base Fare for each boarding is \$1.50 and the Metro Day Pass is \$5.00. A transfer is the same as the Base Fare - \$1.50.

Furthermore, the Westside Subway Extension Project will increase transit options and improve mobility for residents across Los Angeles County, including low-income and minority residents who are transit-dependent. Transit service is meant to serve where the demand is greatest, and these areas are often within neighborhoods that have Environmental Justice (EJ) populations and communities of concern. Four of the seven stations are located in, or adjacent to the Environmental Justice populations identified in Section 4.2.6 of the Final EIS/EIR. Therefore, people living in EJ populations will have the same opportunity to access the transit and mobility improvements provided by the subway.

45

9 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.  
10 Rosa Miranda and then Esperanza Martinez and,  
11 Barbara, I got a second card for you, so I'm going to set  
12 that aside. So after Esperanza will be Michelle Lopez.  
13 This is going to be four minutes? Okay. Great.  
14 Thank you.  
15 MS. MIRANDA: Good afternoon, everybody, my name is  
16 Rosa Miranda, and I'm part of the Bus Riders Union. I  
17 support the no-construction option, and I want them to  
18 expand the option, the TSM, and I significantly support  
19 bus services.  
20 This project sounds very nice, but the reality is  
21 different. This will be a billion-dollar expense, and this  
22 train will not cover the passengers' needs in  
23 Los Angeles County.  
24 We need projects for the short term, like the  
25 Bus Riders Union's plan, and the Clean Air and Economical

310-1

more

**310-1**

The increased connectivity would also reduce the number of transfers which would have a beneficial economic impact to elderly and low-income communities. The Project would also allow easier access to major employment centers. Transit user benefits associated with the LPA are anticipated both along the Project corridor as well as across the region. The transit benefits associated with the LPA are further detailed in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

46

1 Justice Plan. This plan is more economical, \$2.1 billion,  
 2 and this plan is more justified. It's a lot more fair.  
 3 That would help the bus riders' needs in Los Angeles  
 County.  
 4 500 new buses in county, and not just on one  
 5 street. Bus-only lanes in all of Los Angeles County, and  
 also  
 6 this would reduce the congestion in all the streets and  
 7 contamination and also let lower rates to 2007 (sic), and  
 8 the expansion of the services on the weekends and, also, at  
 9 nights.  
 10 This is a true project that is really going  
 11 towards --  
 12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible)  
 13 THE INTERPRETER: Thank you.  
 14 MS. MIRANDA: And this is really a challenge to the  
 one  
 15 cars, and what personnel manages is a green train. With  
 16 percent of reduction of cars, it's not really a green plan.  
 17 We really want them to challenge cars and reducing  
 18 the greenhouse effects and not projects that just benefit  
 19 some of the contractors.  
 20 I'd like to ask, do you have enough to build with  
 21 funds of the F Measure? Where will these funds come from?  
 22 Once again, I support the option of no construction, and I  
 23 want you to expand and take the option of TSM, and I  
 24 significantly support more bus services. Thank you.  
 25 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Excellent timing

1 there.

2 Esperanza Martinez followed by Michelle Lopez and

3 then James McCormick.

4 MS. MARTINEZ: My name is Esperanza Martinez, the

5 organizer with the Bus Riders Union. The Bus Riders Union

6 is a civil rights and environmental justice organization

7 that has been fighting, for the last 15 years, to create a

8 first-class bus system in the L.A. County.

9 For the BRU, the Subway to the Sea has always

10 represented a politically motivated boondoggle project with

11 the potential to massively drain operating dollars from the

12 existing bus system. A move that will result in civil

13 rights violations.

14 The first ten years of MTA's investment in rail

15 construction created deplorable conditions for bus riders,

16 who, by and large, are working class and communities of

17 color. This led to a BRU-motivated Title VI lawsuit.

18 One thing that I want the audience to walk away

19 knowing is that the operation of this project will

20 inevitably result in a significant reduction in existing

21 service, and it has already started with two fare increases

22 that we've seen in the last three years and a reduction of

23 almost 500,000 hours in bus service.

24 The project, the alternative to build the subway

25 Westwood, would require about \$36 million a year to

operate.

311-1

bus

to

operate.

**311-1**

Your preference for the No Build or TSM Alternative 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). Alternative 2 was selected as the LPA because the analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated that the Build Alternatives would be more effective than the TSM Alternative in terms of enhancing mobility, serving development opportunities, and addressing other aspects of the Purpose and Need for the Project. Please refer to Chapter 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for information on this analysis.

Furthermore, the Project would not eliminate bus service along Wilshire Boulevard but rather would supplement it with rail. As explained in Chapter 2, Metro Local, Limited, Rapid, and Express bus service along Wilshire Boulevard will continue to operate in conjunction with the rail system, if approved and implemented. The Wilshire Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit project is also assumed to be in place. Maintenance of local bus service levels is an important component of the transit system serving the Westside Corridor. With the extension the Purple Line subway service to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station, it is estimated that one-third of demand would involve local bus access. Metro continues to seek to improve the region's transit needs and continually evaluates various transit corridors to achieve a more interconnected transportation system. To help guide design of subway stations, potential enhanced local bus service at stations was assessed and is discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS/EIR.

The Project will be funded primarily through a combination of Measure R local funds and Federal New Starts funds, with some other local, State, and Federal funds. Metro will continue to use a combination of local, State, and Federal funding sources to operate and maintain the system. In addition to these funding sources, Metro relies on fare revenues to fund about one-third of its operating costs. Bus operating funds will not be used to construct the Project, and no fare increases or service reductions are proposed to cover the Project's costs. The selection of the TSM Alternative would not have resulted in lower fares. The Metro Board of Directors establishes fares. Currently, the Base Fare for each boarding is \$1.50 and the Metro Day Pass is \$5.00. A transfer is the same as the Base Fare - \$1.50.

