Transcript from Westwood Public Hearing and Responses

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

WESTSIDE SUBWAY EXTENSION PUBLIC HEARING

JODY FEERST LITVAK, MANAGER

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

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Los Angeles, California

Tuesday, September 21, 2010

Reported by:

DANA JACOBS
CSR No. 13499

Job No:
B5640NCO

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

WESTSIDE SUBWAY EXTENSION PUBLIC HEARING

JODY FEERST LITVAK, MANAGER

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

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at Westwood United Methodist Church, at 10497 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, commencing at 6:15 p.m. on Tuesday, September 21, 2010, reported by DANA JACOBS, CSR No. 13499, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California.

APPEARANCES:

JODY FEERST LITVAK
MANAGER
REGIONAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAMS

DAVID L. MIEGER, A.I.C.P.
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER
WESTSIDE PLANNING

I N D E X

PUBLIC COMMENTS PAGE

Los Angeles, California, Tuesday, September 21, 2010
6:15 p.m.

MS. LITVAK: We're going to start the public hearing now. Thank you so much for coming this evening. My name is Jody Litvak. I'm with Metro and joining me tonight is David Mieger, and he and I are going to be giving the presentation.

Before we get into the meat of the presentation, for those of you who have been to our community meetings before, this is somewhat different. This is an official public hearing, and therefore, there's rules and things that govern this that makes this somewhat more structured than what you may be used to seeing.

One of those things is a formal statement I need to read at the beginning of the public hearing, so I'm going to do that right now.

The Westside Subway Extension Transit Corridor Studies Draft and Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report was released on September 3rd, 2010, along with the notice of intent to hold the public hearings and 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 purposes of CEQA. Both agencies prepared the Draft EIS/EIR.

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

Copies of the Draft EIS/EIR are available for public review at the following venues: The Beverly Hills Public Library, the Donald Bruce Kaufman/Brentwood Library, the Fairfax Library, the Felipe de Neve Library, the Francis H.G. Hollywood Regional Library, the John C. Fremont Library, Memorial Library, the Metro Transportation Library, Pio Pico Koreatown Library, Robertson Branch Library, Santa Monica Main Library, West Hollywood Public Library, West Los Angeles Regional Library, Westwood Library and Wilshire Library.

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

stakeholders.

In addition, display ads about the public hearings were published in the Beverly Hills Courier, Beverly Hills Weekly, Jewish Journal, Korean Times, Larchmont Chronicle, Park Labrea/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 Web site. Information about the release of the Draft EIS/EIR and the hearings was also printed in brochure form and was distributed widely on Metro buses and trains, as well as hand delivered at key locations in the study area.

Brochures were also sent by U.S. Mail to a list of nearly 1,000 contacts in the project study area. The same information was also sent electronically to a distribution list of 1,790.

All of these materials, including information about how to find the Draft EIS, as well as more information about the Westside Subway Transit Corridor Study is on the web. Affidavits of publication and copies of detailed mailing lists are available upon request.

Team in the back, I didn't bring any of my props

up with me, so can I get copies of the speaker's cards, the written comments cards and all of the fact sheets. Thank you. My apologies for not doing that sooner.

This is an official public hearing on the Draft EIS/EIR, and Alex is standing here, which reminds me, if there's anyone who needs simultaneous translation into Spanish tonight, we have that available for you. You just need to raise your hand and let us know, and we'll hook you right up. Alex is going to take care of that for you.

If you want to comment tonight, to put your comments on the record verbally, I need you to fill out one of these forms. You may have picked one up on the way in. If you didn't pick one up and you want one or you decide you want one at any point during this evening's presentation, just raise your hand and we'll bring you one. If you decide you want to speak and you haven't turned it in yet, just fill it out and we'll pick it up and we'll take them when we're done with the presentation.

We always like it and appreciate it when our elected officials show up, and I want to welcome Ellen Isaacs, who is representing Assemblyman Feuer tonight in the back of the room. Thank you so much for coming. And you're here to listen tonight, Ellen, or did you want to -- she's hear to listen.

In addition to verbal comments tonight, we have these written comment forms. You're welcome to send us a letter or send us stuff by E-mail, and we have information on how to comment, but if you want to, you can fill this out and turn it in at the table in the back of the room and we'll take that from you or take that with you tonight and you can send it into us later, if you have a brilliant idea that you didn't think of tonight.

The purpose of tonight's meeting/hearing is to give you a brief summary of what's in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report, and I really mean a draft summary. This is the product of really three years' work, and there's no way that this substitutes for what's in that document, but we want to give you a brief overview.

I invite you all to read the document yourself. It's on the back table in print form. We have CD's available. I know it's daunting. Please start with the executive summary, which is not so daunting. It's about that much, and as you go through there, that really does give you an overview. If there's anything in there that piques your interest or you want to follow up on more later, you can then dig into the documents.

In addition to the draft giving you an overview of the draft document, we want to describe the decisions

that are coming up for choosing the locally preferred alternative. That's the required next step in the process. It's important for moving this forward into the final environmental review and for seeking the federal matching funds.

We're going to give you a summary of the next steps, leading up to action by the Metro Board of Directors. That is the decision making body. And then what is likely to happen after the Metro board makes their decision.

But most importantly, as I said, we're here to listen to public comments tonight. They will become part of the official record and the responses to those -- let me just say, we cannot respond during the course of the public hearing tonight.

The official responses will be developed in the final EIS/EIR, and they will be included in writing in that document later in 2011, but we have staff and consultants here who were talking to you before the public hearing started and will be around to talk to you after we conclude the public hearing, but official responses to your comments, as I said, will come in the final. But the main purpose is to listen to you.

There are a couple of things we would like to especially hear from you tonight. You're welcome to

comment on anything that you like, but we're most interested in hearing about what comments you have on the Draft EIS/EIR or possible mitigation measures that are in there.

If you have additional questions that you'd like to see answered in the final EIS/EIR or if there are things you want more information about that you'd like us to look into in the final, let us know, put that on the record.

As we make a recommendation for the LPA, the locally preferred alternative, do you have an opinion or comments or questions about the alternative choice, the station options, the alignment options or other things or do you have additional suggestions for us beyond the LPA.

And, again, comments, at this stage, if you want them included in the official record and for us to take a look at them in the final and respond to them, they have to be in by October 18th.

As I said, we're about three years into this. We started in 2007, late 2007, with an alternative analysis study. That took about 18 months. We wrapped it up in June 2009 and moved into the EIS/EIR about another 18 months, and we're getting close to the next yellow diamond on this chart here, which, again, is a Metro board decision point.

Moving forward from here, this is not the end of the analysis, by any means. There will be more work done in the final, so if there are areas that you think need more analysis, let us know, and we'll take a look at them in the next year.

There has been a lot of work done to date, as I said. And, again, this is intended tonight to be a very quick, brief overview, but I invite you to go back and take a look at some of the material that we have out there. If you want to know about decisions that were made during the alternatives analysis, that's online.

Last summer we were out and we talked a lot about subway construction, so if you're curious about how the subway tunnels or stations are constructed, please take a look at that.

Last fall we were out talking about station information. We had very targeted meetings in each area where people gathered around tables and we talked about stations in their areas and took input on that, if you have questions about what we were looking at and how that evolved.

In April and in October, we had information on how the alternatives performed, and we've had some focus meetings on some special issues.

I do want to let you know, in addition to looking

at the old meeting presentations, we have a very long and growing set of frequently asked questions. This is in the back. It's also online. We have a series of fact sheets here for you. They all look the same on the front, as you see, but there's something written in this purple bar here, so we've got a general information fact sheet and we have our two newest fact sheets, one which gives some more details on how the five alternatives we're looking at perform, and another one which talks about tunneling. I invite you to view all of those.

As I said, we've had a lot of attendance and participation and this is all available on the Web site, metro.net/westside. Please use all lower-case letters. If you don't do that, you won't be happy.

There are seven alternatives under study five, build alternatives. The first thing we're looking at is the no-build alternative. We have to look at what happens if we don't do anything and use that as a base for comparison as we look out into the future.

We also have a Transportation Systems Management, or TSM alternative. That's the alternative that says if we don't build rail but we do the most robust, effective, efficient series of improvements we can do to the roads and bus systems, what would that be.

And then we have five rail alternatives. Two

that are within the funding umbrella, which includes both the Measure R, local funds. Measure R passed just two years ago. Before that, we didn't have any money. It includes the anticipated federal match. Those two include a subway down Wilshire, through Century City to Westwood.

Alternative 1, which would end at Westwood/UCLA, near or around Wilshire in Westwood. And then Alternative 2 adds an additional station just across the 405 to the VA.

In addition, we have three alternatives that are beyond the funding scenario right now. Alternative 3, which continues that line to Santa Monica, the so-called "Subway to the Sea." Alternative 4, which ends at Westwood on Wilshire, but adds the West Hollywood alignment and Alternative 5, which includes everything. And if you look in the fact sheet, that's called the "General Information Fact Sheet," we have maps of all of those, and there's maps available in the back.

As I said, we've got about 4.2 billion in current dollars, which includes assumed federal matching funds, which we don't have yet, we're competing for, over about 30 years for the Westside Subway Extension.

Measure R, which passed two years ago, allocates money to a variety of projects over 30 years around the county and would build the project in three phases to

Fairfax, to Century City and getting to Westwood in 2036. You may have heard that we're working hard to try and accelerate the subway and all of the Measure R projects to try and get them done within the next decade, and that is true, but we don't have that locked in yet.

As soon as we figure out how that's going to happen and we get commitments, we're hoping for from Washington, the first part of that chart/slide will go away. In that case, it would get built by the end of the decade, so that's find of exciting.

And now I'm going to turn it over to David, who's going to talk about what's in the draft, and then I'll be back to wrap things up.

