

METRO RAIL
- ENVIRONMENTAL
14 IMPACT

ORIGINAL

CORE
TRANSCRIPTS

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PUBLIC HEARING RE DRAFT COPY OF
THE SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT ON METRO RAIL CONGRESSIONALLY
ORDERED RE-ENGINEERING STUDY ALIGNMENT

SATURDAY, MARCH 14, 1987

DISTRICT BOARD ROOM
425 SOUTH MAIN STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Reported by

COLLEEN LONG

AJ
JAD
GARYS.
S. Sowell
F. ce
KOGRAM

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

Public hearing before the Board of Directors of the Southern California Rapid Transit District, taken before COLLEEN LONG, a resident of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, at the District Board Room, 425 South Main Street, Los Angeles, California, on Saturday, the 14th day of March, 1987.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD:

MARVIN HOLEN, Chairman
CARMEN ESTRADA, Vice President

RTD STAFF

JOHN DYER, General Manager
GARY SPIVACK, Assistant General Manager

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

PROCEEDINGS

MR. HOLEN: Meeting of the Board of Directors of Southern California Rapid Transit District will come to order and our secretary will please call the roll.

MADAM SECRETARY: Carmen Estrada?

MS. ESTRADA: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: John Day?

(No response.)

MADAM SECRETARY: Joseph Dunning?

(No response.)

MADAM SECRETARY: Nate Holden?

(No response.)

MADAM SECRETARY: Marvin Holen?

MR. HOLEN: Here.

MADAM SECRETARY: Leonard Panish?

(No response.)

MADAM SECRETARY: Nick Patsaouras?

(No response.)

MADAM SECRETARY: Jay B. Price?

(No response.)

MADAM SECRETARY: Charles Storing?

(No response.)

MADAM SECRETARY: Gordana Swanson?

(No response.)

1 MR. HOLEN: My name is Marvin Holen. I'm a
2 member of the Board of Directors and I am chairman of
3 the Metro Rail Committee.

4 On my left is Ms. Carmen Estrada, who
5 is the vice president of our Board of Directors.

6 This meeting is for the purpose of receiving
7 public comment on the draft copy of the Subsequent
8 Environmental Impact Report on the Metro Rail
9 Congressionally Ordered Re-Engineering Study Alignment.

10 That is a long way to describe this nearly
11 600-page bound volume that I am holding up in my right
12 hand. This is the document which is the basic document
13 with respect to the establishment and the mode of that
14 alignment, be it subway or aerial or a combination, of the
15 Metro Rail Project for Los Angeles.

16 The purpose of the meeting is to receive
17 public comment on the final alignment of the Metro Rail
18 Project. It is to obtain expressions of public attitudes
19 and public concerns relating to the alignment and the mode
20 of that alignment being, as I noted earlier, subway
21 or aerial or a combination of subway and aerial.

22 There has been a long period during which the
23 RTD has reached out and drawn in public comment on the
24 Metro Rail Project. There were six rounds of community
25 meetings held throughout the area which is going to be

1 affected by the Metro Rail Project. On April 1st, 1986, a
2 public hearing was held, at which time testimony was taken
3 with respect to the Metro Rail Project and the public
4 concerns and attitudes. Following that hearing there were
5 four CORE Forum meetings held with respect to the
6 community's interest in the alignment and the mode of that
7 alignment with respect to the Metro Rail Project.

8 I might note that at each of these
9 Four CORE Forum meetings eighty to ninety individuals
10 representing upwards of two hundred separate organizations
11 came and expressed themselves with respect to the
12 matters that I have described; the alignment of
13 the Metro Rail Project and the mode of the Metro Rail
14 Project.

15 The reason for Metro Rail, the reason for
16 building the project, is one of costs; that the cost of
17 delivering a passenger by bus is perhaps the highest cost
18 that can be suffered with respect to delivery of large
19 numbers of people. The cost of delivering the same
20 passenger by heavy rail is perhaps the lowest cost that
21 you can achieve in delivering the same passenger.
22 That cost requires a subsidy of perhaps 60 percent to
23 deliver a passenger on a bus.

24 That cost will be reduced to almost nil on
25 the Metro Rail Project so long as the

1 community selects a proper alignment meeting the density
2 corridors, and is able to construct a project in a proper
3 fashion.

4 So, Metro Rail is basically for the purpose
5 of increasing the efficiency and delivery of the public
6 transportation service in Los Angeles.

7 The cost does not describe it all. There are
8 many other reasons. The time and efforts and energy of
9 the passenger speedily going through the city,
10 distinguished from slowly grinding through the city
11 in the heavy traffic on a bus; the cleanliness of the
12 air; the added cost of the wear and tear on our
13 streets; the reduction of accidents; the reduction of the
14 safety costs, are all part of this kind of a project.

15 However, the only thing we have measured is
16 the one thing we have described, that is the reduction in
17 costs of operations all the way from today's subsidy
18 required of 60 percent of those costs to almost nil.

19 I will also note for you that we have somehow
20 or another managed to inject into the body politic a
21 disease; a disease which results in paralysis. The first
22 initiative for a Metro Rail Project in Los Angeles
23 commenced about ten years ago and it took ten years to get
24 to ground breaking, and I would suggest to you that is a
25 state of paralysis that our society cannot continue to

1 afford. It is very easy to be destructive with respect to
2 public efforts. It is very difficult to be constructive
3 with respect to public projects.

4 I would ask you to keep that in mind with
5 respect to your concerns, your attitudes, your positive
6 feelings and your negative feelings with respect to the
7 matters that we will be discussing today.

8 The secretary will please read into the
9 record the information relating the notification of this
10 meeting.

11 MADAM SECRETARY: The notice of intent to
12 hold public hearing was published in the L.A. Times, La
13 Opinion, Daily News, Los Angeles Sentinel, Los Angeles
14 Examiner, Beverly Hills Courier, Eastside Sun, Wave and
15 San Fernando Valley Sun & Breeze.

16 Copies of the draft subsequent Environment
17 Impact Report were sent to elected officials and
18 government agencies at the local, state and federal level;
19 to community groups; members of the CORE Forum; and
20 members of the Interagency Management Committee.

21 A copy of the notice of intent was mailed to
22 federal, state and local agencies who have legal authority
23 to develop and enforce environmental standards and to
24 those who may have an interest in the project.

25 Notices were posted at intersections where

1 Metro Rail stations are being considered, where aerial
2 structures are proposed and in stores near proposed
3 stations.

4 Affidavits of publication and detailed
5 mailing lists are filed with the district secretary and
6 are available in my office for review.

7 That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

8 MR. HOLEN: All right. Thank you.

9 I would like to note that the staff
10 presentation will take between twenty-five minutes and
11 thirty minutes, following which we will have statements
12 from the public.

13 Mr. Dyer.

14 MR. DYER: Thank you, Director Holen,
15 Mr. Chairman.

16 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

17 My name is John Dyer; I serve as the General
18 Manager of RTD.

19 This hearing is being held under the
20 provision of Section 15087(g) of the California
21 Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, which encourages
22 public agencies to conduct public hearings on
23 environmental documents.

24 The purpose of this hearing is to receive
25 spoken testimony or written comments about the Draft

1 Report. I would emphasize that this is not a forum to
2 debate issues or answer questions about the Metro Rail
3 Project. Rather, we are here to receive your opinions and
4 concerns on the Draft Report and to make them part of the
5 record so that they might be responded to by the staff and
6 be reviewed and given due consideration by the RTD Board
7 of Directors.

8 In the audience are staff members who have
9 cards you may fill out in order that you may be called
10 upon to make a statement. You may also use the cards to
11 make a written statement which would be part of the record
12 of this hearing. After the hearing, the period for
13 receiving written comments will stay open until April the
14 10th, 1987, to accommodate public agency requests for any
15 extensions.

16 Before the Board of Directors can select an
17 alignment for the involved portion of Metro Rail, a Final
18 Subsequent Environmental Impact Report must be completed
19 and the Board of Directors must certify that the
20 requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act
21 have been met. There may be several differences between
22 the Draft Report that we will discuss today and the final
23 document. The steps to complete the final document are:

24 First, the final report will contain a
25 compilation of all the substantive comments that have been

1 made at this hearing or in letters that have been
2 received.

3 Second, the final report will contain
4 responses to these comments.

5 Finally, where more precise or revised
6 information has become available since the Draft Report
7 was circulated, such information will be included in the
8 final report. As I am sure you will appreciate, the
9 preparation of the final report is a major effort which
10 will take at least one additional month. When the final
11 report is completed, the RTD Board of Directors will
12 review the documents and certify that all of the
13 substantive comments have been responded to accurately and
14 responsibly.

15 Another very important step will be to
16 determine that reasonable and adequate mitigation measures
17 have been identified for adverse impacts. By certifying
18 the final report, the RTD Board will be committing RTD to
19 the implementation of these mitigation measures should it
20 approve a project.

21 Now, let me move, if I might, to talk a
22 little bit more about the Draft Report.

23 It was prepared in conjunction with the
24 Congressionally Ordered Re-Engineering Study. The CORE
25 Study includes the identification and evaluation of

1 Candidate Alignments, the investigation of subsurface
2 conditions, and the assessment of environmental impacts.
3 The goal of the CORE Study is to identify an appropriate
4 alignment to link the San Fernando Valley, the Wilshire
5 Corridor, and the MOS-1 segments of Metro Rail into a
6 system. This alignment should provide service to the Los
7 Angeles region comparable to the service that would have
8 been provided by the original 18.6 mile project, while
9 avoiding tunneling through any portion of the methane gas
10 risk zones identified in the Task Force Report of the City
11 of Los Angeles, dated March 24th, 1985.

12 In January 1986, the RTD Board of Directors
13 adopted a Public Consultation Plan to encourage and
14 facilitate broad-based community input for the CORE Study
15 decision-making process. Through this process public
16 input was solicited and received for the technical and
17 environmental decisions necessary to redefine the Metro
18 Rail Alignment. There have also been numerous briefings
19 with elected officials, businesses, and community
20 organizations, and public agencies. Input received at
21 these meetings was analyzed by the District staff and used
22 as a basis for formal recommendations, which, with
23 supporting data and public comments, were compiled into
24 reports and submitted to the Board of Directors. These
25 reports include six major documents.

- 1 First, the Public Consultation Plan.
- 2 Second, Subsurface Conditions Study.
- 3 Third, Candidate Alignments and Stations for
- 4 Further Study.
- 5 Fourth, Second Level Evaluation of Candidate
- 6 Alignments and Stations.
- 7 Fifth, Initial Ranking of Candidate
- 8 Alignments.
- 9 And Sixth, Operable Segments Analysis.

10 The District offered various ways for the
11 public to provide input for the CORE Study decision-making
12 process. At community meetings open discussions that
13 followed formal presentations which encouraged dialog,
14 questions and comments. This allowed District staff the
15 opportunity to elaborate on issues and concepts introduced
16 in the presentations. For those who chose not to
17 participate in discussions, the District provided printed
18 comments -- comment forms, pardon me -- which participants
19 could make written comments back to the district.

20 A series of six groups of public meetings was
21 held from January through November, 1986 to allow
22 interested citizens the opportunity to participate in the
23 process of modifying Metro Rail route and station
24 locations. As part of the study of candidate alignments,
25 RSD held 28 community meetings attended by approximately

1 835 individuals and representatives from community groups.

2 The attendees represented many homeowners
3 groups, especially those from the Wilshire and San Vicente
4 corridors; businesses from Wilshire, Fairfax, and
5 Hollywood corridors; and institutions from the Wilshire
6 and Hollywood areas.

7 Another method was used to encourage public
8 review and comments on preferred routes and modes for the
9 realignment of Metro Rail. This was the CORE Forum that
10 Chairman Holen mentioned just a moment ago. It is a group
11 of community leaders, elected officials and citizens, who
12 met four times from November 1986 through February 1987.
13 It was instrumental in developing mix-and-match
14 alternatives that resulted in the final five Candidate
15 Alignments contained in the Draft EIR report.

16 At the February 4 meeting of the CORE Forum,
17 a financial analysis of Candidate Alignments was
18 presented. This analysis demonstrated that with the
19 exception of the "All-Subway Alignment," the four
20 remaining alternatives, plus five Light Rail systems could
21 be constructed by the year 2000.

22 Two additional alternatives, labeled as the
23 "General Consensus" and the "Extended Alignment 3" were
24 presented for comparison and are not among the
25 alternatives fully considered in the Draft Report.