Furthermore, the Westside Subway Extension Project will increase transit options and improve mobility for residents across Los Angeles County, including low-income and minority residents who are transit-dependent. Transit service is meant to serve where the demand is greatest, and these areas are often within neighborhoods that have Environmental Justice (EJ) populations and communities of concern. Four of the seven stations are located in, or adjacent to the Environmental Justice populations identified in Section 4.2.6 of the Final EIS/EIR. Therefore, people living in EJ populations will have the same opportunity to access the transit and mobility improvements provided by the subway.

48

to

1 Measure R, five percent rail operating dollars for the  
 2 entire county will only generate about \$30 million in one  
 3 year. The EIR shows that if it costs \$48 million in 2035  
 4 run this subway, that \$35 million will also come from  
 5 existing bus service.

6 So we support the No-Build alternative or the TSM  
 7 alternative. Thank you.

8 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

9 Okay. Michelle Lopez and then James McCormick,  
 10 followed by Kedar Iyer.

11 I'm sorry. I just remember, I forgot to say this.  
 12 Just take me a moment. Hang on. If any of you parked in  
 13 the library tonight and you need parking validations, make  
 14 sure you pick them up on the way out. I apologize for not  
 15 saying that sooner, and I see -- are we doing okay with  
 16 the -- with the translation? Okay. Great.

17 All right. Michelle, I'm sorry. Go right ahead.

18 MS. LOPEZ: Thank you. My name is Michelle Lopez, and  
 19 I'm a member of the Bus Riders Union.

20 In 20 years, you've been able to build rail lines  
 21 that has been \$10 billion from bus riders' pockets. These  
 22 rail lines up to now have not reduced traffic, just the  
 23 opposite. It keeps growing every day. Now, you claim that  
 24 the \$9 billion Subway to the Sea will reduce traffic, but  
 25 even on Metro's Environmental Impact Report, issued in

**311-1**

The increased connectivity would also reduce the number of transfers which would have a beneficial economic impact to elderly and low-income communities. The Project would also allow easier access to major employment centers. Transit user benefits associated with the LPA are anticipated both along the Project corridor as well as across the region. The transit benefits associated with the LPA are further detailed in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Your comment about potential violation of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act has been noted. The Westside Subway will augment bus service in the corridor, and as such, will not adversely affect low income people or people of color who ride the bus. To the contrary, bus riders will have a new option that will, for many, provide a faster, more reliable, and more comfortable way to travel.

312-1

We

of

1 December, showed that in the year 2035, the extension from  
2 Western to Wilshire to Westwood will show a  
3 less-than-one-percent reduction in cars.  
4 The MTA is planning to pay for this project from  
5 bus riders' sweat. The MTA plans on raising the fares 14  
6 times in 30 years. This is bus riders paying for less and  
7 bus service being reduced.  
8 Instead of wasting \$9 billion on a project that  
9 would help traffic congestion, invest on the bus system.  
10 have the Bus Riders Union Clean Air and Economic Justice  
11 Plan, which will only cost \$2.1 billion and consist of  
12 bus-only lanes, adding 500 more buses, lowering the bus  
13 fares to how it used to be in 2007, and improve weekend  
14 service, which can provide county-wide traffic relief and  
15 create permanent green jobs.  
16 We support either the No-Build alternative or the  
17 significant expanded TSM alternative. Thank you.  
18 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.  
19 James McCormick, followed by Kedar Iyer and --  
20 okay. Let's try this one. Chris Maladenoff (phonetic) or  
21 something close to that, but you'll correct me when you get  
22 up here.  
23 MR. MC CORMICK: I'm James McCormick. I'm a resident  
24 Los Angeles, and chairman of the Subway to the Sea  
25 Coalition. I was also the president of the Coalition for

**312-1**

Your preference for the No Build or the expanded TSM Alternative 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). Alternative 2 was selected as the LPA because the analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated that the Build Alternatives would be more effective than the TSM Alternative in terms of enhancing mobility, serving development opportunities, and addressing other aspects of the Purpose and Need for the Project. Please refer to Chapter 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for information on this analysis.

Furthermore, the Project would not eliminate bus service along Wilshire Boulevard but rather would supplement it with rail. As explained in Chapter 2, Metro Local, Limited, Rapid, and Express bus service along Wilshire Boulevard will continue to operate in conjunction with the rail system, if approved and implemented. The Wilshire Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit project is also assumed to be in place. Maintenance of local bus service levels is an important component of the transit system serving the Westside Corridor. With the extension the Purple Line subway service to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station, it is estimated that one-third of demand would involve local bus access. Metro continues to seek to improve the region's transit needs and continually evaluates various transit corridors to achieve a more interconnected transportation system. To help guide design of subway stations, potential enhanced local bus service at stations was assessed and is discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS/EIR.

The Project will be funded primarily through a combination of Measure R local funds and Federal New Starts funds, with some other local, State, and Federal funds. Metro will continue to use a combination of local, State, and Federal funding sources to operate and maintain the system. In addition to these funding sources, Metro relies on fare revenues to fund about one-third of its operating costs. Bus operating funds will not be used to construct the Project, and no fare increases or service reductions are proposed to cover the Project's costs. The selection of the TSM Alternative would not have resulted in lower fares. The Metro Board of Directors establishes fares. Currently, the Base Fare for each boarding is \$1.50 and the Metro Day Pass is \$5.00. A transfer is the same as the Base Fare - \$1.50.