MR. MIEGER: And Jody's a task master. She's given me six slides to summarize the EIS for you folks tonight. For those of you who have been here or with us over the last year and a half, we've had six rounds of community outreach meetings focused on all of the different topics. Hopefully, you won't see anything new or unusual, if you've come and followed us along in the process.

We hope that what you'll see is what you've been following along with and that we've been able to craft this project in a way that reflects what we've been hearing from everybody about what they'd like to see as a part of the subway project for the Westside.

Just to summarize very briefly what's in the environmental document and the things that we need to be aware of when we are taking this to our board of directors to be approved and when we're asking you to give us comments is that the document is a joint document, we have to get clearance under the federal National Environmental Protection Act, NEPA, national policy act and under the California, so there's a CEQA, local California environmental and a federal NEPA one that we have to satisfy, and we also have a partner agency in this, which is the Federal Transit Administration, which we're hopeful is going to fund upwards of almost half of the cost of this project.

So we have local money that we have from Measure R, the sales tax revenues. We go to Washington and we ask the federal government to give us matching funds to build a project, and so we have to compete with all the other cities around the country in a competitive process to get those funds. We think we have a very, very competitive project here in Los Angeles, and this project will qualify for those funds.

The FTA is our leading agency for the federal environmental clearance working with us. We prepare the document, they approve it, allow us to release it under their guidance.

But what is the major purpose of the EIS in this phase in the draft? The first part is not necessarily environmental, but is to evaluate the alternatives and how they perform because the federal criteria has very strict standards about how we have to meet those standards. Things like cost effectiveness, ridership, travel times savings. These are the measures that we have to show that the benefits of the project are there.

The environmental document has two chapters, 6 and 7, which deal specifically with the performance of the project. The adverse and beneficial effects of the alternatives and the options. That's the core of the environmental work. That's mainly in chapters 3, 4 and 5 of the document. Many of you, I know, do come to meetings where there's environmental documents done for all ranges of projects. It's very similar to what those are.

In the case of the subway, there's two major categories. There's the construction effects when you're building the project, and then there's the long-term effects after you've actually opened the project and you're operating it.

In the case of subways, it's mainly the construction. That's where the impacts are because you're digging holes, you're moving a lot of dirt, you have a lot of construction equipment in the area.

Once it's opened, it's underground, it's buried, and the only thing you see from the surface is just where the escalators and elevators come up to the surface. In a lot of cases, those will be integrated into existing developments.

So the long-term effects of the subway are not nearly as pronounced in the environmental documents as the construction period, that period of four or five years when we're building the project.

A lot of the emphasis in the document is on the construction impacts and the mitigations for that. And in the document, we provide locations and other details of where those impacts are by types of impacts and by locations along the corridor.

We also identify mitigation measures, and these are the draft documents, so every time you find an impact, there's various ways we can address that. We can either change the design to design the project to address that impact, or we can provide a mitigation measure, which is something you can do to offset that adverse impact.

So you'll see mitigation measures. These are drafts at this time. We're welcoming opportunities for you to comment on that, and then in the final, over the next year, we'll develop an exact mitigation program, which will be a part of the funded project, so there will

be money to implement those mitigation measures as a part of the project we're funded. And that's going to be developed in the final and then adopted at the end of the final, about a year from now.

So it's a formidable document. I know when you open it up, it's hundreds and hundreds of pages. There's 20 different categories of impact, and I think I would strongly recommend that you follow Jody's advice and read the executive summary first and then bore in on the particular areas that might affect your community, your area, or your area of interest.

In terms of the 20 different categories in there, I'm just going to focus just a little bit here on the construction side, what the document found with regard to construction impacts, and then what it found with regard to the longer-term impacts. I'm not going to go through these. I think we have about 11 areas where they found certain types of impacts, beneficial and adverse, that need to be addressed and talked about, and these are each discussed.

For example, traffic. When we're building the project at the station areas, we'll have a station here in Westwood Village, one at the VA Hospital, one over in Century City, serving this part of the Westside. In each of those areas where we're building the station under the

street, we have a process. I'm going to click back two slides and show you an example.

On this slide here, this is Hollywood Boulevard. When we built the subway up at Hollywood and Highland where the Kodak Theatre is several years ago, and a mitigation measure that was identified in that environmental document was to say, "Well, when we build the station, we're going to have to actually dig up the street in that area to build the subway station. Let's do that with concrete decking," which is actually an improvement over what we did, if you remember, in downtown.

At Hollywood Boulevard, we were actually able to, in this area, to build concrete decking. We came in over a series of weekends, put the decking in, kept the traffic flowing during the weekday periods so that the traffic could continue to operate during the construction period while we were continuing to dig and build the station underground.

This is what it looks like underneath where they're building the station. So this was a mitigation measure that identified to address a traffic impact, and it actually wound up keeping the traffic moving, pretty effectively, during the construction period. When you read the traffic section, it talks about the types of

mitigation measures you can do to keep the traffic flowing to mitigate any impacts.

We also have heavy construction equipment. We have trucks that have to come in. Generally, they have to haul the dirt away from the construction site, so they will be, generally, trying to get to a freeway to haul this out to remote locations where they could get rid of the spoil from the excavation. So the construction section talks about each one of these categories. That's an example I had of what you might look for in that document, if that's your particular area of interest.

I might want to say noise and vibration. Those trucks create noise. We have to identify the haul routes, where those trucks will operate. We have to identify the types of noise that those trucks would generate and can we put them on streets that would minimize the impacts to sensitive residential and other schools and types of uses where those noises would be sensitive. So you can read about that in the construction section.

In terms of long term, if I took that same issue of noise, instead of the hall routes and the construction sites, how you mitigation the noise, a long-term concern is the subway is down here. The tubes are at least 60 to 70 feet below ground. In some places here, they are over 100, 120 feet below ground, so they're very, very deep, so

you wouldn't feel or hear them.

In some cases where they come closer to the stations, they're shallower, and in those cases, we want to make sure that there's no vibration felt on the surface, so we might need to put in dampeners under the track to make sure that there's no vibration that's felt on the surface of the trains. So that section that talks about noise and vibration on that long term, would show the types of mitigation measures you could have to make sure that there wouldn't be any vibration from the project. So these are just some examples.

I want to just talk about the strategies. In some cases, you just have an impact. You have a mitigation that offsets one for one. In this case, what we really want to do in the next phase of the work now that we've identified where those impacts are, is work on the design to actually mitigate the impact through the design.

A lot of the issues we can address are through the proper design of the project so that the impacts are minimized through the proper design of the project by using the most up-to-date standards that we have for using the ways to reduce those impacts, looking at the depths of the tunnels to reduce any surface noise and vibration, noise dampening fasteners, which I mentioned, during the

construction phase. Can we build the tunnels in a way to reduce any kind of surface disruption.

We have issues concerned with subsidence. We've had two projects now. The last two have been very, very successful. We've had no subsidence whatsoever, but there's always a risk in any kind of utility, pipeline, water line, electrical line, oil, anything underground.

The latest tunnel boring machines that we've used on the east side, actually offset that, keep a pressure and balance so that there is no settlement. So on the east side, we had less than a quarter of an inch of sediment on the surface, which really was not measurable in any way. We want to make sure we're using the latest technologies to reduce any risks of the environmental categories in that sense.

And then in the areas, not necessarily in this area, but we were at the La Brea Tar Pits last night where there's higher incidences of methane gas and hydrogen sulfide, and we actually have identified different ways that we can put double liners in the station to have a double membrane for any penetration of gases that might come out in that area of the stations.

That's something that we've learned from the builders of some of the office buildings in the area that are build in the same gassy ground and have been able to

build their underground parking garages safely in those kinds of conditions. And so we've tried to take those technologies and adapt them into the stations.

And then utility relocation plans. Of course, we're not the only utility out there in the street. There's all kinds of stuff under Wilshire Boulevard, Santa Monica Boulevard, and all of those utilities have to be maintained and kept in operation during the construction phase. So we have to map and identify all of those utilities and keep them in place while we're building the station. It is very important that we can identify where all of those are.

And finally, in operations, once we've built the project, we're still going to continue to monitor all of these effects during the operation of the project. In our current subway, we come back continually and are doing that. We have all kinds of sensors, alarms, bells and things to make sure everything is operating successfully. We've had a very clean record for the last 10 to 15 years that we've been operating this subway with the operations and maintenance.

What I want to talk about first on my last slide, before I get pulled, is to talk about the beneficial effects that we talk about the environmental document. There are some really big ones with this project. Why are

we building this project? Each of those tunnels that you saw underground can carry about a 1,000 people per train. That turns out to about 14,000 people per hour. When you look at a freeway lane that's operating at full speed, that carries about 2,000 cars per hour. So when you see the capacity of the system, we can actually carry multiple, multiple lanes, equivalent of a freeway, underground where we're not having surface cars and traffic on the surface.

And in terms of speed, for any of you who commute to downtown or try to travel in this east/west corridor along the 10 Freeway corridor or Wilshire, Olympic, Pico, any of those, if you do it on a bus today or even in a car, it's about a 50- to 55-minute trip to get from UCLA down to downtown, the Civic Center in downtown. The subway would be about a 24-minute trip, so we think that this project is going to provide a significant benefit for everyone suffering everyday in the congestion that we have out here. If we can get you to give up your car and get into the train and come out to the Westside, that benefits you, so it's an overall benefit.

The last thing I'll mention is the job centers on the Westside, Beverly Hills, Century City, Westwood. Outside of San Francisco, this is the densest concentration of jobs that we've on the West Coast, and we

actually have a huge network of people into the Westside every day, from all throughout the region who are trying to get through the Sepulveda Pass, on the 10 Freeway coming up from the South Bay.

