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Santa Monica, California, Wednesday, September 29, 2010

6:15 p.m.

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

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

(Spanish translation)

MS. LITVAK: Great. Thank you.

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

Okay. The Westside Subway Extension Transit Corridor Extended Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report was released on September 3rd, 2010, along with the notice of intent to hold the public hearings in compliance with the National Environmental
Policy Act, NEPA, and the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA. The Federal Transit Administration, FTA, is the lead agency for the purposes of NEPA, and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Metro, is the lead agency for the purposes of CEQA. Both agencies prepared the draft EIS/EIR.

The notice of availability and intent to hold public hearings was published in the Federal Register, State of California Clearinghouse, Los Angeles Times, La Opinion, Ni Tai Sun (phonetic), and filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk. The notices were published on September 3rd, 2010. Copies of the draft EIS/EIR are available for public review at the Beverly Hills Public Library, Donald Bruce Kaufman Brentwood Library, Fairfax Library, Felipe De Neve Library, Francis H.G. Hollywood Regional Library, John C. Fremont Library, Memorial Library, Metro's Transportation Library, Pio Pico Koreatown Library, Robertson Branch Library, Santa Monica Main Library, West Hollywood Public Library, West Los Angeles Regional Library, Westwood Library, Wilshire Library, and in the back, in the anteroom back there, for the duration of the time we're here this evening.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

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

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

I invite -- we also have available -- we have it available for you in this disk format tonight, and I invite you to start with the executive summary, which is a very brief overview, but it does touch on all of the points, and then if there's anything in there that is of particular interest to you or strikes you as interesting, you can then
delve into the document itself. There are -- there's the main document and all its chapters and appendices, and then online, there's a bunch of technical reports.

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

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

There's a number of things we'd especially like to hear from you tonight, although you're welcome to comment on anything. Do you have any comments on the impacts or the mitigation measures that are discussed in the draft EIS/EIR?

Are there any additional questions you have? Is there more information you need that you would like us to look into
during the final EIS/EIR and give you more information about it?

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

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

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

We'll bring you a blank one. If you need one, just raise your hand, we'll bring you a blank form, and if you need -- and if you filled it out, just wave it about, and we'll come get it from you.
In addition, you were handed these forms tonight. You can use them to turn in written comments. You can do that tonight. Please write legibly. If you took the time to write your comments down, we really want to understand them the way you meant them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although we have -- these fact sheets all have the same picture on the cover, but if you read in the purple bar, it will tell you what it's about. Some of that's summarized in the facts sheet that says, "Performance of Alternatives Under Study."
We've also had some very focused meetings. Crenshaw Station, tunnelling and alignments, we also have a fact sheet on tunnelling. I invite you to take a look at a new one and, again, wide participation.

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

Hold on one moment.

(Pause in the proceedings)

MS. LITVAK: Okay. So anyway, so there are seven alternatives under study. One is what's called, "No-Build."

That's sort of the baseline, which is, what do we do if we don't build anything? What does growth and travel and traffic look like? And that gets compared, and we compare to that.

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

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

The first one ends at Westwood/UCLA, and the second...
one goes just a tad further to the V.A. Hospital, and then
we have three others that go -- that are beyond the funding
scenario, extending all the way to Santa Monica and then
two versions that include the West Hollywood extension.

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

Based on the -- okay. Basically, two years ago
there was no money to do any of this. With the passage of
Measure R, there's money allocated over 30 years or so to a
series of projects and programs and -- all over the county.

There's about -- there's $4.2 billion for this
project to be built in three phases out to Westwood in
2036. We're working very hard to try and accelerate that so we
can get everything done in ten years, which would put us in
Westwood by the end of the decade, and we would build it in
one phase rather than three phases.

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

MR. MIEGER: Okay. Well, thanks very much for coming
tonight. We're out in Santa Monica. This is our fifth of
five public hearings. I see some familiar faces, but I'm
just going to give you a really high-level overview of the
environmental document, and -- and, basically, to tell you
that there's a couple of things we're trying to do with
It's a joint document between Metro and L.A. County MTA and the Federal Transit Administration, who is our federal lead agency for this. And the reason for that partnership is that we have a half-cent sales tax that was approved here in Los Angeles County that's applied to our transit system for bus, rail, and highways.