1 During the CORE Study, the District has used
2 an Interagency Management Committee to coordinate the
3 recommendations of public agencies participating in the
4 Metro Rail Project. This committee is composed of
5 representatives from the City of Los Angeles Planning and
6 Transportation Departments, the Los Angeles Community
7 Re-Development Agency, the City of Los Angeles Legislative
8 and Analyst's Office, the Southern California Association
9 of Governments, the Los Angeles County Transportation
10 Commission and the Los Angeles County Department of
11 Regional Planning.

12 This technical committee met at least twice
13 each month throughout the development of the Draft Report
14 and provided key inputs on the major issues and impacts of
15 the alignments.

16 During the fall of 1986 it became apparent
17 that the Federal Government would not participate at that
18 time in the study, and the environmental process was
19 required by congressional legislation. Therefore, it is
20 important for the District to complete the CORE Study and
21 select a recommended alignment from the Candidate
22 Alignments examined in the Draft Report. This will assist
23 in demonstrating to the Congress of the United States that
24 the Los Angeles Community is fulfilling its
25 responsibilities to meet the transit needs of the region.

1 and is therefore worthy of continued federal financial
2 support.

3 Accordingly, the District has prepared the
4 Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report as a separate
5 document under the provisions of the California
6 Environmental Quality Act.

7 Mr. Chairman, this concludes my report.

8 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Dyer.

9 I'd like to now call on our Assistant General
10 Manager for planning and communications, Mr. Spivack.

11 MR. SPIVACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 MR. HOLEN: By the way, he is the primary
13 author of this volume that I held up.

14 MR. SPIVACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

16 My name is Gary Spivack.

17 The proposed action for which this draft SEIR
18 was prepared is the realignment of a portion of the
19 currently adopted Metro Rail Project connecting downtown
20 Los Angeles, Wilshire, Hollywood and North Hollywood.

21 There are five Candidate Metro Rail
22 Alignments described in the Draft Report. The
23 environmental impacts of each alignment are described,
24 both for the construction of the system as well as the
25 operation.

1 I will briefly summarize the five Candidate
2 Alignments and the range of environmental impacts.

3 Candidate Alignment 1 is all in subway with
4 portions of Wilshire Boulevard to Fairfax Avenue, on
5 Vermont Avenue, Hollywood Boulevard, Highland Avenue, and
6 Lankershim Boulevard.

7 Candidate Alignment 2 is partly in subway on
8 Wilshire Boulevard to Western Avenue, on Vermont Avenue to
9 First Street, on Hollywood Boulevard, on Highland Avenue,
10 and on Lankershim Boulevard, with aerial segments along
11 Wilshire Boulevard from Western Avenue to Fairfax Avenue,
12 on Vermont Avenue and on Hollywood Boulevard.

13 Candidate Alignment 3 is partly in subway on
14 Wilshire Boulevard, Crenshaw Avenue and Pico Boulevard to
15 San Vicente Boulevard, Vermont Avenue to First Street,
16 Hollywood Boulevard and Lankershim Boulevard, with aerial
17 segments along Vermont Avenue and on Hollywood Boulevard.

18 Candidate Alignment 4 is partly in subway on
19 Wilshire Boulevard to Western Avenue, Vermont Avenue to
20 First Street, Sunset Boulevard, Highland Avenue, and
21 Lankershim Boulevard, with aerial segments along Wilshire
22 Boulevard from Western Avenue to Fairfax Avenue, on
23 Vermont Avenue and on Sunset Boulevard.

24 Candidate Alignment 5 is partly in subway on
25 Wilshire Boulevard to Western Avenue and on Western

1 Avenue, Sunset Boulevard, Highland Avenue and Lankershim
2 Boulevard, with an aerial segment on Wilshire Boulevard
3 from Western Avenue to Fairfax Avenue.

4 With one exception, virtually all of the
5 subway portions between stations would be tunneled, in
6 many cases by special tunnel boring machines, so that
7 while construction is going on below, little or no
8 disruption occurs at the ground level.

9 This method is different from the way most
10 subways have been constructed. Most subways have been
11 built using cut-and-cover construction, which requires
12 opening up a large trench within the street, building the
13 tunnel "box" and then backfilling and reconstructing the
14 street.

15 During construction, decking is placed over
16 the trench so approximately one-half of the traffic can
17 continue. This method of construction could also be used
18 to build the Candidate Alignment subway between Crenshaw
19 and Fairfax. However, tunneling through this area is
20 precluded by federal law.

21 In all cases where the stations are to be
22 located beneath the street, the cut-and-cover construction
23 will have to be used as well. While traffic will be kept
24 moving by leaving at least one lane open in each
25 direction, portions of the street over the station will

1 have to be blocked off for periods of time while supports
2 for temporary decking are put in place. Vehicular and
3 pedestrian traffic can then resume over this decking while
4 station construction continues underneath. At stations
5 located outside of the street right-of-way disruption
6 would be much less.

7 For aerial guidway segments of Candidate
8 Alignments 2, 3, 4, and 5, construction would involved
9 relocating utilities, placing foundations, construction
10 piers, and installing guideway girders. A typical four
11 block segment would be built in six to nine months.

12 In addition to the description of
13 construction impacts, the Draft Report includes an
14 evaluation of potential impact areas which are shown here,
15 and which will be mentioned in more detail.

16 The costs for the Candidate Alignments are
17 given in December 1985 dollars, and range from a low of
18 \$2.6 billion to a high of \$3.1 billion. Costs for
19 operating and maintaining the system are from \$38 to \$40
20 million annually for all alignments.

21 Estimated ridership for the year 2000 for the
22 Candidate Alignments ranges from 324,000 daily riders to
23 354,000 daily riders. by estimated year 2000 bus
24 ridership and the total system ridership is shown on this
25 slide.

1 Substantial positive impacts are expected
2 from Metro Rail with regard to transportation. Diversion
3 of automobile trips to rail and bus will reduce the
4 regional daily total of vehicle miles traveled, while at
5 the same time, there will be localized traffic increases
6 in the vicinity of stations.

7 Other traffic impacts could result from a
8 reduction of roadway capacity and restriction of traffic
9 movements due to placement of aerial guideways in streets
10 for Candidate Alignments 2, 3, 4, and 5. There is a
11 potential for parking impacts from demand spilling over
12 into nearby neighborhoods at some stations. Other parking
13 impacts would occur where placement of aerial guideways in
14 the street would require eliminating on-street parking.

15 Land use is another key area. The land use
16 policies of the City of Los Angeles emphasize the
17 reinforcement of "centers" of activity which would absorb
18 growth away from established residential neighborhoods.
19 Where feasible, Metro Rail Stations have been located in
20 these centers. In those cases where it was necessary to
21 locate stations outside of the designated "centers," RTD
22 will work closely with local government to insure that the
23 operation of Metro Rail does not unduly disrupt prescribed
24 land use patterns.

25 In a few cases, where significant growth

1 would not be in accord with station area plans, the growth
2 could be diverted to other stations. The majority of
3 station areas for all alignments would have sufficient
4 developable land to accommodate the significant commercial
5 growth expected; however, a majority of the station areas
6 would not be able to accommodate significant residential
7 growth.

8 Land acquisition and the accompanying
9 displacement of residents and businesses is an additional
10 impact. Metro Rail will displace relatively few dwelling
11 units and businesses for a project of its size, ranging
12 from 239 to 353 total displacements.

13 Displacement of residential units is
14 concentrated at portal where the line changes from subway
15 to aerial structure, at curves along the aerial segments,
16 and in the San Fernando Valley.

17 All alignments have locations where
18 ground-borne noise from subway operations would exceed the
19 established noise criteria, even with mitigation measures.
20 Alignments with aerial segments have locations where
21 air-borne noise from train operations would exceed the
22 noise criteria even with sound barrier walls.

23 Additional work would be done during
24 preliminary engineering and final design to meet the
25 project design criteria at all locations.

1 As a result of the fire at the Ross Store,
2 RTD conducted additional studies of the subsurface
3 conditions along the Candidate Alignments. The studies
4 showed that the greatest likelihood of encountering
5 subsurface gas is from the Wilshire/Western Station
6 westward to Wilshire/Fairfax, or Pico/San Vicente. Along
7 the northern segments of Vermont or Western Avenue, and in
8 the eastern side of Hollywood the likelihood of
9 encountering subsurface gas would be slightly less, while
10 in the western side of Hollywood the likelihood would be
11 lower still.

12 To prevent the infiltration of gas into the
13 tunnels and stations, RTD will wrap the tunnels and
14 stations in a high density polyethylene membrane. A
15 sample is on display at the rear of the room. In areas
16 where both high gas concentration and pressure exist, the
17 tunnels will be lined with welded steel to give added
18 protection from gas infiltration.

19 RTD has also examined the potential for
20 earthquakes to affect the Project. Of the twelve known
21 faults and folds in the study area only two are considered
22 to be active or potentially active: the Hollywood fault
23 and the Malibu-Santa Monica fault. Neither fault is
24 expected to move during the 50 to 100-years useful life of
25 Metro Rail.

1 Historic and cultural resources are evaluated
2 in a separate chapter in the Draft Report. RTD conducted
3 a thorough inventory of potential historically significant
4 structures along the route and found 18 structures
5 previously determined eligible, and 26 structures
6 potentially eligible for listings on the National Register
7 of Historic Places within the Areas of Potential Effect.
8 The number of cultural structures that would be adversely
9 affected ranges from 1 to 17, plus the Miracle Mile
10 Historic District.

11 At most cultural resources the adverse
12 impacts would be in the areas of aesthetics and noise or
13 vibration. Only at the La Brea Tar Pits and the Los Altos
14 Apartments will actual physical damage to the resource
15 occur.

16 During preliminary engineering and final
17 design, RTD will study mitigation measures that could
18 avoid or reduce these impacts. The technical reports that
19 were used to help develop the Draft Report are available
20 for your use from RTD's Environmental Engineering staff
21 and at RTD's library and information center at 425 South
22 Main Street. That's this building.

23 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

24 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Spivack.

25 Is there any reason to leave the table

1 open?

2 MR. SPIVACK: No.

3 MR. HOLEN: Please close the table.

4 We now come to the main purpose of the
5 meeting, which is to hear the public's comments.

2
6 I might note that we have always conducted
7 **these** kind of hearings in a "town hall" type of
8 atmosphere, where the comments by the public might
9 generate questions by Members of the Board or members of
10 the staff, and where we hope that everybody in the
11 audience, everybody amongst the public that's here, will
12 listen to the comments of those making public statements,
13 think about those comments and make your own statements
14 under the consideration that they will be heard and
15 listened to by your neighbors, and hopefully out of that
16 will come a public consensus with respect to Metro Rail,
17 where it goes and how it does it.

18 We're going to hold the public statements to
19 approximately three minutes. We have a little system up
20 there with a green light, yellow light, and red light.
21 The yellow light goes on thirty seconds before the three
22 minutes is up.

23 I'm going to start calling on members of the
24 public. Again, I would ask you to please address the
25 issue at hand, which is your thoughts, your feelings, your

1 concerns, your positive feelings, your negative feelings,
2 whatever it is that you would like to say about the Metro
3 Rail Project, and particularly with respect to the
4 alignments that we have studied.

5 First, Mr. Warren Richardson of the Wilshire
6 community.

7 Clearly state your name when you come to the
8 microphone and clearly state the organization or
9 organizations, singular or plural, and we have a court
10 reporter here and please give her the consideration of
11 speaking reasonably slowly and enunciating as clearly as
12 you can.

13 Okay. Mr. Richardson.

14 MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you.

15 My name is Warren Richardson of the Wilshire
16 community.

17 MR. HOLEN: Stand at the microphone.

18 MR. RICHARDSON: I'm sorry.

19 My name is Warren Richardson. I am from the
20 Wilshire community. I represent no organized group, but I
21 am representative of those persons who live in Wilshire
22 Corridor who are my neighbors.

23 With apologies to the younger persons here,
24 we've gone from the trolley to the moon in our lifetime,
25 and I think in coming to the 21st Century we owe it to

1 ourselves to adopt the Metro Rail system that has been
2 proposed. The pioneers came out here in the early days
3 and we need to pioneer something more ourselves, in my
4 opinion.

5 I live just south of Park La Brea, which is a
6 community within a community, which has 12,000 persons
7 living in that community, and in the entire Wilshire area
8 I would estimate there are probably 250,000 persons in
9 that corridor. Plus the fact that every weekday during
10 the work week we have an influx of numbers of people who
11 work at the CBS, at a -- tourists who come to Farmer's
12 Market and employees in the high rise office buildings, so
13 I'd like to address our need for this project.

