

Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project PDA LASRE Briefing – City of Santa Monica Stakeholder Meeting Minutes

Meeting Information:

Date:	Time:
April 18, 2024	2:00 PM – 2:30 PM
Location:	Call Info:
Join Zoom Meeting https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85190854041?pwd=VgJbHezNSFD4DT6OtNbA8DKPRaHv11.1	

Attendee List:

Metro	LASRE Project Team
Nikhil Damle - PDA Oversight Manager, LASRE	Mark Waier – Project Communications
Eimon Smith – Metro PgM Support	May Song – Project Communications
Community Stakeholders	
David White – City Manager	
Susan Cline – Asst City Manager	
Anuj Gupta – City Management Staff	

Disclaimer:

Because Metro has not completed a CEQA review, the information contained herein does not constitute or evidence an approval by Metro of, or commitment of Metro to, any action for which prior environmental review is required under CEQA. Metro retains the absolute sole discretion to make decisions under CEQA, which discretion includes, without limitation (i) deciding not to proceed with the Project (known as the “no build” alternative) and (ii) deciding to approve the Project. There will be no approval or commitment by Metro regarding the development of the Project, unless and until Metro, as the Lead Agency, and based upon information resulting from the CEQA environmental review process, considers the impacts of the Project.

*For official information regarding the Project, please visit Metro’s project website:
<https://www.metro.net/projects/sepulvedacorridor/>*

Agenda:

A. Briefing Items

1.0 Introductions

2.0 Briefing

- Project Overview
- Monorail/SkyRail Overview
- Alignment Alternatives
- Station Concepts
- Why LASRE is proposing SkyRail

3.0 Q & A: The City of Santa Monica City Manager and his staff had the following questions following the presentation:

Question: What will the parking situation look like for these stations? Ventura Blvd would be a great option for a park and ride.

LASRE response: Concerns about parking are definitely something we will bring back to Metro. Parking is not part of our project but there are stations with existing parking that we connect to like the Van Nuys Station, Orange Line Station and Expo, which currently have additional capacity.

Question: The dialogue in this region seems to have very loosely broken down with the monorail as the NIMBY alternative and the heavy rail as the progressive alternative. Heavy rail can cut down travel times by a lot and also have greater ride capacity. How would you rebut those considerations?

LASRE response: In terms of speed, we have more curves and we have an additional station so we will inevitably take longer. When you look at global cities, they all have their Metro serving cultural institutions and we don't want another Hollywood Bowl situation. We have an alternative that gives UCLA a one-seat ride and serves the Getty with a station. Also, monorails can go up to 75 mph. In terms of capacity, we can carry 12,000 passengers per hour per direction. So we are not concerned with capacity issues as the Red Line is currently carrying 3,000 passengers per hour per direction. We can run the system every 90 seconds. It is an automated system so we can adjust that where necessary.

We've been doing the stakeholder updates. And what I can tell you about the meetings is that the conversation is not that we don't want it, it's how is it going to work. The various alternatives are giving communities certain places where they weigh in. When we started this, monorail was perceived as ONLY above ground, but Alternative 3 does have an underground segment. As we've gotten out there and started these stakeholder

updates (since December 2023), we're changing the perception of what people think about monorail as a transit alternative. We do have more work to do, and we'll continue doing these updates.

Question: I think this is super exciting; I love the connection from the Valley to the West side as well as the connection to the Getty. I'd love to hear more about how safety will become a core component of the operational stance, especially given Metro's struggle with these. I'm curious about the UCLA route alternatives and the costs associated with them. How are you looking at the funding side of it?

LASRE response: At this moment we are unable to share information on cost. Metro will share that information at a later date. We were tasked by Metro to present them with the alternatives and the cost differences for the three alternatives. Know that as you add more miles of tunnel, the costs will rise. In terms of personal safety, we have safety glass at stations, cameras, station platforms that are open, train cars that are open end to end. Also, in terms of safety and security, we will be fully integrated with LAPD and LA County Sheriffs as well as the Metro ambassador program.

Question: What are the next steps?

LASRE response: Decisions from the Metro Board will be in the next year.

Question: You mentioned that electric bus connector for Alternative 1. Is it safe to say that this won't be running by 2030?

LASRE response: Construction won't begin until after the Olympics.

Question/comment: We are currently on track as an agency to be fully electric with our bus fleet by 2030. Our COA does involve adjusting a lot of our services to connect with Wilshire. So by 2030 we will have fully electric bus connections connecting UCLA and Wilshire. So if this is the option that Metro goes with, we would be open to having conversations about being that bus provider.

LASRE response: Great, I'll take that back to the team.