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

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

But the purpose of the environmental -- a lot of you may read environmental documents for all kinds of different projects, but the first bullet up there is that we have to evaluate how they perform in terms of how well they provide transit benefits, because part of this is, we're competing with all the other cities around the country that also want to build these same types of projects, and the competition for subway money, for light rail, for bus rapid transit is very competitive around the country, and we have
to show that our projects are as good or better than other projects in other cities that are also competing for those funds.

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

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

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

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

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

And this is very important, too, because if there's an impact, we have to have a mitigation measure, and those mitigation measures have to be paid for as a part of the
project. So it's very, very important, if there's a mitigation measure, that we find the funding to pay for it as part of the project, and that's part of the outreach process, is to identify whether those impacts are being mitigated.

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

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

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

In terms of the construction impacts, the main difference between a subway and a light rail or a bus rapid transit is the subway is completely underground and, as a
result of that, most of your impacts are building it. That's the time when you have to dig the -- the street up and the areas where the stations are, build the subway station.

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

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

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

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

This is just a typical cross-section of the
about

depths of the tunnels that we have. They are normally
50 to 70 feet below the surface. In some areas in
Beverly Hills, they get down to 100 or 130 feet deep.
They're not at all like the tunnels that you might
see in New York, where they were built 80 to 100 years ago
and you were -- just excavated from the surface, and
just below the city street. These are deep-bore tunnels
that go very, very deep, and they're generally down below
all the utilities and other things that happen in the first
10 to 20 feet below the surface. At the station areas,
though, they do come closer to the top.

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

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

In the station areas, we have to have a place for
the entrance, and those usually aren't -- there's not
enough
room on the sidewalk, so we have to work with property
owners in adjacent properties to find the location for that
entrance to the subway.
And for those of you who have been into downtown Los Angeles and visited, you'll see examples of this where the subway entrance is built into the existing building or a new building. Up on Hollywood Boulevard where the Kodak Theatre is on Hollywood and Highland, we actually put the entrance into an existing building. So it's part of that building and not a separate structure.

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

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

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

The tunnel depths. People are concerned, "Are we going to hear it? Is it going to be noisy? I've been to New York. I've felt that vibration from the subways."
Again, we're very deep. The soil here is very porous and soft. It absorbs it like a sponge. But in some cases where the tracks get closer to the surface and there might be some vibration, we put dampeners on the track, and there's mitigation measures to put dampeners in to soften that to make sure that there is no vibration on the surface.

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

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

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

Adverse impacts, I want to say there's also the beneficial impacts, and one of the main reasons why the voters of L.A. County voted, by over two-thirds, to fund this project and others is because of the types of benefits.
If you’re going from Pershing Square to UCLA today, either driving or by our rapid bus, that's about a 54-minute trip. And because of the traffic we have on Wilshire and Santa Monica Boulevards, it's very slow driving, whether you're in a car or bus.

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

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

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

Little bit about some choices that we have to make when we build this. There's a few choices in the EIS. Basically, we have to pick one of those five alternatives.
There's five that Jody mentioned on the maps. We have to make a recommendation in October to our Board about which one of those five should go forward.

As she mentioned, the funding is limited. We can't afford to build the projects that come all the way to Santa Monica and include all of West Hollywood, about 17 miles of subway. We can afford to build about 8 or 9 miles. And so the only two alternatives that are fundable now are the ones that go to either Westwood/UCLA or to the V.A. Hospital, which are Alternatives 1 or 2, but we have to make that recommendation.

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

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

There's a lot of benefits if we can go one more station west, particularly for those of you who live out here on the far Westside. Getting across the 405 freeway, it's a real barrier to traffic, because not all the streets
go through. And so a lot of people in our scoping meetings said, "Look, if you -- rather than just stopping at Westwood Village, if you can go one more station, that would really help us out. If we don't get the line all the way to Santa Monica, at least we can take a bus or get to the V.A. and get on there before a lot of the traffic backup that we have." So the question is, you know, which one -- where would that station be?

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

So there -- the Crenshaw Light Rail Project from Wilshire, and should it connect at Crenshaw or La Brea or La Cienega or San Vicente.

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

I'm sorry. Okay. Move it along. Move it along.