Furthermore, the Westside Subway Extension Project will increase transit options and improve mobility for residents across Los Angeles County, including low-income and minority residents who are transit-dependent. Transit service is meant to serve where the demand is greatest, and these areas are often within neighborhoods that have Environmental Justice (EJ) populations and communities of concern. Four of the seven stations are located in, or adjacent to the Environmental Justice populations identified in Section 4.2.6 of the Final EIS/EIR. Therefore, people living in EJ populations will have the same opportunity to access the transit and mobility improvements provided by the subway.

**312-1**

The increased connectivity would also reduce the number of transfers which would have a beneficial economic impact to elderly and low-income communities. The Project would also allow easier access to major employment centers. Transit user benefits associated with the LPA are anticipated both along the Project corridor as well as across the region. The transit benefits associated with the LPA are further detailed in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

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.

**312-1**

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](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

313-1

1 Rapid Transit, which has advocated for the expansion of the  
2 subway system since the early '70s.

3 We've come a long way, although we did get stopped  
4 in 1998 for 12 years, in building a major rapid transit  
5 system in the city. We are, in fact, very far behind any  
6 other major first-world city in the world, and we're  
7 suffering the consequences throughout the city of  
8 congestion.

9 Building the subway is not intended to reduce  
10 congestion so much that it is intended to increase  
mobility,

11 and mobility for all of the citizens to have access to all  
12 parts of the city.

13 The Subway to the Sea was originally conceived of  
14 as a means of getting all citizens access to the sea. And,  
15 in that connection, I want to advocate very strongly that  
16 Alternative 3 be considered to be included in the final  
17 EIS/EIR, because, as we know, the opportunity to solve the  
18 problem of giving people access to the sea through rapid  
19 transit is going to be precluded if we do not do the  
20 environmental study and complete the environmental study at  
21 this time. It will be precluded for some time, and it may  
22 not ever get done if we don't include it.

313-2

23 On the other hand, if the wisdom of the Board is  
24 that Alternative 1 is the only one that is funded, I  
25 strongly recommend that we use the terminus plan for UCLA

**313-1**

Your support for Alternative 3 (Santa Monica Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

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

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

**313-2**

Your comment regarding a terminus at Westwood/UCLA has been noted. Please see the above response to comment number 313-1 regarding the LPA selection.

1 Westwood and --

2 MS. LITVAK: That's it.

3 MR. MC CORMICK: That's it.

4 MS. LITVAK: All right. Send in your comments in

5 writing. Thank you so much.

6 MR. MC CORMICK: Thank you.

7 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Kedar Iyer, Chris Maladenoff, and

8 then Elan Glasser.

9 Go ahead. Step right up.

10 MR. IYER: Hello, my name is Kedar Iyer, and I'm here

11 speaking on behalf of UCLA students. I would like to start

12 by voicing my support for the subway extension to Westwood.

13 Westwood is the second largest employment center

14 in Los Angeles, and due to the large amount of students in the

15 area, is also the largest concentration of non-driving

16 adults in the city.

17 Extending the subway -- sorry. A majority of our

18 off-campus students do not drive themselves to campus.

19 Extending the subway by increasing access to Westwood,

20 would also provide thousands of high school students, who are

21 high-performing students, the opportunity to attend the

22 right high-level college that they may not be able to attend

23 give now because of lack of transportation access. It would

24 them a chance to get the education they deserve and would

25 provide equality that's lacking in this city sometimes.

314-1

in

would

right

give

**314-1**

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

Your comment regarding connections to the UCLA Campus from the Westwood/UCLA Station has been noted. Connections to the UCLA Campus were an important consideration in evaluating the Westwood/UCLA Station.

During public scoping, the public was presented with several station options for Westwood/UCLA. Six station location options were developed in response to scoping comments, including two locations along Le Conte Avenue closer to the UCLA campus. These station options were evaluated based on a number of engineering and environmental criteria. Based on the results of this screening, the two Le Conte Stations were eliminated from further consideration for two primary reasons. First, they would have required tunnel alignments to travel under the Veterans National Cemetery in order to allow the subway to continue west. In addition, the narrow streets in Westwood Village and the additional distance from Wilshire Boulevard made these locations ill-suited for station construction and associated impacts, including the location of sufficient land for construction staging and earth removal and the identification of haul routes. Station locations closer to or under Wilshire Boulevard will serve Westwood Village as well as the high-rise office buildings along Wilshire Boulevard and the multi-family residential buildings in that vicinity.

The Westwood area already serves as a major transportation hub for buses, shuttles, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Westwood Village is a pedestrian friendly area with wide, continuous sidewalks and many shops and restaurants. Bicycle lanes along Wilshire Boulevard and Westwood Boulevard have been identified for implementation in the next five years in the adopted City of Los Angeles 2010 Bicycle Plan. In addition, Le Conte Avenue and Veteran Avenue have been identified for longer term implementation.

Significant bus service already exists in the Westwood Village area provided by Metro, Santa Monica Big Blue Bus, Culver City Municipal Bus Lines, UCLA Transit, and others. These services provide connections between Wilshire Boulevard and the UCLA campus. The bus stop for the UCLA Campus Express is currently located on the south side of Kinross Avenue between Veteran and Gayley Avenues, which is easily accessible from the station entrance at the corner of Wilshire Boulevard and Gayley Avenue for either the Off-Street or On-Street Station.

**314-1**

Of the two Westwood/UCLA Stations under consideration in the Final EIS/EIR, 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, including bus connections to the UCLA Campus.

