



Minutes
Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Meeting of Ad Hoc Committee on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor DEIR
Monday August 11, 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	

Call to Order, Flag Salute & Roll Call

Co-Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 6:34, led the salute to the flag, called the roll with quorum met and none absent.

1. The August 11, 2025 Agenda was **approved** unanimously, as **moved** by Schlesinger.
2. **Motion** to approve the August 4, 2025 Minutes (**Attachment “A”**) was **moved** by Sandler, and **seconded** by Schlesinger.

Amendment: Member Brand proposed an amendment (having sent the language to Co-Chair Hall who sent it to Cathy after the minutes were already circulated.) Brand offered two changes in Hall’s list which was included in the minutes:

- a) Change “Fierce opposition from Lower Bel Air...” to just say “Fierce opposition from Bel-Air Association and Keep Bel-Air Beautiful”
- b) Supplement the minutes as to Ms. Levinson’s comment (at the very bottom of Co-Chair Hall’s list in the minutes) to state that she also made a comment about the realistic ridership capacities of the monorails vs. subway.

The two-part amendment was unanimously **approved**, following which the **minutes as amended** were unanimously **approved**.

Prior to concluding the meeting below, following comments from Steve Sann, under General Public Comment, a **motion to reconsider** approval of the August 4th Minutes (*above*) was made, to add some clarifying notes to those minutes, as **moved** by Dr. Longcore, and **seconded** by Member Templeton, requiring a minimum of a 2/3rd vote, which was **achieved** unanimously. The language of said amendments are noted under Steve Sann’s comments in Public Comment below in red and would be applied to the August 4th Minutes.

3. **General Public Comment:**

Lionel Mares, a Budget Advocate speaking as an individual, spoke on the importance of knowing what's going on with the City Charter Commission, which has started and has been meeting, and that very few are aware of what's going on. He noted that it is important that all communities are aware of what's going on: The commission has met six times and will have two meetings next week Monday and Friday. Lionel provided information on speakers who spoke, and topics that the commission is addressing including city council size, independent redistricting, ethics reform, NC reform, City Council reform and Our LA among other things. He stressed the importance that NCs and especially underserved/marginalized communities be aware of what's going on to make LA work for everyone. He urged us to work together, collaborate with all the NCs in the Valley. Co-Chair Hall gave a point of information that our NC has created an ad hoc committee on this Charter Reform Commission and let him know about the special meeting the Board is having this Thursday.

Steve Sann, Chair of the Westwood Community Council, offered comments as to our August 4th minutes that were just approved (above), referring to the comments he made at the August 4th meeting, beginning in the section of our minutes that said "robust conversation with Steve Sann." He asked that we add that *he was speaking as a Chair of his community council* and wanted to clarify that he had outlined Westwood's experiences with the *"Purple D-Line subway construction" (not Purple construction)* He would also add that it would be more accurate to say that he reported that *they received no reports from any of their Westwood neighbors that they felt anything during the construction of the tunnels...* He stated that he did report accurately that *we, our council, and to his knowledge, none of the homeowner associations, NC, no Westwood organization received any reports that any Westwood neighbor reported that they felt anything during the construction.*

Co-Chair Hall noted that he'd revise that on his list and there could be a motion for reconsideration but didn't feel it essential for our purposes. Mr. Sann noted that our website is an excellent resource and, as the official record, he was concerned if someone not at the meeting saw and read our minutes, which did not give an accurate account of what he said. *Public Comment was then closed*, at which time Dr. Longcore recommended that in the interest of the time of our guests from UCLA, that we take this up at the end of the meeting.

4. **Q/A with two topic area specialists from UCLA as to the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) (1 hour total)**

- Dr. Jonathan Stewart — Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering
- David Karwaski — Director for Mobility Planning & Traffic Systems at UCLA Transportation

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

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

Co-Chair Hall introduced this item, noting that we have heard from various individuals for their viewpoints, and this week we're speaking with representatives from UCLA. He welcomed our speakers, Dr. Jonathan Stewart and David Karwaski.

Dr. Jonathan Stewart introduced himself as a Civil Engineer with a specialty in Geotechnical Engineering, which is essentially Civil Engineering as applied to earth structures for

foundations, tunnels, etc., and, he is an expert in earthquake engineering with most of his research in earthquake engineering. He has been in the Civil Engineering Department at UCLA for nearly 29 years, and he does research, teaching and a good deal of public service related to those areas. Dr. Stewart noted that he is *not* in any way involved in the project, is basically an observer, and was not a consultant to the company who did the EIR.

Dr. Stewart noted that in preparation for this meeting, he read portions of the STC EIR related to geo-hazards, etc., particularly Section 3.6, which talks about the regulatory environment as it relates to these things, such as building codes. He has looked at the assessments of the hazards in that document which he noted are “preliminary”. They are not yet drilling borings as part of that. They’ve assessed different hazards including fault rupture on the Santa Monica fault, ground shaking, etc., and concluded with statements about the impact, whether it is the operational impact or structural impact. Dr. Stewart noted he has read those things and it is his understanding that his role in this meeting is to let us know what he thinks about this. He noted that he lives in Santa Monica and has a decent understanding of the geology of this area. He asked for any specific questions related to geological or earthquake hazards.