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

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

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

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

This is, basically, Westwood. That's the V.A. Hospital. If we actually can -- I'll talk about this one -- because it's pretty close to Santa Monica -- a little
If we stop at UCLA, we expect to have about 46,000 boardings per day at each of those stations. If we go to the V.A. Hospital, we pick up about 6,000 more riders.

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

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

Crenshaw Station. Basically, just a summary.

This is the cost. The daily boardings, it's about 42- to 4300, that's a relatively -- it's not really low, but it's at the low end of our range of ridership per station. So to spend that amount of money to get that ridership may not be cost-effective.

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

But there is a very, very good bus line at Crenshaw Boulevard, a lot of transfers at Wilshire and Crenshaw. So if there weren't a station there to transfer
to, you'd have to -- where would those station transfers be accommodated? Would the bus, at the Crenshaw one, go over to Western and transfer there, or would it transfer farther west at La Brea? So there are some plusses and minuses of having a Crenshaw station.

   Multiple station locations. I think I'll talk, maybe, about the last two at -- at Westwood/UCLA and Westwood/V.A. At Westwood/UCLA, the station would either

be under Wilshire Boulevard at Westwood, right at that major intersection under the street, or there's a UCLA property,

a lot between Veteran and Gayley, which is a surface parking lot today right where the BruinGo Shuttle is and the L.A. FlyAway Bus, and we can pop the station off street.

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

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

   UCLA's been working with us really cooperatively. They'd like to help us get it on their property. They want to keep the rights to develop that property at some point
the future, so they would like to be able to build over the
subway to help that happen. They also have their own bus
system that takes people up to campus.

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

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

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

They also are concerned that the station may be
too popular, and there may be a lot of people coming into the
V.A. who aren't going to the V.A. and create congestion on
their campus and make it harder for them to treat the
veterans and people who need care there.
So there's a lot of decisions about which station
would be optimal and better from the point of view of the
V.A. Hospital.

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

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

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

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

And so those are all the types of choices we have
to make between these different alignments. So we're
looking for input between the three different alignments between Century City and Westwood, and we also have three alignments between Century City and Beverly Hills.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On October 28th, we will go to the Metro Board of
Directors and ask them to consider this. This will be their opportunity to do that. Our recommendations for the Locally Preferred Alternative, we'll be asking them to adopt that. We will also be asking them to narrow the options for further analysis in the final EIS/EIR. Some of these choices that have to be made along the way, it is possible that the Board will narrow those down to only one and ask us to continue to work on that in the final. In some cases, they may keep all the alternatives out there, or they may narrow it some. So we'll see what happens when we go to the Board in October.

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

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

As I said, it is during this process that we will -- the final process that we will be developing the responses to the public comments, and those will be provided when the final EIS/EIR is published.
engineering will go on. We will get those cost estimates
nailed down. A lot of the details about the station
alignments and the station designs are -- will be worked
out.

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

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

This is all up here behind me, so I'm not going to
talk about it right now other than to note two things. One
is we've had a very active and robust involvement on the
Web

with social networking. We have over 1,700 people on
Facebook. Please join us there, and we're tweeting
tonight.

However, comments on Facebook or Twitter, which
have been a part of the effort, we really can't include as
part of the official record right now. So to get your
comments on the record, take advantage of these other
methods. And, again, that's on the board behind me, that
will be here for you, and get your comments to us by
October 18th. Please keep talking to each other on Facebook and to us. In fact, send us your comments anyway. Okay. We're done after tonight. We're all really tired, but thank you all for coming. So here's what's going to happen. There's going to be two minutes per speaker, four if you need interpretation. If you didn't indicate on your form, when you come up, let us know. I'm going to call three names at a time. Please line up and be prepared. Do you all see the microphone here to my right, your left? That's where I'd like you to come. I'd like you to line up against that railing over there.

Those of you in the front, if you're called, there's a middle aisle here, please walk around, and go there. Please state your name clearly. This lovely lady in the front corner is our court reporter, and she is trying to record everything you're saying for the transcript. So we want you to state your name clearly and speak clearly so we can accurately get your comments.

We ask everyone to be respectful of all the speakers tonight. Are we going to turn the lights up, Christian? So whether you agree or disagree, we listen to everybody. Everybody has the right to express their opinions, and some of that public comment interaction...
As I said, we're not responding to the comments tonight, and those comments will be addressed in writing in the final EIS/EIR.