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

52

it 1           The second part I would like to point out is, as  
2 relates to students who are currently at UCLA and live in  
3 Westwood, of our 40,000 students, 30,000 are right now  
4 graduate students or third-of fourth-year students who are  
5 looking for jobs or internships, many times in the downtown  
6 area.  
7           Extending the subway to the Westwood area would be  
8 the biggest competitive boost we could receive in competing  
9 for downtown internships and jobs, because many of us don't  
10 have cars and don't have a reliable way of getting there  
11 into downtown and, as such, are forced to compete for local  
12 jobs rather than citywide jobs.  
13           We see investing in the subway as investing in the  
14 future of students and leaders of the city and a way to  
move 15 our city into the 21st century.  
16           And, as the last thing, for the Locally Preferred  
17 Alternative, I would like to voice my support for the UCLA  
18 location, because it will be connected to the LAX FlyAway  
19 Shuttle and to a campus that takes us to the main campus.  
20           Thank you.  
21           MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.  
22           Chris Maladenoff, followed by Elan Glasser.  
23           Where's Chris? You must be Elan.  
24           MR. GLASSER: Yeah.  
25           MS. LITVAK: Okay. Step right up. Following Elan will

53

1 be Lucy Dyke and then Joel Epstein.

2 MR. GLASSER: My name is Elan Glasser. I'm a

3 Santa Monica resident. I strongly support the Westside  
4 Subway Extension, and I urge the Board to select either --  
5 preferably Alternative 5 or, at a minimum, Alternative 3

and

6 build the line all the way to Santa Monica.

7 When voters, by over two-thirds, approved  
8 Measure R, many, many, many of them believed that they were  
9 voting for a Subway to the Sea. There's widespread  
10 community support, not just in Santa Monica but throughout  
11 the county, for building the subway all the way to the sea.

over

12 Part of the reason is, it's not just benefitting  
13 residents of Santa Monica, it allows residents from all  
14 the county to access, not just the beach, but the various  
15 attractions in the Santa Monica area. So this is not just  
16 something that benefits residents, but it benefits the  
17 county as a whole. It also has the most number of trips,  
18 according to the projections.

19 So, anyway, I just wanted to support the extension  
20 all the way to Santa Monica. Thank you.

21 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

22 Lucy Dyke, followed by Joel Epstein and then  
23 Lauren Cole.

24 MS. DYKE: Hi, I'm Lucy Dyke. I'm the transportation  
25 planning manager for the City of Santa Monica.

**315-1**

Your support for Alternative 3 (Santa Monica Extension) or Alternative 5 (Santa Monica Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

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

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

315-1

316-1

1 The City of Santa Monica appreciates the  
 2 opportunity for people in this community to participate in  
 3 public discussion at our main library of the environmental  
 4 considerations in planning a Subway to the Sea.  
 5 The project is critical to the long term of  
 6 of life for the region, including air quality, mobility,  
 7 enjoyable public outdoor space, and access between jobs and  
 8 recreation and affordable housing opportunities.  
 9 It complements the City's Land Use and Circulation  
 10 Element goals to maintain a vibrant, healthy economy, while  
 11 holding peak-hour car trips at or below current levels.  
 12 The City is focussing complementary investments in transit,  
 13 transportation demand management, walking, and bicycling.  
 14 The Santa Monica City Council has expressed  
 15 support for the project and its funding through the Westside Cities  
 16 COG, Measure R, the 30/10 Initiative, and its own Land Use  
 17 and Circulation Element.  
 18 We would like to see the project be constructed to  
 19 west of the 405 and to Santa Monica as soon as possible.  
 20 According to information contained in the documents,  
 21 alternatives, including Santa Monica, are the best  
 22 investment choices, because they have the highest reduction  
 23 in vehicle miles travelled compared to ongoing projects'  
 24 operating costs.  
 25 We support the approach with connecting

**316-1**

Your support for Alternative 3 (Santa Monica Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

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

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

55

together 1 cultural/educational/entertainment activity centers  
 2 with heavy rail subway systems. Connecting Santa Monica to  
 3 this system provides the greatest environmental benefit of  
 4 all alternatives considered.  
 5 According to the EIR, adding Santa Monica to the  
 6 subway system would increase total ridership by over  
 7 25 percent. Providing employees and visitors with an  
 8 alternative to the car has the potential to ameliorate the  
 9 regional and local congestion issues. Thank you.  
 10 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.  
 11 Joel Epstein and then Lauren Cole and then  
 12 Irwin Chen.  
 13 Get up close to the microphone.  
 14 MR. EPSTEIN: Thanks. I want to thank Metro for these  
 15 really terrific presentations, very informative, and I  
 16 welcome and appreciate the opportunity to speak.  
 17 I want to express my support for a stop at  
 18 Constellation in Century City. I think that's a much  
 19 preferred alternative, given the volume of people who work  
 20 in the area, and I think putting it on Santa Monica  
 21 Boulevard would be a waste and you would lose a good number  
 22 of riders that way.  
 23 Additionally, I want to express my support for  
 24 building as far and as much as you can now, ultimately, all  
 25 the way to Santa Monica. If you can't go all the way to

**317-1**

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

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

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

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

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

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

317-1

317-2

56

or, 1 Santa Monica, please, please go all the way to the V.A.,  
 2 as some other speaker this evening mentioned, perhaps  
 3 something at Federal. I like that alternative as well.  
 rider. 4 I'm a 720 -- I'm an Angeleno. I'm a 720 bus  
 and 5 I ride the 720 to Western and Wilshire and get off there  
 6 ride the subway, the purple line, downtown, and it is  
 7 absurd. I just cannot wait until the subway goes all the  
 of 8 way to Santa Monica. I think it will serve all Angelenos  
 9 all races, of all colors, of all ethnicities, and I just  
 10 hope we can build this as quickly as possible.  
 11 Thanks.

**317-1**

*Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report.* The results of further ridership studies can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study*. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: [www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

**317-2**

Your support for Alternative 3 (Santa Monica Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

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

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

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

**317-2**

because of the sharp curve of Wilshire Boulevard. Therefore, the Wilshire/Federal Station was eliminated from further consideration.