14 What we preferably would like to do is to see
15 the terminal at Wilshire and Fairfax be underground,
16 because it would, in our opinion, disturb, noise-wise and
17 otherwise, the very facilities that we enjoy in our area,
18 and I feel that it would be in the interest of rapid
19 transportation, efficiency, economy, safety and especially
20 traffic control.

21 So to sum it all up, I just feel as
22 representative of our community, we join with you in what
23 you are doing. It will take us months to read this plan
24 and hopefully we will get the Metro Rail system in before
25 that.

1 Thank you, very much.

2 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Richardson.

3 MR. HOLDEN: I have a problem -- a question.

4 MR. HOLEN: Director Nate Holden has a
5 question.

6 MR. HOLDEN: Right.

7 My question is: You've heard recently about
8 the fact we have gas pockets there and it's likely that a
9 catastrophic situation could develop if we were to proceed
10 in using tunneling in that area.

11 Are you in favor of proceeding,
12 notwithstanding the facts of that being a likely
13 possibility?

14 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, Mr. Holden, I am. I
15 think we've been under a lot of guises about this. We're
16 all very concerned about what happened at Ross with that
17 methane explosion, and somehow I overly exaggerate when I
18 pray that possibly the La Brea Tar Pits go down fifty
19 feet, and I think that technologically -- I am from Boston
20 and I was born many years ago where there was a subway
21 system, one in New York and in Boston. We put it under
22 the Charles River, and in New York they similarly did many
23 things.

24 I don't feel that is a major problem, in my
25 opinion, though I'm not an engineer. I think we can be

1 comfortable with it. I think we over-magnify and
2 over-exaggerate that particular episode. By the same
3 token, I withhold in my own mental reservation if
4 engineering-wise it could be found that that is a factor,
5 then of course I would turn completely around.

6 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Richardson.

7 It should be noted that the District
8 conducted a number of geological tests recently and those
9 tests revealed that the exact same concentration of
10 methane gas exists throughout the western part of the Los
11 Angeles Basin. Everything west of the Central Business
12 District.

13 The so-called high risk area, which is drawn
14 on a map, certainly did not show the extent of that area.
15 It basically -- the map is nonsense because the same
16 concentrations exist, as I say, throughout the western
17 part of the city.

18 The second person is Mr. Leroy Jones.

19 MR. JONES: My name is Leroy Jones and I'm
20 just representing myself as a private citizen. I'm from
21 Santa Monica.

22 I would like to ask one question of Mr.
23 Holen: Now, you just made the statement that the methane
24 gas being in the same concentration throughout the western
25 areas. Does what you're saying mean you feel that

1 it is safe to dig in the entire western area?

2 MR. HOLEN: We want to point out, we want to
3 be very cautious that we do not prejudice the statements
4 by members of the public either for or against the
5 project. This is part of a very carefully described
6 statutory requirement, this particular hearing. During
7 the CORE Forum hearings we had a little bit more latitude
8 to describe the matters that had taken place. It is
9 important, however, that the public can comment in an
10 informed fashion, that they know, as we have stated
11 before, the results of our latest geological tests which
12 showed the extent of the methane gas.

13 I believe that the reports indicate that the
14 work can be done safely.

15 MR. JONES: Thank you.

16 My statement is -- I -- this statement comes
17 from my editorial letter which I wrote and was
18 editorialized in the Daily News on May 14, 1986, and then
19 I made a statement after that. The editorial reads as
20 follows:

21 After carefully reviewing the most recent
22 Metro Rail plan, I would like to suggest one slight change
23 be made. I believe the Mayor would strongly support a
24 change in direction starting with one-half block east of
25 Crenshaw Boulevard, on Wilshire turn one block, and then

1 take an immediate western route through the Mayor's living
2 room located at Sixth and Irving. This would save the
3 expense of building a subway station.

4 Renovation could be made to include a coffee
5 shop, newsstand, upstairs, which now is an existing tennis
6 court, to be used as loading platforms. Comfortable
7 benches could be brought in for the winos to sleep on.

8 Other savings to taxpayers of Los Angeles
9 could be that the Mayor would no longer require a
10 limousine or chauffer to take him back and forth to City
11 Hall; he could just step out of bed right onto the Metro
12 Rail.

13 Knowing full well that the Mayor will go to
14 any lengths to see Metro Rail boondogled I would submit
15 the project be called a Bradley Plant.

16 In March 12, 1987, it is my opinion the above
17 letter was not taken into serious consideration to be
18 added to the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report and
19 CORE Study because any digging, tunneling, or close
20 inspection in the proposed area, the Mayor's residence
21 would reveal a vast amount of toxic waste of taxpayer's
22 money, gross under-the-surface political manipulation and
23 extremely high levels of stupidity in order to avoid
24 having the above discovered.

25 MADAM SECRETARY: Time is up.

1 MR. JONES: Okay. My time's up.

2 MR. HOLEN: Okay. The green light is still
3 on. I can't see it.

4 All right. Thank you. You have 30 seconds.

5 MR. JONES: The RTD has just discovered the
6 Union Station site must be moved 300 yards at the cost of
7 \$1 million due to toxic soil. Since you're cramming Metro
8 Rail down our throats, I'm sure you will force us to cough
9 up this, plus a few million dollars for other costly
10 changes.

11 MR. HOLEN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jones.

12 Pablo Fiesta.

13 MR. FIESTA: I'm Pablo Fiesta, and I'm from
14 Southwest L.A.

15 As a private citizen I just want to bring up
16 my ideas about this, and first, I think there is a lot of
17 excess taxpayer's money being spent on this and I wonder
18 why we have to dig up all of Los Angeles when we could get
19 a much cheaper economical system of the overhead rail to
20 no-man's land out there in Wilshire and Alvarado. I don't
21 know if it's practical, but that's the suggestion I had in
22 mind.

23 The businesses in L.A. are taking a terrible
24 rip off. They're paying over ten times their taxes before
25 they see the results and I don't think that's fair to the

1 local businesses here, and I wonder what's going to happen
2 to our senior citizens and our students and disabled
3 people, because I know somewhere they're planning to up
4 the price and that affects this group of people immensely,
5 and I can't --

6 I remember a few years ago a famous Russian
7 came over here and made two statements. He says, "We'll
8 bury you," and "You will spend yourselves right out of
9 existence," and I can't keep that off my mind.

10 I hope we're not headed that way and I hope
11 that our money that was on the ballot for reduced fares
12 has not been jeopardized and they are using part of that
13 money that we pay cheaper fares on our buses.

14 I can't see why we can't get more on the
15 ballot that the people vote whether they would rather have
16 a cheaper sort of transportation and save money and have
17 an overhead rail to Wilshire and then from Wilshire on out
18 start digging if you got to dig, and that would save
19 disruption of the city.

20 I thank you.

21 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Fiesta.

22 Sheldon Walters.

23 MR. WALTERS: I didn't think I would be
24 called so soon.

25 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the

1 Board, Mr. Dyer and members of the staff.

2 I want to first compliment the staff and give
3 you a grade "A" for this fantastically fine report, and I
4 would also say that there are 200 days left to ground
5 breaking in the San Fernando Valley Metro Rail. We have
6 to get that started if any of this is going to make any
7 sense to tie in the Valley with the downtown area.

8 Now, we were talking about all this in the
9 background of Cal-Trans and some of our county officials
10 who are considering double-decking freeways, and I think
11 any alignment would be better than the double-decked
12 freeways. Any Metro Rail.

13 Let's go Metro Rail.

14 I think it would be presumptuous of me to
15 make a choice of suggestion as to which alignment to go
16 on. I don't live or work in the area that's under
17 consideration. I live in Van Nuys. However, I would
18 accept a Board selection of what is perceived to be
19 community consensus of the preferred alignment after you
20 have had your hearings and made your decisions.

21 I would like to have you consider perhaps the
22 shortest alignment between the Valley through making stops
23 in Hollywood, Wilshire and the San Fernando Valley -- I
24 mean, the downtown area. I certainly would not suggest
25 that this alignment be serpentine in any way. I mean, it

1 could pick up more people, but I think you will lose more
2 people who will want to make a direct line.

3 So I think the straightest possible travel
4 from the Valley to downtown would be most important.

5 In any case, no matter which way you decide
6 to go, there is going to be bus interface, no matter which
7 way you pick to go.

8 Each mile shorter will be, of course, a mile
9 less of cost. I mean, consider about \$200 million per
10 mile, subway, something perhaps less than that, but not
11 that much less because there is an awful lot of the
12 environmental impact for anything going aerial.
13 Construction on that would be less. It would be
14 completed sooner and certainly if we have a shorter line
15 it would certainly be less travel time.

16 I think the Metro Rail certainly is
17 expendable in any direction. I would encourage you to
18 proceed with preliminary engineering on the Wilshire
19 Corridor or go all the way out to Santa Monica, and
20 I would say there we're trying to design Metro Rail as a
21 permanent system, something that will stay with us for the
22 next 200 to 300 years. We'll design it as if we intend to
23 stay here.

24 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Walters.

25 Mrs. John Chalōise.

1 MRS. CHALDISE: Mr. Chairman, Members
2 present, I speak as a private citizen, although I have
3 been for over eight years a member of the Winsor Square
4 Association.

5 We have studied this very carefully and have
6 worked against the alignments that have been suggested and
7 offered.

8 I speak as a private citizen that would like
9 the reports that I have in my possession, replies to
10 letters which I have written to Mayor Bradley and to our
11 representative Waxman in Congress. In each letter they
12 clearly state that they totally oppose an over-head
13 alignment on Wilshire Boulevard.

14 I would like that to go on record, if you
15 please.

16 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, very much, and it is
17 made a part of our record by a transcript of this hearing.

18 Sylvia Babich.

19 MS. BABICH: My name is Sylvia Babich. I'm a
20 private citizen and I live in the Hollywood
21 Boulevard/Western area.

22 I'm totally opposed to an overhead alignment
23 mostly because I was born and raised in New York City and
24 remember the days of the El going through. And well, I'm
25 sure that they will be made better today, but even so, you

1 cut out the sun and it just engenders bad elements to come
2 under that area.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, very much.

5 Francis J. Heavey.

6 MR. HEAVEY: My name is Francis, the last
7 name is H-e-a-v-e-y as in Victor-y. I live --

8 MR. HOLEN: Do you have an organization?

9 MR. HEAVEY: Yes, I live in the Park La Brea
10 area. I'm here really as a resident of Park La Brea.

11 I'm quite concerned -- first of all, I'd like
12 to thank you gentlemen for letting me come up and talk.
13 You know, what you're doing here is astonishing. All the
14 work and the books that I see and everything else that I'm
15 reading on the thing is absolutely fantastic. I'm very
16 impressed.

17 MR. HOLEN: Thank you.

18 MR. HEAVEY: But I'm much more impressed with
19 what is happening within the community I live in.

20 I noticed that we have a lot of automobiles
21 coming in this community all the time and they are getting
22 more and more and more. They are coming from the area of
23 Wilshire Boulevard.

24 I read a survey one time that said for every
25 thousand square feet of commercial area that you put into

1 buildings that you bring in about three people. We're now
2 talking about opening Museum Square, I think it is, with a
3 million square feet of office space. It looks like we're
4 going to bring in what, about 3,000 more people. They're
5 going to be parking in Park La Brea and we don't have the
6 space now.

7 What we need, and I'm in favor of very
8 strongly, is that you gentlemen consider the Wilshire
9 route, and I know you spoke about the methane gas and all
10 this, but I hope there is a way that you can drill under
11 the ground and relieve some of that traffic on Wilshire
12 Boulevard, because if you don't that's going to be another
13 parking lot, or else Park La Brea is, and I certainly
14 would not like to see that happen.

15 So I thank you, and I would say I think it's
16 your alternative number one for which we go underground on
17 Wilshire Boulevard with a station at Wilshire and Fairfax,
18 because you have such a high concentration of people there
19 and they just spread out from that area.

20 And that's what I have to say, and I thank
21 you again.

22 Do you have any questions of me?

23 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, very much, Mr. Heavey.
24 We appreciate your taking the effort to come, as we do
25 everyone's.

1 Mr. Peter Gates.

2 MR. GATES: Mr. Chairman, can I defer, if you
3 will, to Mr. William Christopher?

4 MR. HOLEN: Certainly.

5 Yes, Mr. Christopher. Welcome to our public
6 hearing, Mr. Christopher.

7 MR. CHRISTOPHER: Good morning, members of
8 the Board and members of the staff.

9 I'm Bill Christopher, President of the
10 Westside Civic Federation, member of the Board of
11 Directors of the Miracle Mile Residential Circle, and
12 coordinator of the No El on Wilshire Coalition, known as
13 NEOW.