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

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

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

Barbara, please step right up. Get very close. Everyone get really close to the microphone. By the way, 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 we'll start counting down your two minutes. Go right ahead.
4    MS. LOTT-HOLLAND: Okay. I am Barbara Lott-Holland, co-chair of the Bus Riders Union. I am here today because the MTA board is supporting the mayor's Subway to the Sea Plan, which will continue to bankrupt the Agency.
5    Rail, as a mode of public transportation, is not suited for the transit needs of people in Los Angeles. Evidence of the past projects have shown that rail has not significantly reduced the amount of cars on the streets and the highways, and it will consume more money -- more money than a first-class bus system.
6    This is not New York or any of the other eastern cities. L.A. is spread out, both in population and economic activity, and as such, it generates the complex pattern of transportation that needs -- that needs -- calls for a major investment in the capital operations of a bus transit system to reduce the funds for the construction of new rail. We support either the No-Build or the TSM significant expansion of bus service. Thank you.
7    MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Philip Obaza, followed by Monroe Jones, and then Ian Crossfield. And by the way, if I mispronounce or butcher your name, I do...
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.
apologize, but that's why we ask you to start by getting really close to the microphone and stating it clearly.

Go ahead.

MR. OBAZA: My name is Philip Obaza. I've been a transit rider for about three years now. I do not own a car in Los Angeles. I'm in full support of the Westside Subway Extension. I can't wait for it, like many other people whom I've spoken to.

Major points that I wanted to make, I support the station location in Century City at Constellation and Avenue of the Stars, aside from the higher ridership and the fact that it's not located along a fault line. I've heard a lot of people talking about noise complaints, vibration, the tunnelling, trains running, is that going to be a problem?

The red line runs under all kinds of public and private property. I've never heard a complaint about vibration or noise from trains from anyone that I know of. So I'm really hoping that that becomes the final station location.

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

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

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

Your comment 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...
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.
MR. JONES: Good evening, Metro staff and bus riders. My name is Monroe Jones, and I’m a Metro transit rider. I’m also an Access transit rider. I think we should have a station at Wilshire and Crenshaw, because there’s a lot of people who have a lot of disability and who are disabled, like myself. People should have a special location for -- for pickup at Wilshire and Crenshaw, because there’s a lot of people who are in wheelchairs who are four times more disabled than myself, and people shouldn’t have to have to wait for 30 minutes just for a bus or a train to show up. And, also, the Locally Preferred Alternative at Constellation and Avenue of the Stars should be -- should be taking place, and everybody should understand that every time that there -- someone is waiting for a bus or a train for 30 minutes, they tend to complain and get back in their car and drive around to find another bus station or a bus stop or anything. So I think that what’s going to happen is that if a station stop at Wilshire and Crenshaw takes place, then

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.

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

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

Ian Crossfield followed by Joel Covarrubias and then Peter Drembelas or Drembelas. Something like that. You'll say it when you come up. All right. Ian, go right ahead. And that's Joel walking up there, and, Peter, if you could line up here, that would be great. Go ahead.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report and the Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives and the Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
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.
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.
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.
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.
1 Constellation, not under Santa Monica Boulevard, because
2 that's more centrally located in the Century City business
3 district.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Claims that the Constellation routes north and south will cause excessive vibration and noise are also nonsense. The draft EIR deals extensively with issues of noise and vibration in Section 4.6. This section describes, in detail, the standardized methodology Metro used for testing and predicting noise and vibration. It then lists its conclusions for 185 separate locations in the study area. On Page 4-128, the draft EIR states, "The build alternatives would not result in operational noise impacts. As for ground-born noise through the Constellation alignments, this means ground rumble, peak decibel levels are expected to range between 32 and 38 decibels."

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

In short, please remember, Metro is responsible for the continuous improvement of an efficient system for entire L.A. County. Consider the entire county, not just
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Your comment regarding noise and vibration during operation has been noted.

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

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

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

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

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

With these mitigation measures, there are no vibration-sensitive receivers that are predicted to exceed the FTA ground-borne vibration criteria during operation. Mitigation measure VIB-2 was added subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR due to the additional studies
Beverly Hills. Put the station where it will do the most good. Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

Peter, who will tell me how to pronounce his last name, and then Eric Romann, if you could line up over there, and then Joana Gaspar.