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

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

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

Please refer to Section 8.8.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station and to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The *Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report* provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the *Westside Subway Extension Westwood/UCLA Station and the Westwood/VA Hospital Station Locations Report* for a comparison of the two Westwood/VA Hospital Station locations in the Final EIS/EIR. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: [www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

**318-1**

Your support for Alternative 3 (Santa Monica Extension) or Alternative 5 (Santa Monica Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) in the long run and Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board approved Alternative 2 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.

While the Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated a significant market for transit improvements serving Santa Monica and West Hollywood, 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. Therefore, further study could occur should funding be identified and secured in the future. 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.

56

12 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.

13 And that was Joel Epstein, who didn't say his name

14 when he got up to the microphone, which is my way of

15 reminding Lauren Cole and everyone who comes afterwards,

16 please start by stating your name. This is Lauren Cole,

17 followed by Irwin Chen and then John Trautmann.

18 Go ahead.

19 MS. COLE: My name is Lauren Cole. I'm chair of the

20 Brentwood Community Council Transportation Committee. The

21 Brentwood Community Council supports the subway

22 that go all the way to 4th Street in Santa Monica, either 3

23 or 5. In the short term, we support Alternative 2 to the

24 V.A. over the UCLA alternative.

25 My comment today is that -- I wanted to make a

318-1

alternatives

**318-2**

Your comments about parking have been noted. Park-and-ride can be an important mode of access to transit. However, these facilities are usually located in low-density areas that lack local bus service feeding the stations. That is not the case with this Project. Therefore, none of the stations proposed as part of the Project will provide parking.

The provision of park-and-ride facilities would be inconsistent with the purpose and need of the Project. The Project Study Area is already very congested and Metro seeks to discourage people from driving to access the subway. Park-and-ride facilities also could lead to increased auto use and potentially result in traffic impacts at intersections.

The provision of park-and-ride facilities also would be inconsistent with both the existing built environment surrounding stations and efforts to encourage transit-oriented development. The Project corridor is very dense due to medium and high density commercial and residential development. The construction of park-and-ride facilities would consume space that could be put to more productive residential and commercial uses.

Any added park-and-ride facilities would have major implications on Project costs. The study area also has very high land costs and there is lack of available parcels for park-and-ride development. Due to land costs and scarcity, any parking would need to be in multi-story garages, resulting in substantially higher capital costs than current estimates.

Please refer to Section 8.8.8 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to parking. In addition, Section 3.6 of the Final EIS/EIR estimates the demand for parking at the stations and provides an analysis of potential spillover parking impacts to surrounding communities.

318-2

1 comment on the parking section of the draft EIR in which  
2 Metro concludes that they would prefer not to support  
3 parking at any stations anywhere along the subway line.  
4 Our particular concerns are the stops at the V.A.  
5 and Bundy Drive, but we believe that before the final EIR  
6 completed, that an actual study should be done taking local  
7 data and local opinions into account.  
8 Currently, the data that's in the EIR appears to  
9 national data, just averages of subway parking  
10 requirements, and it says things, for example, that the parking at the  
11 V.A. and the Bundy stops would be of identical demand,  
12 which makes no sense.  
13 Clearly, the V.A. stop, one of the justifications  
14 park was that people over the Valley, perhaps, would want to  
15 there and not have to drive into Westwood. So we are  
16 are requesting that real work is done before any conclusions  
17 reached by Metro as to whether or not there should be  
18 parking provided.  
19 This is a very expensive project as well as a very  
20 important project, and we think that it's equally important  
21 to have a project that will allow residents of this side of  
22 the 405 to get out of the area and to take advantage of the  
23 subway as it is to provide a project that enables people to  
24 drive or to take the subway into the Westside.

1 There are many people who live west of the 405 that simply  
2 do not have the alternative to take the bus to get to  
3 Wilshire Boulevard due to the geography. There simply are  
4 not enough north streets -- north/south streets that can  
5 support bus lines. Thank you.

6 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.  
7 Irwin Chen, followed by John Trautmann, and then  
8 Jayson Warsuma.

9 MR. CHEN: My name is Irwin Chen. I am a resident of  
10 the city of L.A., and an occasional bus rider.

319-1

11 Here -- I'd just like to make a comment, first,  
12 about today, I drove from Century City, where I work, to  
13 the library, and it took me about 35 minutes. It would have  
14 taken me much longer if I had taken the 704 bus.

15 I'm not sure having a thousand more buses on the  
16 street would really solve anybody's problem of getting to  
17 different places, so I think that that much is very clear.

319-2

18 In regards to the subway project, I'd like to lend  
19 my support to Alternative 5, which is the full build-out to  
20 West Hollywood and Santa Monica. I think it's very  
21 that important for Metro to include that in the final EIR so  
22 when we do find funding to construct these segments that  
23 we're not starting from scratch.

24 In terms of the location for the Century City  
25 City station, I think I speak for a lot of people in Century

**319-1**

Your comment regarding existing traffic congestion and current transit travel times has been noted. Congestion and mobility characteristics of the Study Area are discussed in Chapter 1 Purpose and Need of the Final EIS/EIR. As stated in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS/EIR, the purpose of the Project is to improve transit travel time in order to provide more reliable transit service to the 286,200 transit riders who access the Study Area today.

**319-2**

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.

59

319-3 | be | 1 | that work there, that Century City subway stations should  
 2 | located in Century City, and that means it should be in  
 3 | Constellation.  
 4 |         The Santa Monica location, Santa Monica Boulevard  
 5 | location is not ideal and really, I'm not sure will provide  
 6 | any sort of benefit to the region and the people using the  
 7 | station.