If we can get just a portion of those people off of the surface roads, get them into the subway, free up some street-surface roadway capacity, that would be a tremendous benefit in the project we've talked about in the environmental document, so you can see that.

I'm going to stop now and let Jody talk about there are a few choices that we need to make at the end of this phase of work when we go to the board at the end of October. And the document talks about those, and Jody's going to run you through those six or seven.

MS. LITVAK: I also want to welcome Jay Greenstein, who just walked in, representing the councilman for this area, Los Angeles Councilman Paul Koretz.

And a couple of people who came in through the entrance to my right here, please make sure you sign in at the back. We want to make sure we have an accurate count of who was here, and we do have some information for you in the back.

Look at those speeds. Why wouldn't you do that? I'm sorry. I'm not supposed to say that.

So as we move forward to make a staff

recommendation for the locally preferred alternative, remember I said that that's the next step in selecting what moves into the final environmental review and seeking federal funds.

We need to consider what is the best alternative of the five I talked about, utilizing the federal criteria in considering all of the public input that we've had, and then among those five alternatives, there's a series of decisions to make about them, including some multiple station options and alignments. So there's five key areas I want to talk about tonight. Clearly, a project of this magnitude has many, many, many decisions to be made, but there's five key areas of decisions coming up that we really do need to focus on.

One is what is the best performing alternative within those funding constraints that we have, how far west we should bring the subway within those funding constraints, whether or not there should be a station at Wilshire and Crenshaw. There are five areas where we have more than one possible station location, and from Beverly Hills into Century City into Westwood, we have different alignments we're looking at. And all of this analysis and developing out recommendations is really informed by the technical analysis in the draft and your input.

So let me talk through these. I'm going to spend more or less time on some of these. The three Wilshire alternatives to Westwood, UCLA to the VA Hospital and out to Santa Monica come closest to meeting the federal cost effectiveness target for performance of heavy rail. And the fact sheet that says "Performance of Alternatives" has some more information on that, and we have some more bar charts in the back for you to look at.

The Santa Monica Boulevard corridor through West Hollywood is a really good robust corridor for rail transit, but the Wilshire corridor is the 800-pound gorilla for transportation in Los Angeles for everything, and it has better land use and transit corrections than Santa Monica Boulevard, and I don't want to say that in a way to be disparaging to Santa Monica Boulevard, because it's really fabulous, but Wilshire just outperforms it. Wilshire is a more key-regional destination center than Mid-Wilshire and Beverly Hills and Century City and Westwood.

There's higher population and employment concentrations along Wilshire, and it has more direct transit connections to other regions. Because the Wilshire corridor through the rail line today connects into Union Station, it would allow people to access the Westside Subway Extension who come into Union Station from

the Antelope Valley and Ventura County and the San Gabriel Valley and the Inland Empire and the southeast part of the county and Orange County, so it has a much wider swath of regional connections.

However, only Alternatives 1 and 2, the two that go down Wilshire to Westwood, are currently fundable because those are what are in the adopted Measure R plan, and therefore, those are the only ones that can compete for the federal new starts matching funds, and they're what's in the 2009 Adopted Long-range Transportation Plan. However, as we've said, public input is important to this, and we've gotten a lot of public support for all five of these alternatives.

So how far west to extend the locally preferred alternative. Do we want to end at Westwood/VA or Westwood/UCLA? Alternative 1 is ending at Westwood/UCLA. That's the terminus station, and there's 46,000 boarding along -- at the new stations along the entire line, Crenshaw/La Brea, et cetera, et cetera, with 14,000 of those daily boardings at UCLA. Now, that's only the boardings at the new stations. That doesn't count people who might be boarding at Union Station and riding out here.

It also creates a major transit interface in Westwood, so anyone who would want to transfer from the

bus to the subway from points west to the 405 would actually have to come into the Westwood/UCLA area to transfer, and it's a pretty intense area. There's a lot of bus service in and out of Westwood Village right now.

If we bring the line one more station further west to the VA Hospital, we add 6600 boardings along the entire line with 8,000 boardings a day at the VA station, and there would be more boardings elsewhere. It would allow us to serve the regional VA center, which is really an important regional destination, both for the people who have to get their medical services at a VA facility. They're not like, probably, most of us who are civilians where if we don't like a doctor, we can go to another doctor down the hall in the same medical office building, but also the visitors and staff who work at that center.

It reduces the boardings at the UCLA station by about 1700 a day, and it gives us access to the system for people who are west of the 405 getting to and from locations west of the 405. And, again, we've had a lot of public input on that.

I'm not going to spend a lot of time talking about the station at Wilshire/Crenshaw tonight, but just to let you know that that has always been an optional station, and we've been evaluating that throughout this.

I want to talk about the areas where we have

multiple-station locations -- by the way, this presentation, I know it's hard to read. It's going to be posted online I'm hoping by tomorrow, but certainly by the end of the week, so if we have your E-mail address, we'll send you out a note letting you know when it's posted online, and we'll give you the link. So don't think you have to memorize all of this.

There are a number of factors that go into evaluating an area when we have more than one possible station location, and just to make it easy to read, across the top for you, "Ridership construction Issues, Engineering Issues, Properties for Portals, Seismic Issues, Bus/Bike/Pedestrian Connections, Future Rail Connections, Terminus Station Issues, and Public Input."

If you see -- and all of these things are important at every location, but if you see a checkmark there, it means that among the two or more locations we're looking at in a particular area, which location we choose will actually make a difference for that factor.

And I want to talk about the last three you see here. One is the station in Century City. I think many people know we're looking at two station locations in Century City, one up at Santa Monica Boulevard and Avenue of the Stars and one on that long block south at Constellation and Avenue of the Stars. That's the only

location of all of these where ridership makes a difference.

Depending on which one of those locations we choose, there's some interesting construction and engineering issues, depending on which location we choose there. There are different options for finding property owners to participate with us for locating portals, but we have options in both locations. That's the only location where seismic issues become a factor in making a decision, and we actually have some boards over there talking about it, and you might want to look again at our new tunneling fact sheet, and we've had a lot of public input.

Here at Westwood/UCLA, again, we have two locations we're looking at. One is under Wilshire Boulevard right at Westwood, and the other location, just ever so much to the west and north of there, under the UCLA parking lot. Again, there are different construction issues. If we build the station off street versus under the street -- David talked about that a little bit. If we're under the UCLA lot, it will be because we've come to an agreement with UCLA, and the portal will be there, so we know where that's going to be.

If we're under Wilshire, we'll have to work with the adjacent property owners, and hopefully, someone will work with us and want to have a portal on their property.

And because it's a very crowded area and intersection, really, how bikes and pedestrians and buses allow for fast and easy connections for people transferring to and from the subway, are different at each of those locations.

And I talked a little bit about, in the earlier slide, about what it means if it's a terminus station at Westwood/UCLA. Again, if we go to the VA, we've got two locations that we're looking at, one on the south side of Wilshire Boulevard under that surface parking lot that's in front of the hospital, and the other location is on the north side of Wilshire Boulevard, essentially under the parking lot that's adjacent to the Wadsworth Theatre. Again, that has different implications for connections, different terminus station issues, and we've had a lot of public input on that.

Getting from Beverly Hills to Century City to Westwood, that's where we have, basically, three different areas of alignment. There's some detail boards over there where Michael is pointing that actually shows for Beverly Hills to Century City and Century City to Westwood the three main alignments that shows the depth of each of those to the tracks.

If you were here when we had our special tunneling meeting and if not I, again, invite you to go online. You'll learn a lot more about that, our alignment

meeting, but basically, it's the noise and vibration that emanates from the track, so it's important to know what the track depth is.

The key issue really for choosing, making the decision from Beverly Hills to Century City, is going to be driven in large part by which Century City station we select. That will be a big part of that, so connection to which station becomes important.

Obviously, we're looking at the number of easements that would be needed under each one of those, the seismic issues that I've talked about. Again, there's been a lot of public input. Century City to Westwood, it doesn't really make a difference, but connections to stations. All of the options that we have for that alignment work with every pair combination of Century City and Westwood stations we have.

So connections to stations doesn't really differentiate for that alignment and selection, but number of easements does play into it, again, because the selection of the Century City station is going to be influenced by seismic issues. That's an important aspect in this.

But the length differences among the three main alternatives for alignments from Century City to Westwood is really a huge difference. And if you came to that

alignment presentation, from the shortest to the longest length, it's about double. So the travel time, I think we said, was between two and a half minutes traveling from Century City to Westwood versus almost five minutes, and that makes a huge difference in terms of construction costs. It's a much longer tunnel you have to build, travel time and ridership. And again, we've had some public input on that as well.

Very quickly, you see, generally here, the depths to the tracks for the three alignments we're looking at from Wilshire/Rodeo to Century City, and on the right, you see the number of residential easements that would be needed for each one of those three alternatives, 0, 4 and 23. And again, we have details over here on the right.

And then getting from Century City to Westwood, again, you see this is a summary of the depths along the alignment, and there would be anywhere from 30 to 110 residential easements that would be needed, depending on which one of those alignments we chose. And, again, I invite you to take a look at that in detail about exactly which those are here.

And, again, in that alignments presentation we did back in the spring, it was in the spring, we talked about the process of how we go about getting easements if we're coming under your property and when that would happen.

So what happens next. October 18th is the close of the public comment period. We will be developing our staff recommendation and summarizing the public comments that we've gotten for the board. October 28th, we're scheduled to go to the Metro Board of Directors. This will be their opportunity to consider this. Again, they are the decision-making authority. We will give them our recommendation for the locally preferred alternative. We will ask them to adopt a locally preferred alternative.