14 Over a year ago in the wake of the Ross
15 explosion and the subsequent initiation of the
16 Congressionally Ordered Re-Engineering Study, we
17 reconvened a group of people representing the interests
18 along the Wilshire Corridor. Many of the people
19 testifying today were at that meeting, including
20 representation by the RTD staff, and if I may be permitted
21 the same latitude with the findings of the consensus which
22 Mr. Holen exercised in his editing.

23 The groups along that route, with some
24 exceptions, came to the conclusion that there were two
25 viable options to the RTD to extend Metro Rail beyond

1 Alvarado.

2 We, the No El Coalition, stand before you
3 today to re-affirm those options identified so long ago:

4 One, you can stop for the time being at
5 Western, go to the Valley, and figure out later how to
6 serve the west side if all the questions can't be answered
7 now.

8 When this was first proposed, we were told
9 that in order to secure funding the whole route had to be
10 laid out. This morning we woke to find out that this may
11 not be true after all. Congress in conference yesterday
12 apparently agreed to sign a blank check for \$870 million,
13 although some strings were attached. I congratulate
14 Mr. Dyer for his successful lobbying campaign.

15 However, let's take that as an opportunity to
16 study the question of transit to the west side now that
17 funding pressure appears to have been relieved.

18 Since the beginning of the exercise we have
19 been asking, "What happens after Fairfax?"

20 Those of us who live in the proximity to the
21 proposed Fairfax station have repeatedly asked where and
22 when the line will move west of Fairfax. As the report
23 indicates traffic, noise and development will be
24 horrendous around the Fairfax station. Under no
25 circumstances do we feel it is an appropriate location for

1 an interim end-of-the-line station.

2 We have many times proposed that a task force
3 be formed to study the needs and solutions to the transit
4 demand west of Western to Santa Monica. We renew that
5 call and feel no short term direction should be taken
6 until the ultimate destination is decided upon.

7 While we know that a light rail line will
8 eventually connect the North Hollywood terminus of Metro
9 Rail to Woodland Hills, we know with no such specific
10 plans to extend the Wilshire line beyond Fairfax except
11 for some expressed desires on the part of the West L.A.
12 Chamber for service ultimately to reach Westwood.

13 The other option that evolved from that early
14 working section is now included in the EIR as Candidate
15 Alignment No. 3, allowing the subway to move south of the
16 midtown area with potential for both the western and
17 southern extensions from that point, which has historically
18 been a major transit line in the city's transportation
19 network. We might note that the Candidate Alignment 3
20 features a Hollywood Boulevard alignment through
21 Hollywood. We would much prefer that the alignment follow
22 Sunset in that candidate.

23 The coalition has stated that we do not
24 oppose this routing. However, we will be concerned with
25 any potential extension up San Vicente Boulevard. This

1 line also calls for the potential to serve the far west by
2 sending service down Santa Monica Boulevard from
3 Hollywood.

4 I would ask the Board's indulgence to finish
5 for about another minute.

6 Beyond those two options we wish to state our
7 unequivocal opposition to the three alignments which
8 propose an aerial guideway down the median strip of
9 Wilshire Boulevard beginning with Western Avenue.

10 We represent a dozen homeowner's associations
11 along Wilshire containing more than 20,000 residents who
12 are united in their opposition to this proposal. We are
13 not alone. The Board of Directors of the Los Angeles
14 County Museum of Art, which has just built a new landmark
15 wing fronting Wilshire, and California Federal Savings has
16 joined us in our opposition.

17 I think the report in question today makes
18 clear that we have, what the problems we have. The noise
19 is a major issue and the aesthetic issues are another
20 primary concern.

21 I have, with you, Mr. Dyer, toured the Miami
22 and Atlanta versions to see firsthand what these impacts
23 are. I came away with a different reaction than is
24 indicated in the report. Those structures are very large
25 and oppressive and not at all suited for Wilshire

1 Boulevard, the main street of the city.

2 The report notes in small print that sound
3 walls will be required everywhere the system is elevated,
4 yet the graphic renderings do not show continuous sound
5 walls and in sections they were shown with dotted
6 notations, sound walls were required.

7 Usually these guideways are between twenty
8 and thirty feet in the area which will tower over the
9 delicate art deco buildings in the Miracle Mile and run
10 within 25 feet of the new museum's facade, obliterating it
11 from the street below and eliminating the palm tree line
12 that now marks the distinction of the Miracle Mile.

13 The community is united in a way seldom seen
14 in its opposition to aerial proposals. We feel it would
15 be a grave error to continue to promote them; the solution
16 to the question.

17 If they continue to surface, we will move the
18 fight to Washington over specific appropriations and to
19 Sacramento to assure ourselves that no money will be spent
20 to build such a system.

21 Beyond these concerns, we wish to point out
22 that Candidate Alignment No. 1, which studies tunneling
23 under Wilshire in the high risk zone, flies in the face of
24 a congressional mandate, and that mandate does not appear
25 to be in any danger of changing.

1 In addition, those of us who felt the Ross
2 explosion in our homes have not been convinced by anyone
3 that any kind of tunneling, including cut and cover, is
4 safe. Many of the residents in the area still feel that
5 this is an extremely dangerous situation and should not be
6 played around with.

7 Again, all these issues -- I would like to
8 raise two specific concerns with the EIR itself. First,
9 why do I have two reports? One is a product of the CORE
10 Forum and the other the draft EIR, both dated February
11 1987, which carry costs data for the project varying up to
12 \$1.2 million. That seems to me to call into question all
13 of the data presented in the reports, including the
14 traffic data, land use data in which we were supposed to
15 use to make our judgments.

16 Secondly, the proceedings of the CORE Forum,
17 except for financial data, are used as justification for
18 several findings. As a participant in those meetings, I
19 would like to question the list of participants published
20 in the report. Many of the people listed flatly did not
21 participate either in person or through correspondence,
22 although they may have been invited. And we feel it is
23 improper for them to be made a party to the findings by
24 inference alone.

25 Secondly, as we have stated in written

1 comments, we feel the consensus referred to in the summary
2 of the December Forum is inaccurate. In that forum it was
3 actually preferred the mid-town route over the Wilshire
4 alignment.

5 In closing, please consider the positions
6 carefully in your debate.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. HOLEN: We extended you the courtesy of a
9 very lengthy statement. Do you think that will suffice
10 for the organizations that you mentioned, that you're
11 speaking for?

12 MR. CHRISTOPHER: I think there are some
13 others who would appreciate making some statement,
14 although who are not necessarily going to take that long.

15 MR. HOLEN: And do you think we could reduce
16 the over-all number of people?

17 MR. CHRISTOPHER: Yes, I think we could.

18 MR. HOLEN: All right.

19 I would appreciate that. All right.

20 Mr. Stanley Hart.

21 MR. HOLDEN: Excuse me, I want to make a
22 comment.

23 MR. HOLEN: But you're not a member of the
24 public.

25 MR. HOLEN: I know, but I'm leaving and I

1 want to make a statement.

2 MR. HOLEN: Okay.

3 Mr. Holden would like to make a statement.

4 Mr. Hart, if you would defer for a moment until
5 Mr. Holden tells us -- he arrived here about eight or nine
6 minutes ago, maybe fifteen minutes ago, and now he's going
7 to leave and he feels compelled to make a statement.

8 Go ahead, Mr. Holden.

9 MR. HOLDEN: That's right, and I'm not voting
10 for your position, but in any case let me say this, that I
11 want you to know, the public who have not spoken yet, that
12 your testimony will in fact become a part of the record
13 and beyond that it is recorded and I will listen to the
14 recording, and I want to know exactly what your position
15 is on this particular proposal, and my vote will be
16 reflected in that regard.

17 I wish I could stay longer. I could return
18 if the meeting will go on beyond a certain time, but that
19 may not be the case. But for you, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad
20 that you're here to listen to the public. I'm sure you
21 will stay until it's done, but I will talk to you later
22 about editing.

23 MR. HOLEN: Mr. Hart.

24 MR. HART: My name is Stanley Hart. I'm a
25 civil and structural engineer. I'm speaking on behalf of

1 the Sierra club on behalf of this project.

2 The Metro Rail system is an essential project
3 for the economic and environmental health of this city.
4 It and the remainder of the network which will follow,
5 no doubt, are the only means by which we can escape our
6 dependency on the automobile as a means of going around
7 this urban area.

8 I wish to speak at this time to one point
9 only, and that is the question of the elevated alignment
10 possibility.

11 We should not regard the construction budget
12 alone as representing the full cost in a comparison
13 between the aerial alignment and the possibility of a
14 subway alignment. The aerial mode will add the following
15 costs to the construction budget. Construction will
16 seriously tie up the arterial on which it's constructed
17 for six to eight to twelve months. This should also be
18 considered in considering the alternatives. The pillars
19 will be six to eight feet in diameter. They will
20 effectively remove one lane of the arterial from the
21 traveled roadway. At least one lane.

22 These arterials are already, all the
23 arterials in consideration now, are already congested.
24 The pillars will be an irresistible attraction to traffic
25 and will certainly increase traffic accidents, loss of

1 life, and property in those areas. The aesthetic impact on
2 those using the street and these businesses bordering on
3 the streets are very considerable, as has been pointed out
4 by earlier testimony.

5 The noise accompanying the elevated mode is
6 another question, another cost, which must also be
7 considered. And finally, these pillars are inevitably
8 much more vulnerable to seismic damage than the subway
9 alignment would be in similar situations. The Sylmar
10 Bridges, which are a similar type of constructions, and
11 some eight of them were destroyed during the earthquake,
12 our case in point.

13 The Metro System will be with us for the
14 future of Los Angeles, not merely for the 50 to 100-year
15 study period that we heard mentioned already. I don't
16 have a figure for the construction budget, but I believe,
17 for intuitive reasons, it would be wise to maintain Metro
18 Rail in subway throughout its entire length.

19 With that, thank you very much for the
20 opportunity to appear here.

21 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Hart.

22 Mr. Steve Bangs.

23 MR. BANGS: Mr. Chairman, Steve Bangs,
24 recording secretary for Hollywood Heights Association and
25 consequently a member of the CORE Forum also.

1 I rise to address with specific concerns and
2 questions from the organization, Hollywood Heights
3 Association. We would request that your body direct your
4 staff to respond to specifically proposed information.

5 I have a red light and a green light.

6 MR. HOLEN: Yes.

7 MR. BANGS: And now I have a yellow.

8 MR. HOLEN: Let's go back to green.

9 All right. Start all over again with green.

10 MR. BANGS: I'm sure we all hope that the
11 Metro Rail signals work better than these, of course.

12 MR. DYER: That was too easy.

13 MR. BANGS: I know. That was wide open.

14 Specifically, the request is to provide the
15 data regarding both vibrations and noise pollution in the
16 Hollywood Heights area, and send that information to the
17 address which I have registered when I walked in.

18 Additionally, there is a lot of concern that
19 in some areas, few areas going through the historical
20 monument, the bungalow -- the Highland Kemrose Bungalow
21 Village, the area of the distance between the surface and
22 the tunnel is about from me to yourself, Mr. Chairman;
23 thirty or forty feet. So there is some concern. We would
24 like the opportunity to look over the material that you
25 studied and to respond to it.

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

Thank you.

MR. HOLEN: Thank you.

Mr. Charles B. Pyke.

MR. PYKE: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

I'm Charles B. Pyke. I'm a little too close to the microphone here.

I'm a member of the Beverly-Angeles Homeowner's Association, and I'm representative to the Westside Civic Association of which Mr. Bill Christopher is president.

I'm speaking partly as a representative of Beverly-Angeles and partly on my own as a private citizen.

Beverly-Angeles Homeowner's Association strongly opposes the elevated option on Wilshire Boulevard. We feel that it is unsightly, noisy, and just in general does not fit Wilshire Boulevard or the Westside community.

We do support Alternative 3 as the alternative of the five which have been proposed, and we also support, as Mr. Christopher mentioned, a route along Sunset Boulevard as opposed to along Hollywood boulevard.

Many of our members are not 100 percent in favor of any of the five alignments, I will tell you. We feel that none of them are perfect solutions, but with respect to the environment and community, but Alternative

1 3 is the least objectionable.

