



Revised Minutes

**Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Meeting of Ad Hoc Committee on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor DEIR
Monday July 28, 2025 6:30 P.M. - 8:30 P.M.**

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Irene Sandler, Co-Chair	X		Jamie Hall, Co-Chair	X	
Pamela Pierson	X		Michael Kemp	X	
Aaron Lawrence	X		Leslie Weisberg	X	
Patricia Templeton		X	Nickie Miner	X	
Jonathan Brand		X	Robert Schlesinger	X	
			Travis Longcore <i>ex officio</i>		X

Co-Chair Jamie Hall called the meeting to order at 6:36 PM, welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on the STC DEIR. He noted that Member Irene Sandler and he are co-chairs of this committee. Following the salute to the flag, Co-Chair Hall called the roll with quorum met. Co-Chair Hall introduced the purpose of the meeting of the hoc committee comprised of members of both the PLU and Traffic committees is to look at the proposal and the alternatives, and once done, develop a discussion of what our letter to Metro might be and might contain.

He noted that the first meeting on this, held by the PLU Committee last Monday, July 21st, discussed the alternatives, with the presentation by Bob Anderson of Sherman Oaks HOA (SOHA). The second meeting tonight is to discuss impacts associated with other institutions impacted by the project, and that we would be hearing from Mary-Elizabeth Michaels, Head of Government and Community Affairs, J. Paul Getty Trust.

Co-Chair Hall reminded us that we are not endorsing a particular alternative but were here to learn and gain perspective on the issues that they think are important for the community to understand.

1. General Public Comment:

There were no comments by the public on any topic within the Committee's jurisdiction but not on the adopted agenda.

2. Presentation and Discussion Regarding Sepulveda Transit Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Report

Guest Speaker: Mary-Elizabeth Michaels, Head of Government and Community Affairs, J. Paul Getty Trust

Background: Full Text of Draft EIR is found online here:

<https://us.planengage.com/sepulvedacorridor/page/home>

Ms. Michaels introduced herself, and related that the Getty supported the Alternative with a stop to the Getty Center. She noted that they are extremely limited to access the Getty Center, including by the number of parking spots available there, and that fast and convenient public transportation would allow more people to attend. She related that we are well into the 90-day public comment period before the deadline. She noted of the different alternatives, she was here to speak on Alternative 3, the only one with stops at both the Getty and UCLA. She noted that it is also designed to eventually connect to LAX and provided details of their understanding on how Alternative 3 is different from the others. Questions were asked and answered. Co-Chair Hall thanked her for the institutional perspective.

3. **[7:32 PM] Discussion of Planning, Procedures and Priorities of the Ad Hoc Committee**
Post-presentation, the committee held a discussion. Co-Chair Sandler noted that she thinks we have individual interest for our communities, and the communities represented here are mainly from Sepulveda to Benedict Canyon but that doesn't mean this wouldn't affect other people in other canyons but they are not here. She didn't want anything so general that the individual communities couldn't speak up.

Member Weisberg responded that Dr. Longcore said we can see whether we can write about the areas we represent. Co-Chair Hall noted that he learned a lot from the presentation on the intersection between a major stop and the planning implications. He noted that she brought up an interesting point: How do you *not* have a stop at the Getty?

Hall noted that the EIR needs to analyze the consequences of possible development within a half mile of the development in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). He noted that there will be some developer that chooses to do this, increasing density within the VHFHSZ, which we need to point out. He bets they haven't discussed it fully in the EIR and that is a viewpoint we can express without saying we support one alternative over another. Member Kemp would say that there should *not* be high density development in VHFHSZs.

Hall noted that there is an evacuation issue, where there is increased capacity without cars, asking how they get out. Weisberg recalls hearing about seven (7) miles of no egress, also asking how we can get out. This led to discussion of the possible impacts of SB79 building high rises in VHFHSZs if the bill should pass. Member Miner added that the issue of an escape hatch is often bypassed and wondered where these pieces of transportation will be held. She opined that it will make a big mess wherever it is and asked about eminent domain.

Addition to these July 28, 2025 STC Committee meeting minutes, obtained at the August 4, 2025 STC meeting, during approval of the July 28, 2025 STC Minutes:

Member Templeton reported that she had listened to the tape of the July 28, 2025 STC meeting and heard it mentioned a couple of times that there is no public transportation to the

Getty Center. Member Templeton thought it should be in the minutes that there is bus service to the Getty Center, specifically, the Sepulveda bus stops there, so there is in fact public transportation to get to and from the Getty and the minutes were adopted as amended.

Co-Chair Hall began a list on the shared screen, taking notes on the main topics to include in the DEIR comment letter. (*See **Addendum** below for list added to the minutes after they were already approved with the addition of the comments above)

Co-Chair Hall noted that he and Dr. Longcore will discuss evaluating the DEIR. Future guests include UCLA and Fred Rosen, and will be scheduled.

Co-Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 8:36 PM to return Monday August 4th at 6:30 PM.

***Addendum to the 07/28/2025 Minutes**
Notes from Co-Chair Hall obtained on this date

1. Reasonable Foreseeability of Increased Density Near New Major Transit Stops
 - a) SB 79 May Mandate Apartment Complexes within ½ mile in Very High Hazard Severity Zones
 - b) There May be OTHER laws that would authorize this as well (TOC, CHIP Ordinance, Density Bonus Ordinance, SB 35)
2. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Issues

Adding capacity to Getty Center may leave people stranded without cars and they may not be able to evacuate if trains are not running

 - a) Is sheltering in place the solution?
 - b) How will people exit railcars if they need to exit during an emergency? (especially if they are in a tunnel)
3. Lack of Parking Near New Getty Center Transit Stop

If people park across the street from transit stop they may run across Sepulveda and this is unsafe. Would a pedestrian overpass over Sepulveda be required?

 - a) If Metro wants to be a real stop (not just a Getty stop), then they have to plan for parking
4. Should there be a major transit stop at a cultural center such as the Getty Center?

Yes

 - a) Learn from lessons of the past (like failure to include stop at Hollywood Bowl and airport)
5. Phasing Issues

Concerns that a partial construction will never be completed due to lack of funding (e.g. High Speed Rail)

6. Funding Issues

- a) Where is Metro going to get the money for this?
Will project still be feasible due to inflation?

7. Lack of Transparency for Public-Private Partnership

Lack of detail regarding public private partnerships precludes evaluations of feasibility of alternatives

- a) Also, reduced ridership has called into question public private partnerships. For example, Brightline High Speed Rail may fail due to lack of ridership (it was a high profile public-private partnership in Florida. See recent Bloomberg article.

8. Getty Conditional Use Permit

Was there a condition of approval limits number of visitors? Will it need to be amended if the Getty Stop is designed to increase capacity?

9. Getty Stop

More details are needed to evaluate usability and access to Getty Center

10. First Mile/Last Mile Issues

11. Vibration Impacts

What if Stone Canyon Reservoir is weakened and fails

12. Woodland Impact for Alternative 4

13. Eminent Domain

Is this scope of eminent domain adequate in the EIR?

14. Lack of Federal Transit Authority Approval

Without this approval, the reliance of federal money is suspect