Now, in many of these cases where you see multiple options, it's entirely possible that they would adopt a single-locally preferred alternative, but in some cases, keep more than one option open. They may select one option where we've got multiple stations or alignments or they may narrow where we have, perhaps, three alignments down to two or they could narrow things down to one. We don't know. It's going to be up to them.

But whatever they chose, they will, hopefully, authorize us to prepare the final EIS/EIR, a preliminary engineering. There will be a lot of continued outreach. Exactly what that technical analysis will have to be in the final and the continued engineering and the continued outreach will be somewhat driven by what decision they make.

They'll tell us what they want us to study, and

we'll go out and do that. There was something else I was going to say about that, but I forgot. I apologize. We will then seek the approval of the Federal Transit Administration to enter the new starts preliminary engineering, and we will consider any additional recommendations that may come up, such as things beyond what's in the locally preferred alternative.

During the final EIS/EIR, obviously, we'll be completing the environmental clearance process. As I said, there will be a great deal of continued public involvement. As I said at the beginning, we are not responding to comments tonight. We can't during the draft. We'll be glad to talk to you when we close the public hearing, but the official responses to any of your comments will be in writing in the final EIS/EIR.

We'll do much more geotechnical investigation. There's a board somewhere over there that talks about the geotechnical investigation that we've done so far through the draft and what its purpose was and what we think we may do going forward in the final. We're going to refine the engineering, finalize the cost estimates. A lot of the station details are going to have to be worked out in the alignment details.

We'll do the preliminary engineering. We're going to have to figure out where we're going to do

construction staging, and we will develop the mitigation program and commit to those mitigation measures in the final.

So how to comment, you can testify tonight. Remember, please turn these in if you want to testify tonight. Rebecca has some extras. Raise your hand. She'll get you one and take one back when you fill it out. You can turn in written comments tonight. Please turn them in at the table in the back or to any one of us with these badges on.

You can send the letter to David Mieger. His address is up there, but it's also over here, so I'm not going to read it all to you. You can also go online, metro.net/westside. We have an online comment form or you can send an E-mail to Westside Extension at metro.net.

We've had a lot of people who have been with us on Facebook and Twitter, and we love all of you, but because this is a more official period in the process, we hope you continue to talk to us via Facebook and Twitter, but we can't count those as official comments on the Draft EIS/EIR. And, again, the comments are due October 18th.

We were at LACMA last night. We're in West Hollywood tomorrow night. Next Monday, we're going to be at Roxbury Park in Beverly Hills. Again, that meeting

will be a live webcast like we were last night. By the way, if you want to see last night's meeting, you can get on the live webcast site and you can see last night's meeting and the one we did in the spring, and then we conclude next Wednesday at Santa Monica Library. And, again, all of the meetings are at 6:00. Same format as this, same presentation.

So if you're speaking tonight, two minutes per speaker. I'll double the time if you need translation. I'm going to call three names at a time. The microphone is over there. Please line up along the wall there. By the way, if any of you have mobility issues and can't come up to the microphone, just let us know. We have these cordless mics. We'll bring it to you, but we'd like everybody up at the microphone so we can move quickly and give all of you the maximum time to speak so we can minimize the time between speakers.

I will ask you to state your name clearly. This lovely lady in the corner over here is our court reporter, and she's transcribing everything, so please state your name clearly. We'll count down two minutes on this countdown clock. Not only state your name clearly, please speak clearly for the court reporter.

I'd like to ask everybody to be respectful to all of the speakers. If you could keep your conversations

down while they're speaking, we'd like to not have cheers or jeers. That's not the purpose of tonight. Everyone gets to speak. And, again, we're not responding to the comments. That will be in writing in the final EIS/EIR.

And I want to remind you, again, of the things we'd especially like to hear from you tonight. If you have comments on the draft documents, any of the potential impacts, any of the potential mitigation measures, please let us know about that. If you have additional questions or things you'd like us to answer in the final EIS/EIR, any questions or any information you need further clarified. If you have comments on the LPA selection, the alternative choice, the station options, the alignment options or suggestions beyond the LPA. And that's it.

We have our microphone monitor over there. He will help you raise or lower or adjust the microphone, if necessary. I'm going call the first three names, and then I'm going to say something while you're coming up. We're going to start with Joel Covarrubias, followed by Steve Gilbert and Juan Matute.

And while the three of you are coming up and lining up -- if you could keep it down in the back. Please get very close to the microphone, everybody, because watch what happens as you get away it, it becomes hard to hear, so try to stay close to the microphone. If

you're talking, that means stay close, and also if you move around, I know I'm guilty of this, so get right up close to it.

And Joel, go ahead and state your name, and we'll count you on the two minutes. Go ahead.

MR. COVARRUBIAS: My name is Joel Covarrubias, and I'm going to talk quickly. I would prefer to have Alternative 5, but it looks like Alternative 2 is the way we're going. These are my top priority issues: Century City station, please locate this on Constellation Boulevard. This is the center of Century City, this is where the jobs are, this is where people want to go. Please do not build the station on Santa Monica Boulevard just because people have unjustified fears of vibration.

L.A.'s existing subway tunnels are already cross under private property in several locations with no noise or vibration at the surface. The tunnels will be at least 50 feet under Beverly Hills. Plus, depending on the options, the tunnels will pass only under a few homes, either 4 or 22 homes, to be precise. I'm only talking the Beverly Hills alignments.

Westwood/UCLA station, please locate this on Westwood Boulevard. A major station like this should be in the most central location possible. Wilshire and Westwood is central, Wilshire and Gayley is not. The key

250-1

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

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

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

250-2

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

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

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

250-2

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

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

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

250-3

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

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

The Off-Street Station and tunnels would need to be deeper than the On-Street Station to clear the underside of foundations for a future hotel on Gayley Avenue, which makes the station and tunnels riskier and more expensive to construct, and requires more time for

250-3

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.

to the subway's success is that it connects well to local circulating buses and cross boulevard buses.

250-4 Fairfax station, please locate this under Fairfax and Wilshire, the east option, not west of it. The east option will better serve LACMA, which is a major destination cultural institution. Also, the entrance location for the east option will better serve buses.

250-5 La Cienega station, please locate this east of La Cienega, not west of it. The dense commercial district is located east of La Cienega. The West Hollywood branch of it will not need to directly access Wilshire at La Cienega since it already has stations on both of these streets anyway. Do, however, build the track and exit structure to the west to allow for the future branch.

250-6 All stations, please build at least two entrances opposite sides of the street. I understand construction cost issues, but we're going to live with this subway for a long time, so please get it right the first time.

250-7 No Crenshaw station and I do appreciate all of the work that Metro has done so far.

Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Right on time. Very good.

Steve Gilbert, followed by Juan Matute and then Ruth Weinberg.

250-4

Your comment supporting the East location for the Wilshire/Fairfax Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative, which includes the Wilshire/Fairfax East Station location due to stronger community support and better access and land integration opportunities, including proximity to Museum Row.

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

250-5

Your preference for the East location for the Wilshire/La Cienega 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). At Wilshire/La Cienega, the Board selected the East Station location without a West Hollywood connection structure as part of the LPA. This is the preferred station entrance location for the City of Beverly Hills because it will be located in a denser, more commercial area than the other station location to the west of La Cienega. This entrance location also will provide excellent connections to two major north-south arterials – La Cienega and San Vicente Boulevards.

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

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including station locations, and the LPA selection process. The *Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report* provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the Wilshire/La Cienega Station 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.

250-6

The number of entrances at each station was based on the ridership projections for that

250-6

station. Based on these projections, Metro will construct one station entrance at each of the proposed stations, with the exception of two station entrances at the Westwood/UCLA Station due to high ridership projections.

250-7

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

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

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

251-1

MR. GILBERT: My name is Steven Gilbert. I think if you really want the subway to get people off the street, out of their cars, you're going to have to have parking near each Subway station. I can't believe what I've been reading and hearing, that no parking structures are planned for the stop at Bundy, which is not one we've gotten up to yet.

And at the VA, I think you'll be thinking that you could get some big parking space, but the veterans are so much against anything that doesn't absolutely come to help the veterans, that it's very difficult to get, so I think you should really consider, at each station, to have parking.

I have personally driven down to the Gateway building, not driven, taken the subway, to the Gateway building, which was wonderful. Wilshire Boulevard is a little bit of a drive, a little bumpy, but that will be gone, but I live north of Sunset, and I talk with my friends and you talk about the subway and they say, "Well, how am I going to get to it?" I don't know of one bus line that's up Kenter Canyon, Bundy Canyon, Mandeville, there aren't any, so they aren't going to use it, and all of the homes won't.

It certainly will serve the high-density living and buildings that we expect it to attract, but it won't

251-1

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.

serve the people that live on each side of the subway corridor.

Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

Juan Matute, followed by Ruth Weinberg and then Phil Brown.

MR. MATUTE: Hello. My name is Juan Matute. I'd like to start by announcing my support for the project, preferably the alternative in Century City at Constellation and getting the subway as far west as possible, so our Alternative 2.

I've reviewed the EIR. I think Metro has done an excellent job. I find it to be complete in looking at the issues that I am familiar with. Some of the traffic modeling, I found it to be consistent with best practices in the EIRs, and I thought the facts presented in the EIR speak for themselves, and they will definitely help illuminate decision making in the future.

One misconception about the project that I've seen in the L.A. Times is that the project might not reduce traffic all that much. I look at this as if you go to your doctor, they tell you, "Oh, you have a 5 percent chance of having a heart attack. If you diet and exercise and do good for the next 25 years, you'll have a 4 percent chance." Well, you might look at that and say, "I'm not

252-1

Your comment in support of the Project has been noted.

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

252-1

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.

252-2

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

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

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

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

252-2

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.

252-3

going to do all of that only to gain 1 percent chance of not having a heart attack." But if you did nothing, you can have a 25 percent chance of having a heart attack.