2 We, with or without Metro Rail, know there
3 are many issues that need to be addressed with respect to
4 the existing transit system and traffic patterns, and some
5 of the things that I personally would also like, and would
6 like to see returned in some form or another, is the
7 concept of the old red cars that ran down the streets of
8 Santa Monica Boulevard and San Vicente Boulevard and
9 Venice.

10 We still have those median strips for some
11 light rail usage as a supplement or as an alternative to
12 the Metro Rail. How about, with synchronized traffic
13 signals, re-instating the light rail or, I don't know,
14 perhaps medium rail, down those streets?

15 Then, also, and this gets a little sensitive,
16 but I think it's important. RTD, if it's going to
17 continue having maximum ridership, must clean up their
18 public image regarding safety. Vehicular safety among the
19 one thing, especially RTD drivers.

20 There has been all this recent bad publicity,
21 including the possible drug use by drivers, et cetera, et
22 cetera, and then the crime problem. Crime on buses, as
23 well as at and near bus stops. This is something that
24 need sto be addressed and those same things -- well,
25 particularly the crime problem is going to apply if Metro

1 Rail goes into effect. We've got to work with LAPD, et
2 cetera, to try to reduce the crime problem.

3 And one other thing, very briefly --

4 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Pyke. The three
5 minutes is up.

6 Go ahead.

7 MR. PYKE: I'm hoping that somebody from LA
8 Traffic Department is listening, and that is concerning a
9 major re-alignment of the synchronization on major
10 arteries. That is going to help bus and traffic
11 conditions considerably.

12 I don't want to go into the horror stories
13 about all this multiple synchronization, but it's got to
14 be improved.

15 Thank you, very much.

16 MR. HOLEN: Thank you.

17 Mr. Peter Gates.

18 Again, Mr. Gates, if you would keep in mind
19 what Mr. Christopher had earlier stated.

20 MR. GATES: I need about sixty seconds,
21 Mr. Chairman.

22 MR. HOLEN: Go ahead.

23 MR. GATES: Mr. Chairman, board members,
24 thank you very much.

25 I would like to say first of all, my name is

1 Peter Gates. I live in Hancock Park.

2 I am a board member of the Park Association,
3 so I would like to say first of all that I am associated
4 with the Coalition of No El on Wilshire Boulevard. No
5 elevated alignment on Wilshire Boulevard.

6 Secondly, I think what Mr. Pyke just said is
7 exactly the way we, as board members, feel and that is
8 that it is noisy and that it would be unsightly, the
9 overhead, that is, and that plan no. 3 is the least
10 offensive.

11 I am through.

12 MR. HOLEN: Thank you.

13 Mr. Richard Hegstrum.

14 (No response.)

15 MR. HOLEN: Well, let's do a clean sweep.

16 Mr. Michael Cornwell.

17 MR. CORNWELL: I hope by "clean sweep,"
18 you're referring to UCLA and their tournament.

19 MR. HOLEN: Well, I hope I am too, but I
20 noticed you're from the Winsor Square Association.

21 MR. CORNWELL: I see.

22 Well, when I told some of my fellow basketball
23 fanatics that I couldn't join them today in Salt Lake City
24 because I had a public hearing on my calendar, they said,
25 "It must be something very important to you." And I

1 assured them it was.

2 MR. HOLEN: Well, hopefully channel 2 will
3 help us out.

4 MR. CORNWELL: And I have a feeling this
5 meeting will be concluded before that time.

6 I merely want to state very briefly, I'm vice
7 president of the Winsor Square Association. Michael
8 Cornwell, C-o-r-n-w-e-l-l.

9 Winsor Square is part of the No El on
10 Wilshire Coalition. We're part of the Wilshire
11 Homeowner's Alignment and we support the objectives and
12 concerns articulately stated by Bill Christopher. We're
13 united on this issue and are united opposition to an
14 elevated alignment is very serious. I hope you're hearing
15 it.

16 I've attended all the meetings held at the
17 Wilshire Temple. There was unanimous opposition
18 registered at those meetings by very important people in
19 the community that are not here today, the ministers of
20 the churches that are affected.

21 I don't feel that concern has been filtered
22 into the reports that I'm hearing, and I'm concerned about
23 that.

24 MR. HOLEN: Let me assure you that we have
25 transcripts of all the public hearings and all the CORE

1 Forums. I'm not sure as to whether or not we have
2 transcripts of the series of public meetings.

3 MR. CORNWELL: I just -- you know, if you
4 continue with this elevated line -- I mean this thing is
5 going to get really down and dirty, I want to assure you.
6 If the stupidity of everyone proposing such a line on the
7 main street in this town -- it's just asinine is the only
8 way I can say it.

9 I thought of it this Wednesday when I was in
10 San Francisco. I have a client in the China Basin
11 Building, which is right on the end of this thing which
12 just stops there, and the City of San Francisco, when they
13 saw that thing said, "Enough is enough," and they stopped
14 it in its tracks.

15 And if you start this elevated freeway
16 monster in one part of the city and other people see it,
17 believe me, it's going to stop in its tracks and God
18 forbid it's at Fairfax and those poor people are held
19 there with the end of the line.

20 I mean, you don't know where you're going
21 with this thing. I suggest you stop at Alvarado, see
22 where the money is coming in.

23 We had another headline in today's Herald
24 about "Metro Rail threatened by waste, audit says."

25 It's not laughable to the public, Mr. Holen.

1 It may be laughable to you people.

2 MR. HOLEN: No, no. I'm intrigued with your
3 approach. You sound like a very good lawyer.

4 MR. CORNWELL: Well, I'm not an attorney.

5 MR. HOLEN: Oh, you fooled me.

6 MR. CORNWELL: I won't reveal what I do.

7 I'm in the entertainment insurance business.

8 My friend from Park La Brea who expressed
9 concern about parking in Park La Brea, I don't understand
10 that concern. Park La Brea, the city that gave Park La
11 Brea those streets a couple years ago -- They own the
12 streets. They can certainly prevent parking, but my
13 friends in Park La Brea haven't seen anything yet if
14 subway stations wind up at Fairfax as the end of the Line.
15 I mean, that will just be a catastrophe.

16 The red light is on. I assume it's working.
17 I hope you hear us today about an elevated route.

18 I predict if you start it that there will be
19 a new Mayor in this town and will use that issue to get
20 his seat, because I think political things are happening.

21 People aren't here today because they've told
22 me the politicians are going to force that line down
23 Wilshire regardless of what we say, and I'm inclined to
24 agree with them.

25 Only time will tell.

1 MR. HOLEN: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. Jeff Ely.

3 (No response.)

4 MR. HOLEN: Okay.

5 We'll come back to those two I've called.

6 Mary Ann Goodwin?

7 MS. GOODWIN: My family owns a building at
8 613 South La Brea, which is one block north of Wilshire
9 Boulevard. Therefore, we are related to whatever will
10 occur on Wilshire Boulevard and we have been in this area
11 for 12 years, so we are familiar with both concerns in the
12 area, and we believe, the feelings of the residents and
13 the workers.

14 We would support a subway system down
15 Wilshire Boulevard where it's safe to do so, and we would
16 feel that this would be a good solution to a serious
17 problem of traffic congestion and lack of parking in the
18 area, and we would support and appeal to congress on that
19 basis.

20 We believe that the Wilshire area is a higher
21 density area than the Pico area, and also it's one of the
22 few areas in the city which has a right to basically
23 unrestricted commercial growth. Between 1970 and 1986
24 there was a 20.2 percent growth rate for the Wilshire
25 office market area compared with only a 15.8 percent

1 growth rate for the standard metropolitan area in general,
2 and we've seen a miraculous resurgency in the Miracle Mile
3 area in the past two years.

4 I attended some hearings recently before the
5 Planning Commission and the City Council on this area, and
6 listened to hours of testimony about the plans for a
7 development of housing in the area, the need for more
8 housing, and a very serious problem of transportation and
9 lack of parking. However, we have some very serious
10 concerns about the effects of aerial alignment down
11 Wilshire Boulevard.

12 I received a copy of your Draft Environmental
13 Impact Report a week ago, and I held a meeting with
14 business people in our area and specifically asked to come
15 to those meetings the principals of the major commercial
16 real estate houses in the area. Without editorial
17 comments I showed them your alignment and showed them the
18 plans for aerial Metro Rail and said, "What is your
19 opinion on the effects of the development in this area
20 should each of these plans go through?" It's very
21 important to me to know what our future will be.

22 Without exception, they all said a subway in
23 this area would be fantastic because the conditions in
24 this area are very similar to Manhattan and with the
25 county art museum and all of the development and the

1 combination of residential and commercial space, it would
2 really be an answer to a prayer in this area.

3 On the other hand, without exception, they
4 all said aerial Metro Rail would be an unmitigated
5 nightmare.

6 And the most common comment I heard was that
7 Wilshire Boulevard will become a very dark ghost town with
8 a dinosaur of the proportion in height and thirty feet
9 wide going right down the center, which is too expensive
10 to remove.

11 At the same meeting I asked about anyone's
12 understanding of the safety of having a subway system in
13 this area. They all said that they had felt that it would
14 be safe based upon their work with builders on
15 subterranean excavation.

16 In fact, the person who had the most recent
17 experience and is working on a project right now, said the
18 engineer on that project told him that a subway system in
19 this area might actually bring air from underground
20 creating some release of pressure from the gases and
21 increase the safety potential rather than create a safety
22 problem.

23 I'm not an expert on this area, therefore, my
24 request to you is that there be further investigation and
25 consideration of an appeal to congress for a subway

1 system, otherwise we ask for an alternate route so that
2 this area will not be devastated in an effort, which we
3 realize, is just an effort to help us.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, very much,
6 Ms. Goodwin.

7 Mr. Richard Workman.

8 Richard, are you going to be the cleanup?

9 MR. WORKMAN: I'll be brief.

10 MR. HOLEN: You don't have to be brief.

11 MR. WORKMAN: I must register a little
12 dissatisfaction on the part of the attendance on the part
13 of the directors. Apparently they don't take this too
14 seriously. You know, we put ourselves out to come
15 downtown to hear most of the Board is not here to hear
16 us.

17 MR. HOLEN: Well, some members of the board
18 spent considerable time in Washington earlier this week.
19 The positive results of which I'm sure you read on the
20 front page of the morning's Los Angeles Times, and it
21 becomes a very burdensome matter which can be cured by
22 reading the transcript, Richard, and also listening to the
23 tapes of this hearing. Many of the board members do that.
24 I do that myself.

25 MR. WORKMAN: Okay.

1 I'm Richard Workman, and I'm chairman of the
2 Windsor Village Association, one of the homeowner's
3 organizations, who are a part of the No El on Wilshire
4 Coalition.

5 I think our position has been well stated by
6 Bill Christopher, Mike Cornwall, Peter Gates,
7 Mrs. Chaldise, and you'll hear a couple more of us.

8 I think you're convinced of our opposition
9 and that we intend to fight this with everything we have,
10 the aerial I'm talking about.

11 We do support Alignment 3. We feel that
12 would connect with South-Central Los Angeles and the
13 Westside, the best of all the alignments.

14 On the aerial alignment, I do want to quote
15 from your own SEIR, page 2-108 and 110: "The aerial
16 elements of Alignments 2, 4 and 5 may be in conflict with
17 the Park Mile specific plan." I would interject that it
18 undoubtedly is. This conflict is viewed as an
19 unmitigatable adverse impact. That, I think, sums up the
20 whole thing. It is an unmitigatable adverse impact on our
21 community.

22 Finally, I would say, lest you think that
23 we're just talking because it's in our backyard, I would
24 draw your attention to other great cities of the world
25 such as Paris and New York City; the Champs D-Elysee in

1 Paris, Fifth Avenue in New York City. You don't find an
2 elevated train there because they value the aesthetic
3 importance of those thoroughfares through their cities.
4 Wilshire Boulevard bears the same relationship to this
5 city as those two avenues do to those two cities.

6 So we ask you to use a little common sense.
7 Don't ruin Wilshire Boulevard with an aerial.

8 MR. HOLEN: Thank you.

9 I might note, Richard, that of course the RTD
10 Board of Directors voted for a subway alignment along
11 Wilshire Boulevard which unfortunately became frustrated
12 with respect to the change in federal law.

13 It may be that the direction of your feelings
14 of concern might be spread a little wider than this Board
15 of Directors, or Mr. Dyer.

16 MR. WORKMAN: Thank you.

17 MR. HOLEN: Bill Farkus (phonetic).

18 (No response.)

19 MR. HOLEN: How about Jeff Ely?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. HOLEN: Richard Hegstrom?

22 Neil Berry?

23 MR. BERRY: By the way, the difference
24 between the gas in mid town or mid city and the gas on
25 Wilshire is Congress doesn't have a law against tunneling

1 through mid town.