MR. DREMBELAS: Hi, I'm Peter Drembelas. I'm a resident of Los Angeles and a supporter of, I guess, the second alternative, ultimately Alternative 5. I think it's really important to use all of our resources, first with Alternative 2, and I wanted to voice my support for the Constellation station.

I agree with the previous speaker that the Santa Monica location of the station would waste half of its area with residential — specifically with residential that clearly doesn’t care about public transportation.

I also want to respond to the claim that rapid transit doesn’t reduce the — what was it? Travel time for cars in the city? Which I don’t think is at all the purpose of rapid transit. It’s to reduce the amount of time it takes for an individual to get to another place, not through their car, but through an alternative. So thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

Eric Romann followed by Joana Gaspar and then Rosa Miranda.

Conducted during preparation of this Final EIS/EIR.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Section 8.8.9 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more detailed response to traffic congestion reductions. Information on how the LPA would affect travel in the region and Study Area is presented in Section 3.4, Section 3.5 and Chapter 7 of the Final EIS/EIR. The Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives provides a summary of the updated travel forecast results for the Final EIS/EIR. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
MR. ROMANN: Good evening. Eric Romann from the Bus Riders Union, also, a daily bus rider. So a couple things.

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

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

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

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

We can run -- expand bus service by 20 percent county-wide and pay for that for 15 years. So 20 percent expanded county bus service all throughout the county. 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.
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.
done. There's no need for the Subway to the Sea when there's the bus-only lanes in the works. This is important. It will reduce the traffic by restricting the space that autos dominate and attract more riders to use bus service. This would be less money than the Subway to the Sea. In the auto capital in the country, we need to reduce traffic now.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Rosa Miranda and then Esperanza Martinez and, Barbara, I got a second card for you, so I'm going to set that aside. So after Esperanza will be Michelle Lopez. This is going to be four minutes? Okay. Great. Thank you.

MS. MIRANDA: Good afternoon, everybody, my name is Rosa Miranda, and I'm part of the Bus Riders Union. I support the no-construction option, and I want them to expand the option, the TSM, and I significantly support more bus services. This project sounds very nice, but the reality is different. This will be a billion-dollar expense, and this train will not cover the passengers' needs in Los Angeles County. We need projects for the short term, like the Bus Riders Union's plan, and the Clean Air and Economical...
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 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.
Justice Plan. This plan is more economical, $2.1 billion, and this plan is more justified. It's a lot more fair. That would help the bus riders' needs in Los Angeles County. 500 new buses in county, and not just on one street. Bus-only lanes in all of Los Angeles County, and this would reduce the congestion in all the streets and also contamination and also let lower rates to 2007 (sic), and the expansion of the services on the weekends and, also, at nights. This is a true project that is really going towards --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

THE INTERPRETER: Thank you.

MS. MIRANDA: And this is really a challenge to the cars, and what personnel manages is a green train. With one percent of reduction of cars, it's not really a green plan. We really want them to challenge cars and reducing the greenhouse effects and not projects that just benefit some of the contractors. I'd like to ask, do you have enough to build with funds of the F Measure? Where will these funds come from? Once again, I support the option of no construction, and I want you to expand and take the option of TSM, and I significantly support more bus services. Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Excellent timing
there.
Esperanza Martinez followed by Michelle Lopez and then James McCormick.

MS. MARTINEZ: My name is Esperanza Martinez, the organizer with the Bus Riders Union. The Bus Riders Union is a civil rights and environmental justice organization that has been fighting, for the last 15 years, to create a first-class bus system in the L.A. County.

For the BRU, the Subway to the Sea has always represented a politically motivated boondoggle project with the potential to massively drain operating dollars from the existing bus system. A move that will result in civil rights violations.

The first ten years of MTA's investment in rail construction created deplorable conditions for bus riders, who, by and large, are working class and communities of color. This led to a BRU-motivated Title VI lawsuit.

One thing that I want the audience to walk away knowing is that the operation of this project will inevitably result in a significant reduction in existing bus service, and it has already started with two fare increases that we've seen in the last three years and a reduction of almost 500,000 hours in bus service.

The project, the alternative to build the subway to Westwood, would require about $36 million a year to operate.