The other issue is parking. Parking is very expensive to construct. It could cost $35,000 per space. In order to recoup those costs, you'd have to charge in the vicinity of $20 per space for the parking per day. In many cases, there's already private parking lots adjacent to the stations that charge less than that per day, so if Metro built the parking and they charged enough to recoup their costs for the parking, then nobody would park there. They'd all park in other places where it's cheaper. Is that really the best use of funds?

I think Metro should be spending their money on subways and bus connections.

Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

Okay. Ruth Weinberg, followed by Phil Brown and then Linda Mok.

MS. WEINBERG: I've been following this avidly, because one of the routes would come under my home. Now, I have lived in the Westwood area for 45 years, and I know that area, and anybody that has lived there any length of time knows, or should know, they're ramming this through as quickly as possible from Mayor Villaraigosa, and so on,

252-3

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.

for politics. They're going to get this money. Money for what? Now, it is well known.

253-1 The person just before me said that the L.A. Times does not report it accurately. Oh, it's very accurate. There will be very little reduction. You only have to read it. A tiny reduction in traffic.

253-2 Now, the parking. That's another issue I hadn't even thought of. Who's going to go and park -- how do you get to it, except if you live very close to it.

You know, it sounds great. We're going to become

253-3 New York. We are not New York. Wilshire Boulevard was and is a river. Villaraigosa will not have to have a subway to the sea, he can ride down to the sea in a boat. Yes. Now, this is maybe not known. A lot of people don't know it. The older people know it. When I came -- I have two-level house. The upper level is the main house. It goes down. We had a water -- they had sand bags and that was 12 feet down.

253-4 Now, what happens when you go 100 feet? "Oh, all of this vibration, you won't feel it." Oh, of course not. That's ridiculous. New York is a rock. That's a place for a subway.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you, Ms. Weinberg.

MS. WEINBERG: I just want to add, I wrote to Villaraigosa. If you want a copy of what I wrote, you can

253-1

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.

47

1 have it.

253-2

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

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

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

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

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

253-3

Your comments about a river under Wilshire Boulevard have been noted. The Study area groundwater consists of underground streams, and primarily, the Los Angeles Coastal Plain Groundwater Basins. Groundwater along Wilshire Boulevard varies in depth and inflow rate. In certain areas, such as Westwood, groundwater appears to be under artesian pressure and major dewatering has been necessary for previous underground construction projects. The Draft EIS/EIR did not identify substantial impacts from groundwater as a result of the Subway project. However, Metro will implement Best Management Practices and other measures required for compliance with Federal, State, and local requirements, including those measures that will include dewatering where required and implementation of measures to prevent water intrusion into the Subway system.

253-4

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

253-4

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 conducted during preparation of this Final EIS/EIR.

253-4

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.

MS. LITVAK: Okay. Thank you very much. If you want to give us that letter, we'll be glad to make it part of that record.

Phil Brown, followed by Linda Mok and then Albert Sattin.

MR. BROWN: My name is Phil Brown. I'm an architect and urban designer, and there's too many problems with this proposal to comment on in two minutes, but I would like to talk about performance and the concern I have for congestion, that it's not being solved.

The performance is inadequate. I just did a study for the 405 corridor and getting familiar with the trip movements involved in this west side area and the diversion that would occur if you had a subway is just 2 percent of the trip ends that are occurring in the west side here, and 2 percent is negligible. You won't see it. The subway is, basically, for commuters to work centers and that's fine, but the problem with this proposal is it doesn't solve local problems, along with the general transportation improvement that's needed in Los Angeles.

Another fact is that if you take a corridor line counting all the trips at Fairfax going from the Hollywood to the Baldwin Hills, the Expo and the subway will only address 25 percent of the increase in travel over the next

254-1

254-1

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.

25 years, and so that leaves 75 percent unaccounted for.
This proposal spends money and doesn't solve problems; it is a real wreck a proposal, and until we get comprehensive planning that addresses both transportation and land use, we're going to be buying a cat in a bag, as they call it, or a pig in a poke.
Thank you.
MS. LITVAK: Thank you. No cheers or jeers tonight, please.
Linda Mok, followed by Albert Sattin and then Monroe Jones.
255-1 MS. MOK: My name is Linda Mok. I am against a Westwood/Wilshire stop because the number of people that would be disgorged will tie up traffic, and you won't be able to turn right or left at that busy intersection. I think having it a little bit west would be much better.
255-2 Also, against the Westwood loop that one the proposals -- that would also tie up traffic while that thing is being constructed, and somewhere down the line, somebody will have the bright idea of putting a station there, which I'm against.
255-3 I hope you're going to provide a place on the subway for bicycles so people can ride their bicycles to the subway and then take it with them where they're going and be able to transport themselves there and, also,

255-1

Chapter 3 of the Final EIS/EIR describes estimated traffic impacts in the Study Area, including impacts to the Wilshire/Westwood intersection with a station at that intersection. For auto-related traffic, the traffic impact analysis determined that the construction of this station would not exceed the threshold for a significant/adverse traffic impact as compared to the Future Year 2035 No Build Scenario. In terms of potential impacts on pedestrians and bicyclists, the LPA would have impacts but these can be mitigated. Refer to the *Westside Subway Extension Traffic Analysis Impact Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Transit Impact Assessment Report* for detailed impact analyses.

255-2

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

255-2

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 unmitigatible 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 Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report* provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the alignment between Century City and Westwood following Draft EIS/EIR scoping in response to community comments and engineering requirements. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report*. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

255-3

Your comment has been noted. Riders will be able to bring their bicycles onboard subway trains. Convenient and safe access by pedestrians and bicyclists will be an important element of the Westside Subway Extension Project. Sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and other

255-3

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Section 8.8.8 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to station connectivity. In addition, the *Westside Subway Extension Station Circulation Report* provides a comprehensive station access circulation study of Project stations and Section 3.7 provides an analysis of potential impacts to pedestrian and bicycle networks. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project

255-3

website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

that you would provide safe places to park bicycles at the station, and I mean safe like a cage with, maybe you put your own numbers in for a combination, because bicycle thefts are very rampant these days.

255-4

And, also, if you would consider having a separate car for people with pets. Maybe put dogs with muzzles and you could take your pets with you when you need to.

Thank you.

255-4

Your comment regarding a car for people with pets has been noted. Animals are not permitted in Metro facilities or vehicles, unless one of the following applies: 1) The animal is in a secure carrier; 2) The animal is a certified police or security animal and is accompanied by a peace officer; or 3) The animal is a service animal, as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, and is accompanied by a patron.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

Albert Sattin, followed by Monroe Jones and then Dana Gabbard.

MR. SATTIN: Anyone else here who works at the VA hospital? I don't see any hands. I don't represent the VA Hospital. They have their own management, and I'm sure they're going to have input.

256-1

I'm a full-time physician there. My patients are actually in Gardena, and I drive out there a couple of times a week and one day a week I see them on a closed-circuit TV while sitting in my office on Wilshire Boulevard. I'm, of course, pushing, if we do this project, for the initial terminus to be at the VA. I'll spare you the details. Other people have addressed that. It would be a tremendous boon for patients.

By the way, we are a civilian agency, not

256-1

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

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

military. The Department of Veterans Affairs is a civilian agency and we draw from all over Los Angeles County, except for the southern-most part, which is the Long Beach VA. We go out into Ventura County, we go way to the north, we go to East Los Angeles, and this would be a tremendous boost to the veteran population, particularly to the disabled, to initially have an end station at the VA and that's really what I'm pushing for in speaking now.

Thank you very much. I didn't even use all of my time.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.

Monroe Jones, followed by Dana Gabbard and then Jay Greenstein.

MR. JONES: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Monroe, and I'm a public transit rider. I think that Phase 2 (sic) would be very important to bring to Wilshire and Wilshire and Santa Monica. I think that most people who are new to the subway should really try the subway because I think it might benefit all of you guys who are personally driving on your own because sometimes in a lot of traffic on the major corridor on Wilshire Boulevard.

And most people don't like to ride the bus and rail system because they think it's too expensive or too much construction or anything that might be getting in your way or anything that might be taking place, and I

257-1

257-1

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

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

think that this Phase 2 on Wilshire and Santa Monica or to the VA or to UCLA or to Century City might work out for you.

So I think that everything that you guys are talking about tonight might benefit you, so I think that Phase 2 on Wilshire and Santa Monica will work out, so I think the more you guys get involved and try to help build the subway and bring it to pass, the better it will benefit all of us and all of you and the rest of the county.

Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

Dana Gabbard, then Jay Greenstein and then Myrna Singer.

MR. GABBARD: My name is Dana Gabbard. I'm the executive secretary of Southern California Transit Advocates. I'm a daily transit user. I get around on the bus and the train. I live on Wilshire and work on Wilshire in the old Bullocks/Wilshire building. I don't live in this area, but I certainly come in and out of it quite often.

Let me say to you nay sayers, history is passing you right by. Whining about parking, whining about you're not going to solve congestion. That's not our job. What this is about is increasing regional mobility, and that's

258-1

what it's going to do. You're 20 years out of date. The argument that no one rides the train is basically dead now. Go down to ride the Red Line. The Red Line is in the top five subway alignments in the United States for ridership. Top five as a separate line. So anyone who claims that no one is going to ride the train, that thing will be packed the day it opens.

What we need to do is focus in. Once the mid-term election is over, reauthorization will finally come back into play. That's where the money is going to come from the federal level. So next year all of us are going to have a role to play in trying to figure out how to fix the federal funding trust funds.

Just in the few little things I want to say about

258-2

it personally. Personally, I don't like the idea of having the Expo Line on one end of Fourth Street and the subway at the only end. Couldn't we be looking at the joint station for the two of them? It just seems to make some

258-3

sense to me there, and overall I think either Alternative 1 or 2.