319-4 | to | 8 |         In terms of the Westwood location, I -- I'd like  
 9 | lend my support to the station location on the UCLA parking  
 10 | lot. This will enable a much easier construction process  
 11 | and avoid shutting down the Wilshire and Westwood  
 12 | intersection. So that's my comments.

**319-3**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**319-3**

*Fault Investigation Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report*. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study*. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: [www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

**319-4**

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

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Section 8.8.6 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns

**319-4**

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

59

**320-1**

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

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

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

**320-2**

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

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

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

14 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.  
15 John Trautmann, then Jayson Warsuma, and then  
16 Ed Mofrad.  
17 MR. TRAUTMANN: John Trautmann. I'd also like to voice  
18 my support for Alternative 5, because it's what we need in  
19 L.A. so we don't fall behind -- we've already fallen behind  
20 Shanghai and Beijing and Nanjing and Tokyo and  
21 Santiago de Chile and Mexico City, so it's time to build  
22 full subway.  
23 Specifically, I would advocate the Constellation  
24 station, and I would like to speak against the really  
25 convoluted eastern alternative and getting from there to

320-1

the

320-2

320-3

**320-2**

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

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

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

**320-3**

Your comment about the alignment between Century City and Westwood has been noted. The East Alignment was approved by the Metro Board to be carried forward as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), and the Central and West Alignments were removed from further consideration as part of the LPA. The West Alignment is significantly longer than the other two, and would increase travel time between Century City and Westwood by more than two minutes. This, in turn, would lead to somewhat lower ridership and user benefits, and to fewer air quality and energy conservation benefits. The West Alignment Option would also increase capital costs by \$122 to \$142 million in comparison to the East Alignment Option. Between the Central and East Alignment Options, both have similar performance characteristics and costs. The East Alignment, however, passes under fewer private properties. Therefore, it was selected to be carried forward in the LPA into the Final EIS/EIR.

As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors also requested that Metro staff

**320-3**

fully explore the risks associated with tunneling in the West Beverly Hills to Westwood area. Safety, both during construction and eventual operations, is one of Metro's highest priorities and is one of the key evaluation criteria in selection of the LPA. The resulting studies have been completed as part of the Final EIS/EIR and are presented in two separate reports: the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report*.

On most transit tunnel projects, significant portions of the alignment are constructed adjacent to or beneath buildings. The LPA passes beneath homes and schools in these neighborhoods because the curve radius required for subway tunnels is much wider than that required at a typical surface street intersection. The current alignment minimizes tunneling under buildings to the east and west of both the Century City Stations.

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

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

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

**320-3**

Please refer to Section 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more detailed response to alignments and Section 8.8.4 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more detailed response to geotechnical concerns. 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 alignment 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 alignment between Century City and Westwood following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report*. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: [www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

60

320-4

1 Westwood. It just seems way too circuitous.  
 2                   And then, finally, I'd like to lend my  
 3 whole-hearted support by having no parking at any of the  
 4 stations. I think that's a brilliant idea, because, you  
 5 know, cars are the evil. Thank you.

**320-4**

Your comments about parking have been noted. Park-and-ride can be an important mode of access to transit. However, these facilities are usually located in low-density areas that lack local bus service feeding the stations. That is not the case with this Project. Therefore, none of the stations proposed as part of the Project will provide parking.

The provision of park-and-ride facilities would be inconsistent with the purpose and need of the Project. The Project Study Area is already very congested and Metro seeks to discourage people from driving to access the subway. Park-and-ride facilities also could lead to increased auto use and potentially result in traffic impacts at intersections.

The provision of park-and-ride facilities also would be inconsistent with both the existing built environment surrounding stations and efforts to encourage transit-oriented development. The Project corridor is very dense due to medium and high density commercial and residential development. The construction of park-and-ride facilities would consume space that could be put to more productive residential and commercial uses.

Any added park-and-ride facilities would have major implications on Project costs. The study area also has very high land costs and there is lack of available parcels for park-and-ride development. Due to land costs and scarcity, any parking would need to be in multi-story garages, resulting in substantially higher capital costs than current estimates.

Please refer to Section 8.8.8 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to parking. In addition, Section 3.6 of the Final EIS/EIR estimates the demand for parking at the stations and provides an analysis of potential spillover parking impacts to surrounding communities.

60

6 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

7 Jayson Warsuma, Ed Mofrad, Mofrad, and then

8 Michael Clark. And we're getting near the end of these

9 speaker cards, but if anyone else wants to turn in a card,

10 just raise your hand, and we'll either get you a card or,

if 11 you've got it filled out, we'll take it from you.

12 Jayson, go right ahead.

13 MR. WARSUMA: Hello. My name is Jayson Warsuma. Good

14 evening, everybody.

15 Yes. MTA is doing a great job. MTA should make

16 the subway elevated, because if MTA built the subway

17 underground starting from Wilshire and Crenshaw to Wilshire

18 and 4th, that means earthquakes, oil spills, floods.

19 Elevated is so much easier.

20 Build it underground will take 30 to 40 years,

21 because there's oil underground, and water underground. It

22 will cause chaos, and people are going to complain and

23 students will not be able to focus on their subjects.

24 Teachers won't be able to teach their students. People in

25 their home won't be able to sleep. The construction

workers

**321-1**

Your comment about alternative routes and technologies for the subway has been noted. Between 2007 and 2009, Metro conducted an Alternatives Analysis (AA) Study for the Westside Corridor. The AA Study considered the need for transit improvements in the corridor and evaluated various transit technologies and alignments. During Early Scoping meetings, Metro presented the public with technology options that included Heavy Rail Transit (HRT), Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). In response to comments received, Metro added monorail to those other technologies to be analyzed in the AA Study. As a result of these analyses, the Metro Board decided to carry five subway alternatives into the Draft EIS/EIR. An underground alignment was recommended because it has fewer land use, traffic, visual, historic, and noise impacts than an elevated alignment. This is due to the impacts an elevated alignment would have on adjacent buildings (some historic), visual quality, shadow, noise, land acquisitions and traffic, as well as the mitigations needed. The AA Study also identified HRT as the preferred mode for further study because it has the capacity to meet the anticipated ridership demand and would minimize the number of transfers.