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.
Measure R, five percent rail operating dollars for the entire county will only generate about $30 million in one year. The EIR shows that if it costs $48 million in 2035 to run this subway, that $35 million will also come from existing bus service. So we support the No-Build alternative or the TSM alternative. Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

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

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

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

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

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

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.
December, showed that in the year 2035, the extension from Western to Wilshire to Westwood will show a less-than-one-percent reduction in cars.

The MTA is planning to pay for this project from bus riders' sweat. The MTA plans on raising the fares 14 times in 30 years. This is bus riders paying for less and bus service being reduced.

Instead of wasting $9 billion on a project that would help traffic congestion, invest on the bus system. We have the Bus Riders Union Clean Air and Economic Justice Plan, which will only cost $2.1 billion and consist of bus-only lanes, adding 500 more buses, lowering the bus fares to how it used to be in 2007, and improve weekend service, which can provide county-wide traffic relief and create permanent green jobs.

We support either the No-Build alternative or the significant expanded TSM alternative. Thank you.

James McCormick, followed by Kedar Iyer and -- okay. Let's try this one. Chris Maladenoff (phonetic) or something close to that, but you'll correct me when you get up here.

I'm James McCormick. I'm a resident of Los Angeles, and chairman of the Subway to the Sea Coalition. I was also the president of the Coalition for...
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.
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.
Rapid Transit, which has advocated for the expansion of the subway system since the early ’70s. We’ve come a long way, although we did get stopped in 1998 for 12 years, in building a major rapid transit system in the city. We are, in fact, very far behind any other major first-world city in the world, and we’re suffering the consequences throughout the city of congestion.

Building the subway is not intended to reduce mobility, and mobility for all of the citizens to have access to all parts of the city.

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

On the other hand, if the wisdom of the Board is that Alternative 1 is the only one that is funded, I strongly recommend that we use the terminus plan for UCLA.
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.
The second part I would like to point out is, as it relates to students who are currently at UCLA and live in Westwood, of our 40,000 students, 30,000 are right now graduate students or third-of fourth-year students who are looking for jobs or internships, many times in the downtown area.

Extending the subway to the Westwood area would be the biggest competitive boost we could receive in competing for downtown internships and jobs, because many of us don’t have cars and don’t have a reliable way of getting there into downtown and, as such, are forced to compete for local jobs rather than citywide jobs.

We see investing in the subway as investing in the future of students and leaders of the city and a way to move our city into the 21st century.

And, as the last thing, for the Locally Preferred Alternative, I would like to voice my support for the UCLA location, because it will be connected to the LAX FlyAway Shuttle and to a campus that takes us to the main campus.

Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

Chris Maladenoff, followed by Elan Glasser.

Where’s Chris? You must be Elan.

MR. GLASSER: Yeah.

MS. LITVAK: Okay. Step right up. Following Elan will

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.
be Lucy Dyke and then Joel Epstein.

MR. GLASSER: My name is Elan Glasser. I'm a Santa Monica resident. I strongly support the Westside Subway Extension, and I urge the Board to select either -- preferably Alternative 5 or, at a minimum, Alternative 3 and build the line all the way to Santa Monica.

When voters, by over two-thirds, approved Measure R, many, many, many of them believed that they were voting for a Subway to the Sea. There's widespread community support, not just in Santa Monica but throughout the county, for building the subway all the way to the sea. Part of the reason is, it's not just benefitting residents of Santa Monica, it allows residents from all over the county to access, not just the beach, but the various attractions in the Santa Monica area. So this is not just something that benefits residents, but it benefits the county as a whole. It also has the most number of trips, according to the projections.

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

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

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

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

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

We support the approach with connecting

Appendix H - Response to Comments

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.
cultural/educational/entertainment activity centers
together

with heavy rail subway systems. Connecting Santa Monica to
this system provides the greatest environmental benefit of
all alternatives considered.

According to the EIR, adding Santa Monica to the
subway system would increase total ridership by over
25 percent. Providing employees and visitors with an
alternative to the car has the potential to ameliorate the
regional and local congestion issues. Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

Joel Epstein and then Lauren Cole and then
Irwin Chen.

MR. EPSTEIN: Thanks. I want to thank Metro for these
really terrific presentations, very informative, and I
welcome and appreciate the opportunity to speak.