258-4

But the spur to West Hollywood for a 50 percent increase in construction costs, you're getting a marginal increase in ridership. It doesn't just pencil out. It's going to weigh down the rest of it in terms of cost effectiveness for federal funding.

258-1

Your comment has been noted. SAFETEA-LU, the federal legislation authorizing the federal transit programs, expired in 2009 and has been extended several times. The availability of federal funds and other support for the Westside Subway is dependent upon future actions by the Congress.

258-2

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

Your comment on developing a connection to the Expo Line at Wilshire/4th Street has been noted. Since the Project would terminate at the Westwood/VA Hospital Station as part of the LPA, a connection to the Expo line at the Wilshire/4th Street Station would be beyond the scope of this Project if the LPA is approved for implementation.

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.

258-3

Your support for Alternative 1 (Westwood/UCLA Extension) and Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) have been noted. Please see the response above to comment number 258-2 regarding the selection of the LPA.

258-4

Your comment is correct. Chapter 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR showed that Alternatives 4 and 5, which included the West Hollywood segment, would be much less cost effective than Alternatives 1, 2 and, 3, which did not include the segment. Lower cost effectiveness would make it more difficult to secure Federal New Starts funding.

Prepare for the future when someday maybe we can do the line extension.

MS. LITVAK: Dana, thank you.

Jay Greenstein representing L.A. Councilman Paul Koretz, followed by Myrna Singer and then Charles Follette.

MR. GREENSTEIN: I'll be brief, Jody. Thank you. I'm speaking more for the public than for the public record.

My name is Jay Greenstein. I'm the district transportation deputy for City Councilman Paul Koretz, who represents this area out to the 405 Freeway. Councilmember Koretz is a big supporter of the Westside Subway Extension, at least out to Westwood or Westwood VA. He's also a strong supporter of the 30/10 plan and will do whatever he can to support the mayor in his efforts to get federal funding to move this project along more quickly.

What I'd like to add is for those of you who are submitting written comments, I'd also like to encourage you to copy Councilmember Koretz, copy our office, with your comments so that we have more of a sense of what the public is saying. If you can try and get it to us earlier rather than close to the October 18th deadline, we'll be submitting our own comments.

Thank you, everyone, for being here this evening. Thank you, Jody.

259-1

259-1

Your comment in support of the Westside Subway Extension Project and support of the 30/10 plan 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.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

Myrna Singer, followed by Charles Follette and then Sarah Hays.

260-1 MS. SINGER: I'm Myrna Singer, and I believe our house is situated right above where the subway will be running, and I'm very concerned about what the impact will be upon the homes. If cracks occur or damage is done, who is responsible then?

260-2 And, also, being if you're not too far from a station, I'm not aware of does the subway start to go uphill toward -- I'm sure where the people get off the subway is not as far down below as where the tracks are right along for -- I'm not aware of how it works, but I'm very concerned about if we're right below, rather above the tracks, the impact, if it will be felt in homes.

260-3 And also as Ruth Weinberg stated, it's known that there is a river under the area, which I don't know what impact that will have.

Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

Charles Follette, followed by Sarah Hays, if you're up, I'd appreciate you moving to get ready; and then Ellen Mercier.

And I apologize if I bungled anybody's name, but that's why you'll state your name and correct it.

260-1

Your comment regarding concerns about tunneling beneath homes and schools has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors decided to continue to study both station location options in Century City (Santa Monica Boulevard and Constellation Boulevard) to address concerns raised by the community regarding locating a station directly on a seismic fault and the safety of tunneling under homes and schools. The Metro Board of Directors also decided to not include the Constellation South alignment between the Wilshire/Rodeo and Century City Stations as part of the LPA, but to continue to study the Constellation North and the Santa Monica Boulevard alignments. The Constellation South alignment passed beneath more residential properties than the Constellation North or Santa Monica Boulevard alignments. In addition, the Metro Board of Directors decided to not include the West or Central alignments between Century City and Westwood/UCLA as part of the LPA, but to continue to study the East alignment because the East alignment is the most direct and least expensive route between the two stations.

Safety, both during construction and eventual operations, is one of Metro's highest priorities and is one of the key evaluation criteria in selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). In response to the Metro Board of Director's request for more information, further analysis was undertaken to focus on the engineering and environmental aspects of the two options during the preparation of the Final EIS/EIR to expand on the studies conducted in preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that prior to conducting the comparative study, the Santa Monica Boulevard Station location was shifted slightly to the east from the location in the Draft EIS/EIR to avoid the Santa Monica Fault zone.

On most transit tunnel projects, significant portions of the alignment are constructed adjacent to or beneath buildings. The LPA passes beneath homes and schools in these neighborhoods because the curve radius required for subway tunnels is much wider than that required at a typical surface street intersection. The current alignment minimizes tunneling under buildings to the east and west of both the Century City Stations. The station position on Constellation Boulevard requires the tunnel alignment to be under the south portion of Beverly Hills High School Building B in order to reach the station location. There is no reasonable tunnel alignment that does not pass under homes or structures within the Beverly Hills High School campus.

The geotechnical studies conducted during preparation of the Final EIS/EIR concluded that tunneling can be safely carried out beneath the Beverly Hills High School campus and the West Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood neighborhoods. The use of state-of-the-art pressurized closed-face TBMs for soft-ground tunneling has greatly improved the control of ground movements such that tunneling can be done with minimal surface settlements. The presence of the tunnels will neither affect the risk to buildings above them during an earthquake nor change the severity of shaking. Finally, tunnels can be constructed and

260-1

operated safely in gassy grounds and oil wells do not pose an unmitigatible risk to tunneling.

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

The Westside Subway Extension will not reduce the availability of BHHS for use as an emergency shelter or impact the operations of its use as an emergency shelter. Furthermore, tunneling would not prevent future development of the BHHS campus. The vertical alignment of the tunnel would be 55 to 70 feet below the ground surface (to the top of the tunnel), which would allow for construction of an underground structure over the tunnel at a later date.

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

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

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

260-1

Please refer to Section 8.8.2 and 8.8.3 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed responses to concerns related to the Century City Station and alignments and Section 8.8.4 of the Final EIS/EIR for a more detailed response to geotechnical concerns. Refer to Section 7.3 of the Final EIS/EIR and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Station Location Report* for a comparison of the two Century City Station locations. The results of further geotechnical investigations in the Century City vicinity can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report*. The results of further ridership studies can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Technical Report Summarizing the Results of the Forecasted Alternatives* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City TOD and Walk Access Study.* All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

260-2

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

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

Additional detailed geotechnical studies were conducted during the Final EIS/EIR phase to 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

260-2

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

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

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

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

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

260-3

Your comment about a river under Wilshire Boulevard has been noted. The Study area groundwater consists of underground streams, and primarily, the Los Angeles Coastal Plain Groundwater Basins. Groundwater along Wilshire Boulevard varies in depth and inflow rate. In certain areas, such as Westwood, groundwater appears to be under artesian pressure and major dewatering has been necessary for previous underground construction projects. The Draft EIS/EIR did not identify substantial impacts from groundwater as a result of the Subway project. However, Metro will implement Best Management Practices and other measures required for compliance with Federal, State, and local requirements, including those measures that will include dewatering where required and implementation of measures to prevent water intrusion into the Subway system.

MR. FOLLETTE: You said it exactly correct. Thank you very much. You have a good French accent.

My name is Charles Follette. I'm a resident of Santa Monica, born and raised in Santa Monica, and I would, initially, like to say that I'm in full support of the Wilshire subway project, and I think it's the best thing we can do for Los Angeles, and I know for a fact that it will be very popular and will take a great number of cars off the streets and reduce pollution and reduce our global warming impact as well, as little there may be from a global standpoint.

I'm a graduate of the University of California, Berkley, and when I was a student at Berkley in the mid-70s, they were building BART, and they said the same thing. Nobody is going to use it, and it's turned out to be one the most successful subway systems in the world, and in fact, they've extended it, not only from Concord, but also all the way out to Suisun Bay and Pittsburgh in the Bay Area and points south as well.

I would say I support the Constellation route through Century City because that's where everybody is going to work. It would be a central location in Century City, and it would make it part of the class number one subway system in destination in Century City.

I support the subway going all the way to the VA

261-1

261-2

261-1

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

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

261-2

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

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

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

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

261-2

walksheds.

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

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.

261-3

for what is currently funded under Measure R. We need to get west of the San Diego Freeway, and I also am an advocate of when we get additional funding passed, Measure R, that the first step would be Alternative number 3, which will take the subway all the way to Santa Monica because we have to go -- we have to complete this to Santa Monica.

That's where the tourists are, that's where the people on the weekends want to go to the beach and the pier and the promenade and that's where the people of Santa Monica want to take it to Staples Center and Downtown Los Angeles and everywhere between Santa Monica and downtown, so we have to go with Alternative 3.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

261-4

MR. FOLLETTE: And finally, I would encourage all of your congress people in Washington should go ahead with the 30/10 proposal to build this in ten years --

MS. LITVAK: I need you to wrap it up.

MR. FOLLETTE: Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Go Bears.

Sarah Hays, followed by Ellen Mercier and then Glenn Flug, I believe.

MS. HAYS: My name is Sarah Hays. I live in Rancho Park within walking distance of the future Expo Line and within a bike ride distance of the future

261-3

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.

261-4

Your comment about the project schedule has been noted. In April 2010, the Metro Board of Directors adopted the America Fast Forward 30/10 Initiative that directs that the Westside Subway Extension Project to seek accelerated federal funding to deliver the Project in a single phase to Westwood. Based on this accelerated funding schedule, the parallel construction of portions of the alignment and stations would allow the entire LPA to be open and operational to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station in 2022 as a single phase.