2 MR. HOLEN: Now, will you please identify
3 yourself and your organization?

4 MR. BERRY: I'm president of the Mid City
5 Chamber of Commerce, and as president of the Mid City
6 Chamber of Commerce, I appeared before you on previous
7 occasions and I've attended the four CORE Forum meetings
8 which you held. I'm appearing today once again because I
9 feel it's important to verbalize the Chamber's interest
10 and what is appeared to be the unheard dismissed
11 positions -- do you desire you to shut my microphone off?

12 MR. HOLEN: No, Mr. Berry. I'm going to
13 listen attentively to everything you say.

14 MR. BERRY: Thank you, sir.

15 I sometimes -- I started out on this thing
16 and now I feel like a gadfly, you know, watching the guys
17 that come on all these things, but I think we are getting
18 left behind on a few viewpoints.

19 Anyway, first the Mid City Chamber of
20 Commerce in February of '86 presented an altered route
21 around the CORE area which turns south on Wilshire and
22 Crenshaw and traveled westward on Pico to San Vicente.
23 This alignment has many advantages, as we pointed out in
24 previous statements.

25 The advantages were obviously credible since

1 two of the first six Candidate Alignments, the 13 of the
2 28 alignments had subsequently in the second left SCRTD
3 route 3 of the four candidate alignments consisted of the
4 south of Wilshire route as the most feasible and effective
5 for riding rail transit serves for the areas that would
6 have been served by the original LPA, and I think that's a
7 quote from what our friend was talking about before.

8 Additionally -- are you listening, Mr. Holen?
9 You said you'd promise me you'd listen.

10 MR. HOLEN: Mr. Berry, I have heard you
11 previously. I hear you again.

12 MR. BERRY: Thank you.

13 All right. Additionally at the last two CORE
14 Forum meetings and even though by this time the five
15 alignments now consisted of only one modified route south
16 of Wilshire, the consensus of those present favored this
17 alignment but it was not considered the favored alignment.
18 Dismissing the desires of those were a part of the
19 process.

20 The dismissal of the apparent interest,
21 wishes and desires of the community participants disturbs
22 us greatly.

23 Secondly, the CORE Study was initiated to
24 develop an alternative route around the methane gas
25 explosive area. The SEIR identified Candidate Alignment 1

1 as the CORE Forum for current alignment, which I take
2 exception to, but this alignment, as well as 2, 4 and 5,
3 and even more importantly through the risk areas are
4 prohibited by congressional action. Even I'm getting
5 bored by these.

6 Anyway --

7 MR. HOLEN: It's all right. Take a moment,
8 find your place. We won't cut you off.

9 MR. BERRY: Thank you. All right. Here we
10 go.

11 These alignments fly in the face of
12 congressional action and it would seem to jeopardize the
13 entire funding.

14 Well, anyway, here we go with the red light.
15 This is the main part. It's extremely important to the
16 progress of this entire area that Metro Rail Project go
17 forward and that the rail transportation be developed to
18 serve the people of the business commerce of the basin.
19 We waited too long, worked too hard, fought too many
20 funding battles to allow a need for a detour in the
21 original alignment to destroy our intent.

22 We hope that you'll be straightforward about
23 the true desires of those who tried to speak in the past
24 or consider the consequences of the Alignment 1 route,
25 that it could mean that funding for this and future

1 segments will be forthcoming.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Berry.

4 MR. BERRY: I'll be back.

5 MR. HOLEN: Let's see, Henrietta
6 Mirell-Meadows.

7 MS. MIRELL-MEADOWS: I'm Henrietta Mirrel. I
8 would like to defer to speak after Chuck Rosin, Charles
9 Rosin, who I believe is scheduled to speak after me. We'd
10 just like to reverse our order.

11 MR. HOLEN: Do you have a number of people
12 here from the Carthay Homes?

13 MS. MIRELL-MEADOWS: No, it's just the two of
14 us.

15 MR. HOLEN: Why don't you both speak to us at
16 the same time and we will give you twice as long.

17 Mr. Rosin?

18 MR. ROSIN: Good afternoon.

19 I didn't realize when we put this together --
20 that when I worked all night on this presentation I'd have
21 three minutes, so I have cut it down significantly and I'd
22 ask if I could have an additional minute?

23 MR. HOLEN: Well, if you and --

24 MR. ROSIN: I'm not speaking about the No El
25 on Wilshire. I'm speaking about -- my name is Charles

1 Rosin and I'm president of the Carthay Circle Homeowner's
2 Association. My role will be two-fold.

3 First, to represent the sentiment in Carthay
4 Circle as opposed to locating an interim end-of-the-line
5 station at the Fairfax and Wilshire, as contained in a six
6 point resolution which was passed by unanimous vote by
7 more than 100 homeowners at our general membership meeting
8 on February 26 and was submitted to the Board of RTD on
9 February 26.

10 Secondly, more importantly, to review the
11 conclusions of SEIR --

12 MR. HOLEN: Excuse me, Mr. Rosin. We have a
13 court reporter. You can slow down.

14 MR. ROSIN: Well, I'm trying to get --

15 MR. HOLEN: I suggested that you and Ms.
16 Mirrel-Meadows combine your time. You have six minutes or
17 so.

18 MR. ROSIN: Okay.

19 MR. HOLEN: So slow down a bit. I'd like to
20 hear what the two of you have to say.

21 MR. ROSIN: Thanks for your comment.

22 Secondly, more importantly, to review the
23 conclusion of the SEIR pertaining to the Fairfax/Wilshire
24 intersection which is comment to Candidate Alignments 1,
25 2, 4 and 5.

1 And so, today, as we begin to analyze the
2 SEIR, please keep in mind the staff's admonition on S-20,
3 which states the quote, "the Metro Rail Project will
4 require the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of
5 land, manpower, energy, construction materials and money
6 for the alignment."

7 The fact that I've participated in 14 months
8 of these public consultations, I don't think I truly
9 understood the impact of this irreversible and
10 irretrievable commitment until I read the conclusions of
11 your staff which confirmed what we in Carthay Circle have
12 been saying from the start; that the placement of an
13 interim end-of-the-line station in Fairfax and Wilshire
14 would have a substantially negative impact in the areas of
15 transportation, parking, land use and development that it
16 comes as no surprise that Fairfax intersection compares
17 unfavorably with La Brea and Wilshire and Western and
18 Wilshire and virtually all segment impacts.

19 I quote from the record about parking.
20 Quote, "Individual stations will differ markedly in their
21 ability to accommodate the parking demand produced by the
22 Metro Rail. The number of deficient stations is highest
23 at Wilshire/Fairfax, which will have to absorb almost
24 2,400 spaces of potential spill-over parking. Under all
25 alignments the station at Wilshire/Fairfax does not

1 provide enough space to meet the expected park and ride
2 demand."

3 Under land use --

4 MR. HOLEN: Slow down a little bit because of
5 our court reporter, please.

6 MR. ROSIN: Okay.

7 MR. HOLEN: It's all right, we are not going
8 to cut you off.

9 MR. ROSIN: Thank you.

10 On the issue of land use, and I'm quoting
11 again, and everyone of these in my written cites the
12 specific location of these quotes; projected growth in
13 station areas may or may not be compatible with
14 surrounding land use or with the desired character of the
15 station area.

16 Potentially adverse impact could occur if the
17 projected growth was inconsistent with surrounding uses or
18 where inadequate land supply exists to accommodate
19 projected commercial and/or residential development. The
20 greatest impact would be at four stations, including
21 Fairfax and Wilshire. Alignment 1, 2, 4 and 5 have five
22 stations in which the supply of land could potentially be
23 inadequate to support the projected commercial growth and
24 which are located in predominantly residential areas,
25 including Fairfax/Wilshire.

1 In the station areas unable to accommodate
2 residential growth, pressure to rejoin single family areas
3 to higher residential density would only occur at four
4 stations, including Fairfax and Wilshire. Station areas
5 unable to accommodate commercial growth, pressure to
6 rezone residential partials to commercial would occur at
7 five stations including Wilshire and Fairfax.

8 Then and only then it concludes that the
9 Wilshire/Fairfax station will experience significant
10 residential and commercial development pressure that would
11 not be easily mitigated. Not be easily mitigated, that's
12 an understatement. For judging from the table on 228,
13 pertaining to land use mitigation, your report makes
14 recommendations that completely contradict each other. On
15 the one hand you suggest rezoning both commercial and
16 residential properties, both on Wilshire, to accommodate
17 growth while at the same time advocating redirecting
18 growth to stations further east on Wilshire, such as La
19 Brea and Western, which are better equipped to handle any
20 increase in development.

21 Why the contradictions? Why the confusion?
22 On the one hand you suggest rezoning both commercial and
23 residential properties on Fairfax/Wilshire to accommodate
24 growth, while at the same time advocating redirecting
25 growth to further east along the Wilshire Corridor.

1 To this end the staff used Miracle Mile
2 Center as a rationale to bring Metro Rail as far west as
3 Fairfax, even though Fairfax, the Miracle Mile and the
4 rest of the city have changed dramatically since the plan
5 was adopted but never implicated by the City Council in
6 1974.

7 Ladies and gentlemen of the RTD, I don't know
8 what city you've been living in for the past 13 years, but
9 I know what city I've been living in in the past six
10 months and Los Angeles is the place where in the last
11 election voters from every councilman's district
12 overwhelmingly passed Proposition U. The down zoning
13 ordinance to control commercial development as a means,
14 perhaps the most effective means, perhaps the only means,
15 to mitigate gridlock and other breakdowns in traffic.

16 Therefore, for the RTD to predict that the
17 traffic at Fairfax/Wilshire will be doomed to operate at
18 the level by the year 2000 with or without Metro Rail not
19 only fails to acknowledge the impact of the Proposition U
20 and AB-253 will have in limiting the density in limiting
21 the Miracle Mile Center, but it completely underestimates
22 the vigilance by which we in the residential community
23 will go to prevent further congestion on our streets and
24 preserve the quality of life in our neighborhood.

25 And to this end, be assured that the 400

1 families in Carthay Circle will not allow the RTD to skirt
2 the major land use issue pertaining to the development of
3 an end-of-the-line station at Wilshire and Fairfax.

4 That is how motorists driving north on the
5 Santa Monica Freeway and on Fairfax are supposed to have
6 access to the terminal via a one-lane road in acute
7 disrepair, which cannot handle the projected increase in
8 traffic without expensive and extensive condemnation
9 proceedings.

10 But at last this crucial land use point was
11 not even considered in the SEIR because you have concluded
12 that Fairfax/Wilshire is, and I'm quoting here, a
13 temporary terminal.

14 And if this is a temporary terminal, quote,
15 "no additional facilities are planned to accommodate the
16 increase in auto activity."

17 Now, how can something as permanent as the
18 impact on this irreversible and irretrievable commitment
19 called Metro Rail ever be judged temporary?

20 MR. HOLEN: Mr. Rosin --

21 MR. ROSIN: Excuse me. I'm just going to add
22 one sentence here.

23 MR. HOLEN: Well, slow down a little bit.
24 The poor lady. She's trying to take this down.

25 MR. ROSIN: I took the time to write my

1 remarks, so you do have it on the public record.

2 MR. HOLEN: Okay.

3 MR. ROSIN: I want to ask again the major
4 question: How can something as permanent as the impact
5 from this irreversible and irretrievable committment
6 called Metro Rail ever be judged as temporary?

7 Moreover, how can the district justify
8 spending hundreds of millions of dollars on a Western
9 Segment on a rapid transit system that doesn't serve
10 Westwood or Century City, and once you reach Fairfax,
11 sometime in the next centruy, how do you expect finance
12 the remainder of a \$150 million traffic corridor?

13 Here's an idea: own up to the fact that with
14 the CORE area boundary restrictions, the district is not
15 able to service the last three miles of LPA. Therefore,
16 it has no choice but to consolidate its federal money to
17 complete the Valley/Hollywood segment where it reassesses
18 a fully integrated rapid transit system on the Westside as
19 called for by the No El on Wilshire Coalition, the
20 Westside Civic Federation, and every other responsible
21 residential group from the Wilshire Corridor who
22 participated in the CORE Forum.