Safety, both during construction and eventual operations, is one of Metro's highest priorities and is one of the key evaluation criteria in selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors requested more information on the safety of tunneling. 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 LPA during the preparation of the Final EIS/EIR to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR.

On most transit tunnel projects, significant portions of the alignment are constructed adjacent to or beneath buildings. The LPA passes beneath homes and schools in these neighborhoods because the curve radius required for subway tunnels is much wider than that required at a typical surface street intersection. The current alignment minimizes tunneling under buildings.

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

These geotechnical studies also determined that the Century City Santa Monica Station would cross the West Beverly Hills Lineament, a northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood Fault, which poses a significant safety risk to passengers at this station location. No evidence of faulting was found at the proposed Century City Constellation Station site.

321-1

**321-1**

Tunnels to the east and west of Century City pass through at least two active faults. However, there are numerous tools, designs, and construction means and methods that have been used elsewhere that can be used to safely tunnel through these fault zones.

Please refer to Section 8.8.4 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more detailed response to geotechnical concerns. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report*. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: [www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

Please refer to Section 2.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis Study, available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: [www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

61

1 are going to make noise drilling the grounds. MTA can't  
 2 make it elevated.  
 3 It will be so much easier. The traffic will be  
 4 better. More people will ride the train going to  
 5 Santa Monica. Gas is going up these days. More people are  
 6 losing their jobs. It makes me sad. Taxes are -- taxes  
 are  
 7 going up.  
 8 New York subway and Paris Metro can get the key  
 In  
 9 lime pie. MTA and L.A. County can get the key lime pie.  
 L.A.  
 10 the '50s and '60s there's where the red cars, people in  
 11 complain about the red cars. People in L.A. saying, "Take  
 12 the red cars out."  
 13 More people should come to these meetings. Why?  
 14 It will help more people to decide if there should be a  
 15 subway going to the sea or not, and people won't complain,  
 16 that's why you have a subway going to the sea or you have a  
 17 train onto the street. It's going to make problems. Cars  
 18 are going to crash into that train. The MTA meetings will  
 19 help you. It will make people feel --  
 20 MS. LITVAK: Jayson --  
 21 MR. WARSUMA: All right.  
 22 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.  
 23 MR. WARSUMA: Thank you.  
 24 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Ed, you'll tell me how to pronounce  
 25 your last name, followed by Michael Clark, and then

62

1 Glenn Bailey.

2 MR. MOFRAD: Good evening. My name is Ed Mofrad. I'm

3 long-time resident of Santa Monica. It's been my dream to  
4 actually one day take the subway from Santa Monica to  
5 Hollywood or to downtown L.A., and I'm really amazed that  
6 this dream may actually come true. I'm strongly for  
7 construction.

8 In case anybody hasn't noticed, and I don't mean  
9 to be sarcastic, but it's really hard right now to get from  
10 Santa Monica to Hollywood, such as to the eastern part of  
11 Hollywood. The great fathers of the city didn't design the  
12 roads to go there.

13 More buses don't add more roads, but supposedly  
14 new subways could take new routes that make getting from L.A.  
15 or Westside to Hollywood a lot easier. Also, I am -- I do  
16 speak several languages. I've lived in several other  
17 countries. I know Los Angeles is a joke, and I really mean  
18 it, in other languages about how it's so hard to get  
19 around.

20 Like so many people said, it would be a way for  
21 L.A. to catch the other world-class cities, like Chicago,  
22 San Francisco, New York, Paris, Santiago de Chile, and so  
23 forth.

24 Trains reduce pollution. Buses -- we have a  
25 congestion problem on our roads, as everybody knows. More  
buses simply add more congestion, there's more space taken

**322-1**

Your support for the Westside Subway Extension Project, and for Alternative 5 (Santa Monica Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) in particular, has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board approved 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.

While the Draft EIS/EIR demonstrated a significant market for transit improvements serving Santa Monica and West Hollywood, 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. Therefore, further study could occur should funding be identified and secured in the future. 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.

322-1

**323-1**

Your comment has been noted. The issues described are outside of the scope of this Project.

63

1 on our roads, whereas trains actually reduce that,  
 2 underground trains. That's all. Thank you.  
 3 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.  
 4 Michael Clark, then Glenn Bailey, and then  
 5 Juan Matute. By the way, did Chris Maladenoff come back in  
 6 the room? Okay. I'll ask again. At the moment then,  
 7 Juan Matute's speaker card is the one I have, but we'll  
 8 more. So just let us know.  
 9 Michael, go right ahead.  
 10 MR. CLARK: My name is Mike Clark. This is a status  
 11 update on my \$63.4 million Federal Transit Administration,  
 12 that's FTA, grant for the park district around the  
 13 Wilshire/Fairfax station and Museum Row.  
 14 We have reached consensus on the distributor  
 15 extension to Beverly/San Vicente to serve West Hollywood,  
 16 Cedars-Sinai, and Beverly Center. I have a proposal for  
 17 federal funding, which I have committed to discuss and  
 18 pursue with FTA.  
 19 With only minor envelope changes to the  
 20 MTA-provided preliminary engineering drawing for the  
 21 Beverly/Fairfax distributor station, all grant elements can  
 22 be maintained, including access and grant funds for the  
 23 critically important revitalization of historic Fairfax  
 24 Beverly to Clinton. The cooperation and support from both  
 25 FTA and MTA have been extraordinary.

take

323-1

from

1           Recently, Doug Failing, Executive Director, MTA  
2 responded to my request for cost estimate for both the  
3 distributor station under my grant and the potential  
4 extension by authorizing an excellent comprehensive TB  
5 evaluation and cost estimate under date of March 24, 2010.