In the event that accelerated federal funding cannot be secured, the LPA would be constructed in three sequential phases in accordance with the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. The first phase to the Wilshire/La Cienega Station would open in 2020, the second phase to the Century City Station would open in 2026, and the final phase to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station would open in 2036.

Please refer to Section 2.6.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for further information on the construction schedule.

Century City station.

262-1 How far west? I think within the funding it should go to the VA. This reduces the impact on Westwood, makes connections for bikes and bikers and buses from the west of the 405 easier, and it just seems a better idea. Once there is more funding, I would take it all and do

262-2 Santa Monica and West Hollywood. And I grew up in Hancock Park, so I would say yes to a Crenshaw station and not leave that neighborhood out.

262-3 In terms of Century City, if you're going through all the trouble and expense to build this, you should build to where the people are, the greatest number of riders are. That's the Constellation location.

262-4 In terms of the routes, I can't see why you wouldn't take the shortest, most feasible route. It doesn't make any sense to make the ride longer, in my opinion.

262-5 I'm very supportive of this project, and I hope it's built in ten years and not 30.

Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

Okay. Ellen Mercier, followed by Glenn Flug and then Susan West.

MS. MERCIER: I'm Ellen Mercier, and I lived through the recent Santa Monica Boulevard revision, and I'm happy

262-1

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

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

262-2

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

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

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

262-3

Your comment in support of the Century City Constellation Station has been noted. On October 28, 2010, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 2 (Westwood/VA Hospital Extension) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). As part of the LPA selection, the Metro Board of Directors decided to continue to study both station location options in Century City (Santa Monica Boulevard and Constellation Boulevard) to address concerns

262-3

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:

262-3

www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

262-4

Your comment about selecting the most direct and least expensive route that generates the highest ridership has been noted. Ridership is indeed one of several important factors that Metro considers in its recommendations to the Board. In selecting a route, Metro considers several factors, including ridership, user benefits, travel time, capital costs, performance characteristics, and environmental impacts. Generally, the least expensive, most direct, and highest ridership route is the preferred route, but a combination or balancing of the factors identified above are used in making a selection. Between Beverly Hills and Century City, two route options – Santa Monica and Constellation North – were carried forward for further analysis in the Final EIS/EIR as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). These route options reflect the two station location options remaining in Century City. In the case of the route options between Century City and Westwood, the East Alignment was selected as part of the LPA, as it is shorter and less costly than the West Alignment and has fewer environmental impacts than the Central Alignment.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including alignment locations, and the LPA selection process. The *Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report* provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the alignments in the Century City vicinity 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.

262-5

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

Your comment about the project schedule has also been noted. In April 2010, the Metro Board of Directors adopted the America Fast Forward 30/10 Initiative that directs that the Westside Subway Extension Project to seek accelerated federal funding to deliver the Project in a single phase to Westwood. Based on this accelerated funding schedule, the parallel construction of portions of the alignment and stations would allow the entire LPA to be open and operational to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station in 2022 as a single phase.

In the event that accelerated federal funding cannot be secured, the LPA would be constructed in three sequential phases in accordance with the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. The first phase to the Wilshire/La Cienega Station would open in 2020, the second phase to the Century City Station would open in 2026, and the final phase to the Westwood/VA Hospital Station would open in 2036.

262-5

Please refer to Section 2.6.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for further information on the construction schedule.

263-1

to tell you everything the elected officials promised us and never happened. Jackhammers roared at 2:00 in the morning, babies screamed, cars were hit, animals were killed, all at the promise of the impact studies saying none of this would transpire, so forgive my lack in apathy of elected officials promise us.

Secondly, and more importantly, I am a master

263-2

student of public policy at Pepperdine, and I would encourage fiscal responsibility. There is no guarantee at this point, none whatsoever, that the federal funds will match Measure R. Furthermore, Measure R will not fund the entire project.

In a time of recession where taxes are going down, income is lower, stagnation in the growth of Los Angeles we've never seen before, or not in the recent history, puts forth what happens if the funding is not there. I'm sure our elected officials will find a wonderful way to tax us again to come in with the money.

Up and beyond fiscal responsibility, I would encourage you to build within budget. Why overstep what we can financially can do at this point? Do what we budgeted for. If, in fact, we find that we are under budget, then you can extend the line. Until then, do what we've proposed, keep it within budget, and then come back to the taxpayers and ask us for an increase in income.

263-1

Your comments about the impacts from the Santa Monica Boulevard project have been noted. While Metro appreciates the complaints that you indicate in your comment, Metro has no means of addressing these concerns given that the improvements to Santa Monica Boulevard have been completed.

With regard to any construction impacts from the Westside Subway Extension Project, Metro has worked diligently with the community and through the environmental impact analysis process to identify potential environmental impacts and then to identify measures to mitigate those potential impacts. Please refer to tables S-6, S-7, and S-8 in the Executive Summary of the Final EIS/EIR for a summary of the impacts and mitigation measures for the Project. A complete list of the mitigation measures can also be found in Appendix I, Mitigation Monitoring Report Program, of the Final EIS/EIR.

263-2

The approved financial plan for the Westside project is based on the assumption that Metro will receive a portion of the funding from the Federal Transit Administration for the project. If Metro does not receive a commitment of FTA New Starts funding for the project, the Board will reevaluate whether the project can be funded with non-New Starts funding. Please refer to Chapter 6 of the Final EIS/EIR for the cost and fiscal analysis of the Project.

Thank you.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Glenn Flug, followed by Susan West and then Ruth -- is this the same Ruth Weinberg who already spoke or was that Weisberg?

By the way, that's the last card that I have, but I'll take more speaker's cards. Rebecca will help you out, so please turn them in.

Go ahead, Mr. Flug.

MR. FLUG: Good evening. I'm a resident of Westwood, and I'm also a regular user of the Purple L and Red Line. I find them dirty, slower than driving, and the only thing I can really count on is that during any week, the escalator will be out of service at at least one of the stations.

264-1

One issue you didn't address, what makes the Red Line so successful, is volume of people it carries from North Hollywood to the downtown area. No one has addressed this for the west side. There is no presentation in terms of moving people from the Valley to the work sites in either Westwood or Century City. I don't think there's anybody who commutes from Century City to Westwood, or vice versa, who would take the underground.

264-2

The second thing is after San Bruno, nobody mentioned anything about natural gas pipeline issues.

264-1

Your comment on future transit connections to a Sepulveda/I-405 line has been noted. The San Fernando Valley I-405 Corridor Connection is included in Metro's 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan and funding has been allocated in Measure R for the project. Metro will undertake planning studies for the corridor to identify the mode, alignment and appropriate connections to other area transit projects, including the Westside Subway Extension. Within the LPA, riders from the North Hollywood area would be able to access the Westside through a transfer from the Red Line to the Purple Line.

264-2

Your comment regarding methane gas and other subsurface hazardous gases has been noted.

Safety, both during construction and eventual operations, is one of Metro's highest priorities. It was also one of the key evaluation criteria during the Draft EIS/EIR, and has been further considered in the Final EIS/EIR phase. In 2005, an American Public Transportation Association Peer Review Panel determined that "It is possible to tunnel and operate a subway along the Wilshire Corridor safely." This conclusion was reached given the newer technology now used for tunneling, including pressurized face tunnel boring machines.

Subsurface gas is present throughout much of the Los Angeles area and is often a factor in foundation design and construction of underground structures. While tunneling for transportation has special considerations, other projects have been constructed in subsurface gas zones within the Los Angeles region, including buildings with deep parking garages and basements, storm drains, sewer projects and other utility projects along the Wilshire Corridor. In addition, Metro has safely operated the existing Metro Red/Purple Line subway for over 15 years and has successfully constructed subway tunnels where subsurface gas has been present.

Methane and hydrogen sulfide are present in high concentrations along about a 1.1 mile stretch of the Westside Subway Extension alignment along Wilshire Boulevard from about Burnside Avenue on the east to about La Jolla Avenue on the west. However, the entire LPA alignment passes through an area characterized by oil and gas fields and is within the City's Methane Zone. Therefore, the possibility of encountering gaseous subsurface conditions can be expected for any portion of the alignment, and hazardous subsurface gases pose a significant hazard for construction of the LPA.

During construction, the pressurized face tunnel boring machines isolate gas from workers and the public, while gassy soil and tar sands are handled and disposed of appropriately. Robust underground ventilation and gas monitoring systems provide additional warning and protection. In addition, the state of California's division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) maintains strict safety orders for tunneling where ground is classified as

264-2

"Gassy" or "Potentially Gassy." Safety measures include continuous monitoring of the environment, "spark-proof" equipment, and other means to reduce risks to workers and the surroundings. The following mitigation measures will be implemented during construction of the LPA to reduce risks related to the presence of hazardous subsurface gases:

- CON-51—Techniques to Lower the Risk of Exposure to Hydrogen Sulfide
- CON-52—Measures to Reduce Gas Inflows
- CON-53—Further Research on Oil Well Locations
- CON-54—Worker Safety for Gassy Tunnels

The design and operation for tunnels and stations will provide a redundant protection system against gas intrusion. This will include: physical barriers to keep gas out of the tunnels and stations; high volume ventilation systems to dilute gases to safe levels; gas detection and monitoring systems with alarms; emergency ventilation triggered by the gas detection systems; additional training of personnel to respond to alarms. The following mitigation measures will be implemented during operation of the LPA to minimize risks related to subsurface hazardous gases:

- GEO-5 – Hazardous Subsurface Gas Operations
- GEO-6—Hazardous Subsurface Gas Structural Design
- GEO-7 – Tunnel Advisory Panel Design Review

With implementation of these mitigation measures, risks associated with hazardous subsurface gases will be reduced to less than significant levels during both construction and operation of the LPA.