I want to express my support for a stop at
Constellation in Century City. I think that's a much
preferred alternative, given the volume of people who work
in the area, and I think putting it on Santa Monica
Boulevard would be a waste and you would lose a good number
of riders that way.

Additionally, I want to express my support for
building as far and as much as you can now, ultimately, all
the way to Santa Monica. If you can't go all the way to
Santa Monica, please, please go all the way to the V.A., or, as some other speaker this evening mentioned, perhaps something at Federal. I like that alternative as well. I'm a 720 -- I'm an Angeleno. I'm a 720 bus rider. I ride the 720 to Western and Wilshire and get off there and ride the subway, the purple line, downtown, and it is absurd. I just cannot wait until the subway goes all the way to Santa Monica. I think it will serve all Angelenos of all races, of all colors, of all ethnicities, and I just hope we can build this as quickly as possible.

Thanks.

---

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

Irwin Chen, followed by John Trautmann, and then Jayson Warsuma.

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives and the LPA selection process.
Your comment in support of the Century City Constellation Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors decided to continue to study both station location options in Century City (Santa Monica Boulevard and Constellation Boulevard) to address concerns raised by the community regarding locating a station directly on a seismic fault and the safety of tunneling under homes and schools.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Section 8.8.6 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns.
related to the Westwood/UCLA Station. Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The *Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report* provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Westwood/UCLA Station following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the *Westside Subway Extension Westwood/UCLA Station and the Westwood/VA Hospital Station Locations Report* for a comparison of the two Westwood/UCLA locations. In addition, the *Westside Subway Extension Station Entrance Location Report and Recommendations* provides a comparison of the potential entrance locations at Westwood Boulevard, Gayley Avenue and Veteran Avenue for both the On-Street and Off-Street Stations. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.
Your support for Alternative 5 (Santa Monica Extension plus West Hollywood Extension) has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Only Alternatives 1 and 2 are affordable within the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and between them, Alternative 2 provides significantly higher ridership and better cost effectiveness. Additionally, Alternative 2 serves the VA Hospital and other communities west of the I-405 more effectively.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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
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.
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 ExtensionAlternatives 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.
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.
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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 unmitigable 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.
are going to make noise drilling the grounds. MTA can't make it elevated. It will be so much easier. The traffic will be better. More people will ride the train going to Santa Monica. Gas is going up these days. More people are losing their jobs. It makes me sad. Taxes are going up. New York subway and Paris Metro can get the key lime pie. MTA and L.A. County can get the key lime pie. In the '50s and '60s there's where the red cars, people in L.A. complain about the red cars. People in L.A. saying, "Take the red cars out." More people should come to these meetings. Why? It will help more people to decide if there should be a subway going to the sea or not, and people won't complain, that's why you have a subway going to the sea or you have a train onto the street. It's going to make problems. Cars are going to crash into that train. The MTA meetings will help you. It will make people feel --

MS. LITVAK: Jayson --
MR. WARSUNA: All right.
MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.
MR. WARSUNA: Thank you.
MS. LITVAK: Okay. Ed, you'll tell me how to pronounce your last name, followed by Michael Clark, and then
Glenn Bailey.

MR. MOFRAD: Good evening. My name is Ed Mofrad. I'm a long-time resident of Santa Monica. It's been my dream to actually one day take the subway from Santa Monica to Hollywood or to downtown L.A., and I'm really amazed that this dream may actually come true. I'm strongly for construction.

In case anybody hasn't noticed, and I don't mean to be sarcastic, but it's really hard right now to get from Santa Monica to Hollywood. The great fathers of the city didn't design the roads to go there. More buses don't add more roads, but supposedly new subways could take new routes that make getting from L.A. or Westside to Hollywood a lot easier. Also, I am -- I do speak several languages. I've lived in several other countries. I know Los Angeles is a joke, and I really mean it, in other languages about how it's so hard to get around.