23 MR. HOLEN: We thank you and

24 Ms. Mirell-Meadows.

25 Thank you, very much.

1 MS. MIRELL-MEADOWS: I have some remarks.

2 MR. HOLEN: Well, Ms. Mirrel-Meadows, we have
3 really provided you --

4 MS. MIRELL-MEADOWS: I have --

5 MR. HOLEN: Go ahead.

6 MS. MIRELL-MEADOWS: They're quite different.
7 I'm speaking on the Candidate Alignment 3 extended.

8 There is no EIR report on San Vicente. Also,
9 between Fairfax --

10 MR. HOLEN: That was not an alignment for
11 consideration. It was merely for comparative study
12 purposes with respect to costs. They are not under
13 consideration for adoption.

14 MS. MIRELL MEADOWS: Well, why is it one of
15 the alignments?

16 MR. HOLEN: Comparative study purposes with
17 respect to cost.

18 MS. MIRELL-MEADOWS: I have to treat it --

19 MR. HOLEN: they are not under consideraton
20 for adoption.

21 MS. MIRELL-MEADOWS: Well, then why is it one
22 of the alignments?

23 MR. HOLEN: Because it was added for the
24 purpose of reflecting the cost of extensions from the end
25 of candidate alignment, I think it's 3, back to the

1 Wilshire Corridor.

2 MS. MIRRELL MEADOWS: In other words, then,
3 it is not being considered at all?

4 MR. HOLEN: It is not under consideration,
5 no.

6 MS. MIRELL MEADOWS: All right.

7 Then I would like to talk about Candidate
8 Alignment No. 3.

9 The main question is, where do you go from
10 there? And our concern is because the CORE area runs from
11 Olympic and Fairfax along to Wilshire and San Vicente and
12 I have the map to show that. It is important.

13 We feel that you decided where the Metro Rail
14 is going from the so-called interim end of the line at
15 Wilshire and Fairfax and only until that is done will we
16 be able to consider that.

17 So, our recommendation and the consensus of
18 our association is that you start at Western until you
19 determine where the real transportation problems are and
20 where you go from there.

21 MR. HOLEN: Thank you.

22 Mr. Jeff Ely? Is Mr. Ely here?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. HOLEN: All right. Mr. Richard Hegstrom.

25 (No response.)

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

MR. HOLEN: Mr. Farkus?

(No response.)

MR. HOLEN: Dale Gasteiger?

MR. GASTEIGER: My name is Dale Gasteiger and I'm with the Braille Institute on Vermont.

I want to state that we, as an organization, support Metro Rail.

Our main concern, aside from some of the things that other people have said about the elevated or underground, is that we address the handicapped and since we are putting a state of the art unit in, that we put state of the art in for the handicapped.

That's the whole point.

MR. HOLEN: Thank you, very much.

Paul Holiday?

(No response.)

MR. HOLEN: Susan Sherdlow (phonetic)?

(No response.)

MR. HOLEN: Greg Roberts?

(No response.)

MR. HOLEN: John Walsh? Pat Moser?

MR. MOSER: I'm Pat Moser. I'm representing the NOW Inner City Los Angeles Chapter of the National Organization for Women.

Don't laugh, I am.

1 The statement that -- I'd like to correct
2 some statements that were made prior.

3 The statement about the loss of the palm
4 trees on Wilshire Boulevard; well, I have lived most of my
5 life both in Florida and California, and believe me, palm
6 trees, especially Royal Palms are no big deal.

7 The statement about the prospects of crime in
8 Metro Rail stations, I'd like to point out in the modern
9 Metro Rail facilities throughout the United States, the
10 crime problem is very minimal. In fact, it's more safe to
11 go into these stations than it is to be on the streets
12 themselves.

13 In regard to the alignment, I'd like to say
14 that I prefer -- I do prefer Alignment No. 1, a complete
15 subway mode, which would be built eventually anyway
16 because obviously the elevated structure, even on modern
17 aerial structures, I should say, will eventually be torn
18 down and the line will be placed underground anyway.

19 The cut and cover method, which has been
20 proposed to build a subway in the corridor area would, I
21 think, protect the ridership from any danger from the gas
22 that is present in the area. The subway, that will be
23 built later on, but it will be built on a higher cost.
24 So, you might as well build it now.

25 I would hope that the Hollywood Station, for

1 the same reason that the Hollywood Bowl Station will be
2 also included right away and not added on as an
3 afterthought.

4 Let me say that Alignment No. 3, of course,
5 would go down to Pico Boulevard. Pico Boulevard should
6 have its own subway line, a separate subway line as
7 prescribed in the 1925 Rapid Transit Plan, and I propose
8 that the Pico Boulevard subway will go east to Whittier
9 Boulevard, Brooklyn Avenue or East 1st Street, or turn
10 north and go to northeast Los Angeles, and I think that if
11 the RTD is prevented from building a line in either area,
12 or a subway west of Western Avenue, then I propose that
13 the north end of the subway, which would be in the San
14 Fernando Valley, go further north into the San Fernando
15 Valley.

16 I certainly believe, Mr. Chairman -- I
17 certainly believe that we do need the Metro Rail. I am
18 opposed to all this NIMBY, not in my backyard opposition.

19 The aerial on Wilshire Boulevard would be a
20 fine structure which would not really bother anyone, and
21 they can be happy to have it. They would say they
22 invented the idea.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Moser.

25 Diane Plotkin, welcome.

1 MS. PLOTKIN: Thank you, Mr. Holen.

2 My name is Diane Plotkin. I'm vice president
3 of the Beverly-Wilshire Home Association. I'm vice
4 president of the Westside Federation and a member of No El
5 on Wilshire.

6 I won't take much of your time. I just want
7 to reiterate Mr. Bill Christopher's position. We support
8 it a hundred percent.

9 We would ask you to please consider from
10 Western down to Santa Monica a coalition of residential
11 people to discuss where that alignment should go in the
12 future, to discuss what the future of the Westside should
13 be as we support Alignment No. 3.

14 Thank you, very much.

15 MR. HOLEN: All right.

16 Mr. Allen Sieroty.

17 MR. SIEROTY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
18 members of the RTD Board and staff.

19 My name is Allen Sieroty. I'm here as a
20 property owner representing the Property Owner's
21 Coalition, which is basically made up of commercial
22 property owners in the area between San Vicente and La
23 Brea. I think the comments that I make, and by the way, I
24 would like to compliment RTD and you, Mr. Chairman, for
25 the CORE Hearing that you held previously.

1 I thought they were well attended. Everybody
2 had an opportunity to state his opinion, and I thought
3 they were quite good.

4 I appreciate the opportunity to have spoken
5 at that time and what I'm going to say today perhaps may
6 be repetitive, but nonetheless I guess it's important once
7 in a while to continue the position for the matter of the
8 record before you.

9 I think the comment that I would like to make
10 while on behalf of the property owners I really believe
11 are on behalf of the total community and best for the
12 total system. I guess if I were to paraphrase others, or
13 to repeat what others have said, I think the comment of
14 Stan Hart and Ms. Goodwin are closest to what I would like
15 to say.

16 I think it's pretty clear from the comments
17 that have been made that Wilshire Boulevard is the supreme
18 street, the west part, of this community, and must be
19 treated with great respect. It is also that your study
20 has shown the area with the greatest density of people and
21 residency and where your greatest service may be rendered,
22 and I think your responsibilities are to look to the long
23 term and to try to -- it's very difficult, I know, for you
24 to do it because there are so many of these things that
25 come into play, but the basic mission is to provide a

1 system of transportation which will serve this community
2 in the long run and serve the greatest number of people
3 and thereby, also reducing the cost of the taxpayers
4 because we know that systems of this kind are not going to
5 operate merely on the farebox.

6 So, your job is to look at the long range, to
7 look at the total picture, and I know that you are doing
8 that.

9 Wilshire Boulevard is the source of the
10 traffic that you must serve and also the reduction of the
11 other kinds of traffic which will occur. How to do it is
12 really a problem and you are facing a congressional
13 problem here which I think you're responsibility must be
14 to try to convince the community and to convince
15 congressional leaders that the system can be built on
16 Wilshire Boulevard safely and the subway system will be
17 built and serve the community best.

18 The opposition from people who do not want to
19 see an elevated system on Wilshire, I think that is well
20 founded. I agree with that, but I think it's important to
21 have this service on Wilshire Boulevard, and I would urge
22 you to try to do everything that can be done, and I think
23 it can be done, to find ways to convince people that such
24 a system can be built safely.

25 Thank you, very much.

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

MR. HOLEN: Thank you.

Has Mr. Jeffery Ely arrived yet?

(No response.)

MR. HOLEN: Mr. Hegstrom, has he arrived yet?

(No response.)

MR. HOLEN: It's now about 12:00 noon. We have food service in our cafeteria on the third floor that is available and we will adjourn for 30 minutes until 12:30.

Thank you, very much. We look forward to seeing you then.

(proceedings were adjourned until 12:40 p.m. of the same day.)

1 MR. HOLEN: We will reconvene the meeting of
2 the Board of Directors of the Southern California Rapid
3 Transit District holding a public hearing with respect to
4 receiving public comment on the Draft Copy of the
5 Subsequent Environmental Impact Report Congressionally
6 Ordered Re-Engineering Study Alignment.

7 Our first public speaker after lunch is
8 Mr. Jeffery Ely.

9 (No response.)

10 MR. HOLEN: Mr. John Walsh.

11 (No response.)

12 MR. HOLEN: Greg Roberts.

13 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, very much.

14 I was given a yellow booklet. I haven't had
15 a chance to go through it yet.

16 In fact, Mr. Dyer, I want to thank you for
17 going and getting it because the staff would not give it
18 to me because I would not give an anonymous black female
19 my name and address. She already knew my name. She
20 wanted my address.

21 That's not right, Mr. Dyer. Your lawyer
22 knows the Government Code 54957. She won't enforce it,
23 but it says there that's improper to demand somebody's
24 name and address coming to a public hearing for any
25 reason. It has to be voluntary.

1 MR. HOLEN: Greg, you're so familiar to us
2 from your frequent appearances to us, I'm sure that was a
3 minor technicality.

4 We're pleased that you are with us now.

5 MR. ROBERTS: Then I was harassed by a
6 transit police officer who is sitting in the back and he
7 bad-mouthed, slandered me to the other officers and I have
8 talked to the watch commander, Sergeant Harrison.

9 But, now to the issues at hand.

10 I was in San Francisco. I saw the BART. I
11 was on it. I could go from Seventh and Mission to Hayward
12 on a train within 45 minutes. And it took to go from Palo
13 Alto to Seventh and Mission on the 7-F line anywhere from
14 an hour to an hour and a half, depending on the traffic,
15 maybe it would be a little less. So the rail car did
16 stop, for whatever reason, somewhere along the line.

17 On the elevated it was somewhat noisy going
18 under the bay in a tube. That's what it runs through.
19 Fortunately the water did not come in.

20 Now, you wait on Wilshire today, there is no
21 doubt you wait there. It takes a long time to go by bus
22 during the daytime to get from Wilshire and Westwood.
23 There is no doubt about it. If you want to have a subway
24 there or a rail, why don't you take a street like Seventh
25 Street and build one there, or Sixth Street, build one

1 there, have it go there adjacent to Wilshire Boulevard.
2 Why have it going underground when you can do that.

3 And in the San Fernando Valley it takes a
4 long time to get on the 424. Today I didn't even get on
5 the 424 to come down here. I stayed on the 420 because
6 the bus overloads on Saturday and you stand there on
7 **Ventura** and Vineland. When is it going to be faster?
8 When is it going to be faster to get down here?

9 And since you have press coverage -- you have
10 public hearings every Saturday, this is going to be a
11 regular thing, and whether the transit police like it or
12 not, this is the place to come on Saturday for public
13 hearings with the RTD and press coverage with the general
14 manager and this -- can we get here faster? When can we
15 get here faster? At what level? What point? We don't
16 even had stopping bays for the bus to free Ventura
17 Boulevard and Hollywood Freeway.

18 MR. HOLEN: Greg, we have the red light on
19 and we thank you for your testimony today.

20 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

21 MR. HOLEN: Mr. Paul Holiday, is he here?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. HOLEN: Susan Sherdlow, is she here yet?

24 (No response.)

25 MR. HOLEN: John Walsh?

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

(No response.)

MR. HOLEN: Abraham Falick?

(No response.)

MR. HOLEN: Jeff Ely?

(No response.)

MR. HOLEN: Richard Hegstrom?

(No response.)

MR. HOLEN: Howard Watts. A man of temperate structure.

MR. WATTS: My name is Howard Watts. Mrs. Gifford told me not to yell, so I won't yell.

MR. HOLEN: Speak slowly for our court reporter, because we would not want to lose a single word you have to tell us.