Please refer to Section 4.8 (operations) and Section 4.15 (construction) of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed discussion of methane gas and other subsurface hazardous gases. The results of further geotechnical investigations conducted during the Final EIS/EIR can be found in 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.

264-3 Nobody went into electromagnetic wave issues, and most
264-4 importantly, nobody discussed the operating cost issues,
and it would be interesting to see if Metro would be
willing to open their books to outside inspection on how
the trains have been operating financially to date.
264-5 The last anything I'd like to say is I would
address the 30/10 issues, which just appalls me that
anyone would place 30 years of income into the hands of
Metrorail, L.A. City or anything else, and say, "Go to
it."

264-3

The Project will not operate on an electromagnetic suspension. The subway is an electrified rail system provided by traction power. Traction power substations would be located in the station box or in the crossover box and are generally in an underground room that measures about 50 feet by 100 feet. A cost and financial analysis was provided for the Project and is presented in Chapter 6 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Detailed information on this analysis is also provided in the *Westside Subway Extension Cost and Financial Analysis* technical report for the Project. Additional information on operating costs for Metro transit can be found on the Metro web site at www.metro.net. . All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

264-4

The operating and maintenance (O&M) costs for each alternative are presented in Chapter 6 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Existing O&M costs are reported in Metro's Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports and budget documents, which can be found at http://www.metro.net/about/financebudget/

264-5

The concept of the 30/10 Initiative is to use the long-term revenue from the Measure R sales tax as collateral for long-term bonds and a federal loan which will allow Metro to build 12 key mass transit projects in 10 years, rather than 30. This will result in substantial cost savings, and expedite project benefits.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you. I need you to wrap it up; everyone gets two minutes. Thank you.

Okay. Susan West, followed by Ruth Weinberg.

That's the last card I have, but I'll take more. Let us know.

265-1 MS. WEST: I want to start by saying I support the need for a subway. I think it's a really good idea, but I

265-2 agree with the woman in the orange that we can't really trust that there won't be large problems, and I live in one of the neighborhoods where the subway will be going under, and I really think we need to look long and hard for alternatives.

I also think that you should read the EIR report and not just the executive summary because the executive summary leaves off some very, very, very critical pieces.

265-1

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

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

265-2

Your comment about looking long and hard for alternatives has been noted. In selecting a route, Metro considers several factors, including ridership, user benefits, travel time, capital costs, performance characteristics, and environmental impacts. Generally, the least expensive, most direct, and highest ridership route is the preferred route, but a combination or balancing of the factors identified above are used in making a selection. Between Beverly Hills and Century City, two route options – Santa Monica and Constellation North – were carried forward for further analysis in the Final EIS/EIR as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). These route options reflect the two station location options remaining in Century City. In the case of the route options between Century City and Westwood, the East Alignment was selected as part of the LPA, as it is shorter and less costly than the West Alignment and has fewer environmental impacts than the Central Alignment.

Please refer to Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR for an overview of the development of alternatives, including alignment locations, and the LPA selection process. The *Westside Subway Extension Alternatives Screening and Refinement Following Scoping Report* provides a more detailed description of the refinements to the alignments in the Century City vicinity 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.

265-3

For instance, it only looks at cost and seismic. It says that the seismic strongly -- Constellation is a strong preference because of seismic, yet when you look inside the report, the summary of the seismic section says that all alternatives are perfectly fine and any one of them could be built, all options, any one of them could be built.

265-4

There's also a sense that we have unjustified concerns about noise and vibration. In fact, that was the only concern that was mentioned by the executive summary, yet by their very own report, the areas where they would like to put the options are much more sensitive to noise and vibrations than the main route a long Wilshire and Santa Monica.

265-5

There are any number of discrepancies that we found between the executive summary and the actual data that's reported in the report, so I really highly recommend that if this is really an issue that concerns you, that you read the entire EIR and not just the executive summary.

MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

And Ms. Weinberg, we're only giving people one time. I'm sorry. Everybody only gets one turn to speak, but, again, you have lots of ways to turn in your comments.

265-3

Your comment regarding the Executive Summary has been noted. The Summary attempts to provide a high level synopsis of all aspects of the Project. for more detail on any aspect of the Project or the potential environmental impacts, refer to the specific sections of the Draft and Final EIS/EIR.

Your comment about seismic safety has been noted. The LPA, as with most sites in southern California, is susceptible to strong ground shaking generated during earthquakes by nearby faults. At least one segment of the Santa Monica Fault crosses the LPA. In addition to the Santa Monica Fault, the West Beverly Hills Lineament (WBHL)/Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone crosses the LPA in the vicinity of Moreno Drive in the Century City area. However, many underground facilities—subway tunnels, sewers, and storm drains—have been built in Los Angeles and throughout California near and across active fault lines.

The hazards from an earthquake include fault rupture (cracking/fracturing of the ground where one side of the fault moves relative to the other), shaking, and other secondary effects. While the hazard due to shaking can be designed against, the hazard due to fault rupture is potentially much more severe, but is also much more limited in area, being confined to the specific zone of rupture. Because surface fault rupturing is generally confined to a relative narrow zone of tens to several hundred feet wide, avoidance is often a practical means of avoiding surface fault rupture hazards for facilities such as stations. Furthermore, since subway stations are structures for human occupancy, they should not be built on active fault/deformation zones because of life/safety concerns expressed in state regulations and in Metro Design Criteria.

However, for linear facilities such as tunnels, avoidance may not be possible. Design will allow for the tunnels to cross the faults as perpendicular as possible to the fault line to limit the area of potential damage. Tunneling or building stations along an active fault in a parallel direction is generally not recommended and is in some instances prohibited by State law. Depending on the predicted fault off-set and area over which the movement is distributed, some distortion may be accommodated by the structure. Special designs, such as larger tunnel diameters and enhanced tunnel linings, are employed when crossing fault zones to reduce the risk of damage and allow for a relatively swift return to regular operations should fault displacement take place at a tunnel crossing. The Metro Red Line tunnels cross the Hollywood Fault north of the Highland Station and were built to these heightened standards.

During the Final EIS/EIR phase, Metro conducted further geotechnical studies to supplement the studies conducted during the Draft EIS/EIR, which concluded that both the Santa Monica fault zone and the WBHL in the Century City vicinity are active fault zones and each fault zone is capable of generating earthquakes of M7 or greater with average surface displacements of 3 to 6 feet. Moreover, there is no knowledge of where either of

265-3

these faults resides in their respective seismic cycles.

Santa Monica Boulevard effectively lies within the Santa Monica Fault zone from west of Century Park West to east of Avenue of the Stars. The originally proposed Santa Monica Boulevard Station at Avenue of the Stars would be directly within the fault zone. The WBHL is a wide fault zone with several well-defined strands situated along the eastern margin of Century City. It is the inferred northern extension of the active Newport-Inglewood fault zone. The WBHL terminates the active Santa Monica Fault to the east. The refined location of the Santa Monica Station at Century Park East would straddle the WBHL. No evidence of faulting was found on the Constellation Boulevard Station site.

In summary, both of the Santa Monica Boulevard Station options are located within active fault zones, but the Constellation Boulevard Station site is located outside zones of active faulting and can be considered a viable option. The LPA will cross fault zones and will require special designs to accommodate fault movement. These mitigation measures, which are detailed in Section 4.8 of this Final EIS/EIR include:

- GEO-2—Fault Crossing Tunnel, Fault Rupture, Tunnel Crossing
- GEO 7 – Tunnel Advisory Panel Design Review

With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts will reduced to less than significant. During subsequent design phases, explorations will continue to more precisely locate the fault zones with respect to the tunnel alignment selected and the fault characteristics for design.

All tunnels, stations, shafts and all other project facilities and infrastructure are designed and built with due consideration and a strict adherence to earthquake design requirements, building codes and conformance to Metro Design Standards for the ground motions of the design level earthquakes.

- GEO-1—Seismic Ground Shaking
- GEO-3—Operational Procedures During an Earthquake
- GEO 7 – Tunnel Advisory Panel Design Review

By compliance with these regulations and requirements, potential seismic ground shaking impacts will be minimized and impacts will be reduced to less than significant.

Please refer to Section 4.8 and Section 4.15 of the Final EIS/EIR for more detailed discussion of seismic safety both during operation and construction. The results of further geotechnical investigations conducted during the Final EIS/EIR can be found in the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Fault Investigation Report* and the *Westside Subway Extension Century City Area Tunneling Safety Report*. All reports are available on the Metro Westside Subway Extension Project website: www.metro.net/projects/westside/westside-reports.

265-4

Your comment about noise and vibration has been noted. Table 5-6 in the Executive Summary of the Draft EIS/EIR stated that "Noise impacts relating to construction are expected to be adverse." The table then proceeds to list a series of mitigation measures that would be taken to minimize these effects. As stated in Section 4.6.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR, there would be no noise or vibration impacts after mitigation.

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,

265-4

which will reduce ground-borne noise by 5 to 6 dBA.

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

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

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

265-5

Your comments about discrepancies between the executive summary and the actual data in the report have been noted. Since no specific discrepancies were noted, no specific response can be provided. However, refer to the response to comment 265-3 above about the intent of the executive summary to be a synopsis of the full Draft EIS/EIR. For any specifics about the Project or potential impacts, refer to the specific sections of the Draft EIS/EIR or Final EIS/EIR.

Is there anyone else who wants to speak tonight who hasn't spoken yet?

So with that, I want to remind you we will be around to continue to answer your questions. We have copies of the documents here. We have a lot more information online. Remember, this was a very high-level overview. Please get your comments in by October 18th, and thank you all for coming tonight and with that, we'll conclude the public hearing, and, again, if you didn't sign in, please do so at the back.

Thank you very much.

(Hearing adjourned at 7:48 p.m.)