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

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

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.
on our roads, whereas trains actually reduce that,
underground trains. That’s all. Thank you.
MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.
Michael Clark, then Glenn Bailey, and then
Juan Matute. By the way, did Chris Maladenoff come back in
the room? Okay. I’ll ask again. At the moment then,
Juan Matute’s speaker card is the one I have, but we’ll
take
more. So just let us know.
Michael, go right ahead.
MR. CLARK: My name is Mike Clark. This is a status
update on my $63.4 million Federal Transit Administration,
where is FTA, grant for the park district around the
Wilshire/Fairfax station and Museum Row.
We have reached consensus on the distributor
extension to Beverly/San Vicente to serve West Hollywood,
Cedars-Sinai, and Beverly Center. I have a proposal for
federal funding, which I have committed to discuss and
pursue with FTA.
With only minor envelope changes to the
MTA-provided preliminary engineering drawing for the
Beverly/Fairfax distributor station, all grant elements can
be maintained, including access and grant funds for the
critically important revitalization of historic Fairfax
from
Beverly to Clinton. The cooperation and support from both
FTA and MTA have been extraordinary.
Recently, Doug Failing, Executive Director, MTA responded to my request for cost estimate for both the distributor station under my grant and the potential extension by authorizing an excellent comprehensive TB evaluation and cost estimate under date of March 24, 2010. I will continue under Gordon J. Linton's written federal instruction and complete FTA's private-sector disclosure requirements. Documentation, its bipartisan nature, this initiative started when the Administrator of Federal Transit sent me a written request to submit. I will return to FTA's headquarters for continued processing to ensure timely grant funding so that the Wilshire/Fairfax station distributor connection and Beverly/Fairfax distributor station can open simultaneously as part of the initial MOS. All three of these stations can provide extensive parking lot facilities on sites that offer outstanding joint development opportunities. We continue to make excellent progress. Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

MR. BAILEY: My name is Glenn Bailey. I am a chair of
I realize that this main focus is the alignments, the routes, but whatever route and whatever station you select, you need to include consideration -- full consideration for accommodating bicycle access in terms of getting to the stations as well as into the stations as well as into the -- onto the trains.

This was not done adequately, actually hardly at all, for the red line station -- for the red line or for the purple line, and we're paying the consequences now. Shortly after the red line opened, there was so many cyclists arriving at the North Hollywood Station that they had to continually put more and more bicycle parking racks. Until very recently, it was very difficult to even get -- be accommodated on the trains.

So I'm putting that plea in for this planning from the get-go, because we've been criticized that we weren't there when the Sepulveda Boulevard and the 405 project was being developed, so now, hopefully, this is early enough in the process that you'll fully accommodate bicycle access to and parking as well. Most of the trips are within two to four miles.

If you're not providing parking to the stations, then a lot of local people can arrive there by bicycle, and either be
accommodated with very limited space for parking, or be able to take their bicycle to the next leg of their trip. I used to ride the bus to downtown, and that was truly the slow boat to China until the red line opened up. And, you know, it seems to be a lot more efficient to have one driver carrying hundreds and hundreds of passengers than one driver on a bus that’s stuck in traffic carrying just a fraction of those. So I support this all the way to Santa Monica.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you. Thank you very much. Can we keep it down in the room, please? There’s, I don’t know, something about this room. I’m hearing a lot of the background noise.

Juan Matute. Did Chris come back? Okay. And are there other people who want to speak after Juan? Turn in your cards. Raise your hand, we’ll get you a card. Go ahead. Step right up. I’m going to ask again when he’s done.

MR. MATUTE: Hi. My name is Juan Matute. I just want to talk a little bit about the cost of the project. $4.2 billion seems like a lot of money, but it’s really an investment. Moving people along the red line now costs Metro about -- the neighborhood of about $2 a passenger for operations cost. For buses, it’s at least three times that amount for passengers, and fares don’t make
up anywhere near that amount. So this is really an investment. We spend $1.2 million of local money, we get $3 billion of federal money, and then, in the future, it costs Metro less to operate the system. So if they want to, they don't have to raise fares as much, because it's cheaper to operate rail than buses.

One of the things that Measure R did was give 20 percent to transit operations, which is -- has reduced the need to increase fares until 2011. So fares are going up. If you look at other transit systems in the country, fares have gone up considerably. Metro's been able to \[delay\] that -- that pressure during this down economy because of Measure R. So there's a lot of good things that Measure R did, and one of them is the immediate impact on bus fares, and the other is the reduced cost of moving people around L.A. via transit.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

Are there other people who wish to speak? Are there other people who wish to speak tonight? Okay. With that -- hang on. We're almost done. First of all, I want to thank you all for coming tonight and for participating as this is our last of our five public hearings. So I have to thank the entire team of staff and consultants.

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

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

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

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