MR. WATTS: Madam Court Reporter, I will make the statements to you.

First of all, the Brown Act has been violated. This meeting does not have a quorum. There can't be a hearing when there is no quorum. I would suggest that you start your session with a quorum and keep that quorum going.

Now, on the actual issue, we got the document just as we came in. I would say that that's not a way of conducting informational meetings, and if this is what you call an informational meeting, I consider it illegal. I

1 don't think the Congress wants three people to show up at
2 this meeting to hear the comments of the public.

3 I would say that all of the alignments that
4 I've seen so far would not be in my favor. The
5 underground death trap, which is what I call the thing,
6 needs to be thrown out.

7 We have already found three different sites
8 that have toxics of some sort. In any kind of these
9 movements that you got going, you're going to have a lot
10 of toxics that you'll find, and you don't really seem to
11 care. We've seen three of them already. Two in the
12 MOS-1, one in the busway already. The extension of the
13 busway. How many more are we going to find?

14 Is it possible that this district doesn't
15 really care? Are they just going to keep on going until
16 they find all the toxic dumps, I guess is a way of putting
17 it, in our way?

18 Why don't you just dump this project and
19 bring some buses on, and a lot of buses for the amount of
20 money that this is going to cost us? 4.3. Not 3.2 any
21 more, but 4.3.

22 And I see where the Congress has done some
23 stupid things again. They are going to give you some \$800
24 million over eight years, and the president says he will
25 probably veto. He said that last time. He never vetoed.

1 And you always think you're going to get an override.
2 You're not going to have to get an override because he'll
3 never veto nothing.

4 I would like to see more meetings with more
5 board members out in the public. Hopefully that can be
6 scheduled. I think it's important, and in fact, it's not
7 important, it's a necessary hopeful thing that we have
8 that.

9 MR. HOLEN: Thank you, Mr. Watts. You were
10 very restrained today, and we applaud you for that.

11 Mr. David Morgan.

12 MR. MORGAN: David Morgan from the Hollywood
13 Better Government Association.

14 First, I want to object to having this
15 meeting in this location, the middle of a terrible traffic
16 jam. It took over an hour to get her just driving through
17 downtown due to blocked off streets.

18 Our main objections we have to this proposal
19 are that there hasn't been a study of the cumulative
20 effects of all the special assessments in conjunction from
21 the redevelopment agencies in Hollywood.

22 They are planning to spend \$922 million there
23 in public tax money which will have to be made up probably
24 by taxes and special assessments.

25 In addition, now for Metro Rail you're

1 proposing something like a thirty cent a square foot
2 assessment on the property owners there. I wish to object
3 strongly to that.

4 I feel you have completely adequate funding
5 from the federal government, the state government and
6 other governments, and you should not be asking small
7 business and property owners and renters of small business
8 space and other space to subsidize this proposal. This
9 will result in higher prices on the consumers in and
10 around the Metro Rail station, and I feel it's quite
11 unfair.

12 I think with all this federal money you've
13 got you should eliminate this \$15 million proposal which
14 would run for 20 years, as the problems have arisen here
15 in downtown. There has been additional complaints about
16 it and I hope you strike it completely.

17 The EIR fails to disclose the effects of the
18 humans of such an assessment and upon the consumers. I
19 feel a large number of consumers and owners of small
20 businesses will end up subsidizing the giant corporations.

21 The Hollywood Better Government Association
22 is working hard to try to protect the rights of the small
23 people in this matter, and I think you should disclose in
24 your EIR a full budget of what's going on here. The EIR
25 does not have a proper budget of who's going to pay for

1 the project and where all the money is going to come from.
2 I understand it's been raised from the figures in the EIP,
3 according to Mr. Watts' testimony, from something on the
4 order of 3.2 billion up to 4.3 billion.

5 We don't know where it all comes from. I
6 think the impact should be much more carefully explained.
7 The bonding isn't clear.

8 There is no budget as to each year on the
9 bonds and who is going to pay the bond, whether they're
10 going to come from property assessments or what. It
11 doesn't state what property assessments on which property
12 is going to be used for bond amortization and interest. I
13 think that's incorrect.

14 There is no way the property owners affected
15 can know if they are going to be assessed or not, because
16 there is no maps showing which parcel or the station in
17 the project area. It's not accurately done.

18 I feel this should be supplemented and
19 straightened out before you go ahead with your proposal.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. HOLEN: Thank you.

22 Has Jeff Ely shown yet?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. HOLEN: Richard Hegstrom?

25 (No response.)

1 MR. HOLEN: John Walsh?

2 (No response).

3 MR. HOLEN: Susan Sherdlow?

4 (No response).

5 MR. HOLEN: Paul Holiday?

6 (No response).

7 MR. HOLEN: There are seven slips here, all
8 from the No El on Wilshire people, that I believe was
9 covered by Mr. Christopher's extended statement, which
10 he agreed to, I believe at the outset of his statement.

11 Is there anybody in that group that feels
12 compelled to add to what Mr. Christopher and Mr. Workman
13 and Ms. Plotkin said?

14 I don't see anybody indicating that they want
15 to be heard at this time.

16 Go ahead.

17 MR. VANDEVEER: Good afternoon. My name is
18 Tom Vandever.

19 MR. HOLEN: Oh, sorry. Yes, we did get one
20 from you.

21 MR. VANDEVEER: Again, my name is Tom
22 Vandever and I am a member of the Windsor Village
23 Association.

24 We are aligned with the No El on Wilshire, so
25 I will keep my comments brief.

1 I would like to add my name to my neighbors
2 who have spoken here before, as well as those who could
3 not be here who are all strongly opposed to an aerial
4 alignment on Wilshire, and I'll end it with that.

5 I would like to go on to say that if pressed
6 to make a selection from the Candidate Alignments that are
7 presented, I would favor, hesitantly, Alignment No. 3.

8 I would hope that with the approval of funds
9 that there is a release of the pressure for finding these
10 alignments so they could be studied in a little more
11 detail.

12 I believe you gentlemen have a great
13 responsibility to the community to come up with long-term
14 solutions, as we have heard today, to solutions which will
15 serve all the community as a whole, and I hope that that
16 would include no aerial on Wilshire.

17 With that, thank you, very much.

18 MR. HOLEN: thank you.

19 I'd like to note for the record that I was
20 remiss in not earlier noting the arrival of Director
21 Charles Storing, who has been sitting here since we
22 reconvened after lunch, and has been listening to the
23 public comments.

24 I'm also going to recess the hearing until a
25 quarter after 1:00 to see if any of the people who had

1 earlier indicated they would like to be heard have
2 arrived.

3 Thank you.

4

5 (Recess.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. HOLEN: We will now reconvene
2 the public hearing, and I will call the names of
3 the individuals yet to be heard, and we will see
4 if they are available to make their comments as
5 of now.

6 Mr. Paul Holiday.

7 (No response).

8 MR. HOLEN: Mr. Holiday does not appear
9 to be here.

10 Susan Sherdlow.

11 (No response).

12 MR. HOLEN: She doesn't appear to be here.

13 Jeff Ely.

14 (No response).

15 MR. HOLEN: He does not appear to be here.

16 Richard Hegstrom.

17 (No response).

18 MR. HOLEN: He does not appear to be here.

19 Abraham Falick.

20 (No response).

21 MR. HOLEN: He does not appear to be here.

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

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

There was one request to be heard at a time later than this, so we will hold the hearing open until that time.

Our Vice President, Ms. Estrada, will chair that portion of the public hearing and in attendance will be director Charles Storing.

At this time, we will recess until 2:00 p.m.

(Recess.)

1 MS. ESTRADA: We will now reconvene the
2 Public Hearing.

3 We have a couple of speakers left.

4 Let me call Abraham Falick, please.

5 You can come up to the podium. I'll ask your
6 name and who you are representing.

7 MR. FALICK: Thank you very much.

8 I am Abraham Falick, former Planning
9 Economist for the City of Los Angeles and presently
10 chairman for the Coalition of Rapid Transit.

11 I believe that all the members of the Board
12 have a copy of my March 4th letter, but I'd like to touch
13 upon it, if I may.

14 I was concerned, mainly, about the financing,
15 financial aspects of your SEIR, and about Mr. Dyer's study
16 and status report.

17 I believe that you're not giving the public
18 enough of an entree into what can be done for the
19 self-financing of stations.

20 According to your own estimate, it's about a
21 billion dollars of additional funding that could come from
22 that.

23 Now, you have your own Milestone 6, which was
24 a very good proposal. I don't think it's gotten the
25 emphasis. The public is not really aware of it, and I

1 should be a plan that goes along with the construction of
2 the system, and certainly beforehand rather than as a
3 retrofit afterwards. This building construes to defray
4 what the public deserves.

5 Now, we have identified 14 sites. That
6 actually should be 15. The 15 would be Beverly/Vermont.
7 We have to overlook that one. Of these 15 sites, two are
8 already under, in the MOS-1 area, under construction.
9 We're talking about the Union Station and
10 Alvarado/Wilshire.

11 The Union Station has an obsolete Post Office
12 that is going to be sold to other public servies and Metro
13 Rail would certaily have an opportunity to take this over,
14 develop it as a site at the Union Station. It could be
15 your headquarters building, but it could also be an office
16 building.

17 In any case, a building that is a part of the
18 system should be a profit maker. It's an important site.

19 What you're doing with the Metro Rail is to
20 give location value, and this is a value that's being
21 established at the Union Station as a central point for
22 railroads, in addition to Metro Rail and buses and many
23 other functions. It is a key site. It should be a money
24 maker for the Metro Rail.

25 The same thing applies to a lesser extent to

1 the Alvarado/Wilshire. It should be some kind of a
2 shopping center for people who live locally. It does not
3 have quite the earning potential that the Union Station
4 has, but nonetheless, value to the people of the
5 neighborhood, and it should be planned as an office
6 building, shopping center, bus terminal, so forth.

7 And the same can be said for all of the
8 others as we go down the line.

9 We get to a problem with the Wilshire
10 Corridor, and we're faced here with the opposition of
11 Congressman Waxman on the subway, Mayor Bradley for an
12 elevated, Councilman Ferraro for elevated, and the Hancock
13 Park Homeowners, who are opposed to anything.

14 Now, if this group of opponents succeed in
15 blocking the Metro Rail west of Crenshaw, who loses?

16 Well, the general public has reduced access
17 to the County Art Museum, Page Museum, office workers in
18 that densely populated area -- basically the Miracle Mile
19 area is the one that's going to lose out on this, but I
20 don't think that we should butt our heads against a stone
21 wall if it's something we can't overcome. I think we
22 should go around it.

23 We were initially opposed to consideration of
24 a site at Pico and San Vicente, but we think that could be
25 made into a useful site for the shopping center there.

1 However, we feel that it must be extended to at least
2 Olympic and San Vicente to give some incentive for people
3 who want to go further west and know there is a good
4 jumping off point at Olympic and San Vicente.

5 The decision as to whether Beverly Hills
6 wants to have subway is something else again, and you can
7 go either way, either up into Wilshire through Beverly
8 Hills or perhaps along Olympic and a bypass of Beverly
9 Hills, but that station at Olympic and San Vicente would
10 be an appropriate place to start it from.

11 MS. ESTRADA: Mr. Falick, we do appreciate
12 your comments. However, we have asked other speakers to
13 limit their comments to three minutes, and unfortunately,
14 the lights in front of you are not working and we have
15 given you a few minutes beyond that.

16 May I ask you to summarize.

17 MR. PALICK: Yes.

18 I feel the major ones we're talking about are
19 the Wilshire line and the Hollywood line. I feel there
20 has been a major omission in the consideration of Selma
21 Avenue because of the geographic centrality which would
22 serve both the Hollywood and the Sunset corridor.

23 We do believe that it should go down either
24 Sunset. Also, that there should be two major stations in
25 the central business district of Hollywood.

1 If you have any questions perhaps I can have
2 a minute to respond to whatever questions they have, since
3 you've already got my paper.

4 MS. ESTRADA: Do you have any questions?

5 (No response.)

6 MS. ESTRADA: Thank you, Mr. Falick.

7 I have one other speaking notice here from
8 John Walsh. Is he here?

9 (No response.)

10 MS. ESTRADA: Are there any other public
11 speakers?

12 Very good.

13 Then I'll entertain a motion to close the
14 public hearing.

15 MR. STORING: So moved.

16 MS. ESTRADA: Thank you, very much, members
17 who are here who made your statements. Thank you, very
18 much.

19

20 (At 1:51 p.m. proceedings for this

21 date were concluded.)

22

23

24

25