6           I will continue under Gordon J. Linton's written  
7 federal instruction and complete FTA's private-sector  
8 disclosure requirements. Documentation, its bipartisan  
9 nature, this initiative started when the Administrator of  
10 Federal Transit sent me a written request to submit.

11           I will return to FTA's headquarters for continued  
12 processing to ensure timely grant funding so that the  
13 Wilshire/Fairfax station distributor connection and  
14 Beverly/Fairfax distributor station can open simultaneously  
15 as part of the initial MOS.

16           All three of these stations can provide extensive  
17 parking lot facilities on sites that offer outstanding  
18 development opportunities. We continue to make excellent  
19 progress. Thank you.

joint

20           MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

21           Glenn Bailey and then Juan Matute and anyone who  
22 wants to speak after that, we need to get a card in from  
23 you.

24           Go right ahead.

25           MR. BAILEY: My name is Glenn Bailey. I am a chair of

65

324-1

however, 1 the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Advisory Committee;

2 I'm speaking as an individual tonight.

3 I realize that this main focus is the alignments,

4 the routes, but whatever route and whatever station you

5 select, you need to include consideration -- full

6 consideration for accommodating bicycle access in terms of

7 getting to the stations as well as into the stations as

well 8 as into the -- onto the trains.

9 This was not done adequately, actually hardly at

10 all, for the red line station -- for the red line or for

the 11 purple line, and we're paying the consequences now.

Shortly 12 after the red line opened, there was so many cyclists

13 arriving at the North Hollywood Station that they had to

14 continually put more and more bicycle parking racks. Until

15 very recently, it was very difficult to even get -- be

16 accommodated on the trains.

17 So I'm putting that plea in for this planning from

18 the get-go, because we've been criticized that we weren't

19 there when the Sepulveda Boulevard and the 405 project was

20 being developed, so now, hopefully, this is early enough in

21 the process that you'll fully accommodate bicycle access to

22 and parking as well.

23 Most of the trips are within two to four miles.

If 24 you're not providing parking to the stations, then a lot of

25 local people can arrive there by bicycle, and either be

**324-1**

Your comment in support of Alternative 3 (Santa Monica Extension) and your comments regarding bicycle parking have been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

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

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

66

able 1 accommodated with very limited space for parking, or be  
 2 to take their bicycle to the next leg of their trip.  
 3 I used to ride the bus to downtown, and that was  
 4 truly the slow boat to China until the red line opened up.  
 5 And, you know, it seems to be a lot more efficient to have  
 than 6 one driver carrying hundreds and hundreds of passengers  
 7 one driver on a bus that's stuck in traffic carrying just a  
 8 fraction of those. So I support this all the way to  
 9 Santa Monica.  
 10 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. Thank you very much.  
 11 Can we keep it down in the room, please? There's,  
 12 I don't know, something about this room. I'm hearing a lot  
 13 of the background noise.  
 14 Juan Matute. Did Chris come back? Okay. And are  
 15 there other people who want to speak after Juan? Turn in  
 16 your cards. Raise your hand, we'll get you a card.  
 17 Go ahead. Step right up. I'm going to ask again  
 18 when he's done.  
 19 MR. MATUTE: Hi. My name is Juan Matute. I just want  
 20 to talk a little bit about the cost of the project.  
 21 \$4.2 billion seems like a lot of money, but it's  
 22 really an investment. Moving people along the red line now  
 23 costs Metro about -- the neighborhood of about \$2 a  
 24 passenger for operations cost. For buses, it's at least  
 make 25 three times that amount for passengers, and fares don't

**324-1**

- 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 Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process. Please 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](http://www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports).

67

325-1

1 up anywhere near that amount. So this is really an  
2 investment.

3 We spend \$1.2 million of local money, we get  
4 \$3 billion of federal money, and then, in the future, it  
5 costs Metro less to operate the system. So if they want  
to,  
cheaper 6 they don't have to raise fares as much, because it's  
7 to operate rail than buses.

8 One of the things that Measure R did was give  
9 20 percent to transit operations, which is -- has reduced  
10 the need to increase fares until 2011. So fares are going  
11 up. If you look at other transit systems in the country,  
delay 12 fares have gone up considerably. Metro's been able to  
13 that -- that pressure during this down economy because of  
14 Measure R.

15 So there's a lot of good things that Measure R  
did,  
16 and one of them is the immediate impact on bus fares, and  
17 the other is the reduced cost of moving people around L.A.  
18 via transit.

19 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

20 Are there other people who wish to speak? Are  
21 there other people who wish to speak tonight? Okay. With  
22 that -- hang on. We're almost done. First of all, I want  
23 to thank you all for coming tonight and for participating  
as

24 this is our last of our five public hearings. So I have to  
25 thank the entire team of staff and consultants.

**325-1**

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

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

1                   This has been a long, hard road, and I know how  
2 tired we are, but I thank everyone who is a part of this  
3 team.

4                   And please get your comments in to us by  
5 October 18th, and then we'll go to the Board on  
6 October 28th, and the board is up here that has more  
7 information. And, again, it's all available online,  
8 metro.net/westside.

9                   Thank you again, and with that, we'll conclude the  
10 public hearing.

11                   (Hearing concluded at 7:41 p.m.)

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