Questions were asked and answered including but not limited to the following:

Committee member asked why we would have a sinkhole on Stone Canyon in Bel Air last week to which he explained sink holes. He was asked about reasons for the failures when the Red Line was built, if those could happen again here, as well as about LA being earthquake prone, concerns about tunneling in this environment and what procedures and protocols might be in place in tunneling environments where earthquakes are known to be hazards. Dr. Stewart mentioned various factors, including liquefaction and failure of the walls, columns, as occurred in stations in some locations in Japan during the Kobe earthquake in 1995.

He did opine that by and large, even in places where all hell is breaking loose up on the surface, oftentimes tunnels and underground structures in general do pretty well. Part of the reason this happens is that when they design underground structures, they have to design for a significant amount of gravity-related earth pressure and the additional earth pressure that an earthquake produces is often not that large relative to the gravity-induced stresses. So, if you design the wall of a tunnel for a gravity-induced stress and use a margin of safety, say by a factor of two, designing for twice what gravity will give you, and the earthquake increases the stress by 50% you are still within your margins of safety, so it is often the case that the underground structures do pretty well in the absence of a fault rupture or liquefaction.

He discussed the importance of knowing in advance if there is fault rupture or liquefaction, so that they do the investigation, find that the problem there, engineers identify hazards and designs to mitigate them. So, even if hazards are present, and there is a fault rupture issue for this line which crosses the SM fault, you can implement mitigation measures to deal with it. Further questions included the location of the Santa Monica Fault, which Dr. Stewart noted is pretty close to Santa Monica Boulevard in this part of Los Angeles. Member Weisberg noted that there is a fault at Nimes Road at Lower Bel Air, and pointed out that Lower Bel Air is also a liquefaction zone.

Asked if engineers have found ways to engineer in these environments, to which he noted that the case of liquefaction is essentially a nonissue in the mountainous part of the segment, and while there might be liquefaction at the surface that is not where the tunnel is, the liquefaction has to happen at the level of the tunnel. The main hazard is fault rupture.

He discussed having issues of fault rupture on critical tunnels in many places in SoCal, e.g., the Elizabeth Tunnel which brings water over from Owens Valley that goes through the San Andreas Fault. He thinks it is very likely that if the Santa Monica Fault ruptures, that service would continue; they would do the repairs and reopen it. He'd anticipate that designing for a no-damage situation is not typical but designing for something that is fairly resilient, where repairs take a few months or a few weeks is practical. The design team will deal with this.

Further questions were asked and answered as to monorail vs. subway, aka tunneling vs. a bridge, about potential impacts to the dam, or hazards to the proposed mitigations.

He discussed the importance of pressurization of the face (and he explained the meaning of "the face" - look for the recording) the need to line the tunnel; pressurization and lining being critical issues to keep the miners doing the tunnels safe. He discussed the reason for the instrumentation to find out what you are doing is working; expect that instrumentation would be there and there would be action plans.

Asked about the three terms and technologies of tunneling options, and where the tunnel would be shallow as it comes up to the UCLA station, 40-feet deep, and starts pinging on the depth vs. the size of the tunnel with concern about the stream in Stone Canyon; to address concerns about the dewatering; how these things come together in terms of safety of the technologies and the degree in which it is reasonable and be concerned and asking questions about the upper UCLA and lower Bel Air area.

Dr. Stewart noted that as to the question of whether you can tunnel through saturated grounds and what the ecological impact would be, dewatering is one but not the only way and whether it's water intrusion or really unstable material ahead of the boring machine, you can improve the grounds ahead of the tunneling operation, citing the example of building the BART tunnels in SF. He noted that ground water is not a reason not to build a tunnel just a constraint... He discussed the shallowness, referencing tunneling down Wilshire Blvd.

Asked for his ideas with respect to the actual monorail cars or subway cars, in the event of an earthquake, the probability of cars coming off the track or monorail fall off the platform. His response was that it would be pretty unlikely; they would do an assessment if track is stable; as far as the cars toppling over, he is quite certain that they have mechanism to avoid that.

He was asked about construction vibration or noise which he said he could not answer.

Asked also if they know for sure all the faults in the SM Mountains in this area and if not would they be engineering this with a nonknown fault. His answer was that geology is *not* usually amenable to knowing. He noted that they did not know about the Northridge Fault before the Northridge earthquake. Asked how that impacts a project like this and if they are

tracking what they are seeing as they are tunneling, he noted that if there was a fault coming up to the surface the tunnel would intersect, they'd notice, probably stop, stabilize the base, and go back to their design team and ask what they do, noting that it is more cost efficient to deal with it before in design rather than in construction. They'd address it.

Concerns were voiced by committee members about spring water in the SM Mountains, asking if that the same as ground water. He answered that spring water is a common thing in mountainous areas... that can pop up to the surface here and there; a normal geological process. It would be alarming if it never happened before or that it could mean a pipe broke. There are ways of dealing with water.

Asked to define liquefaction, he noted that you have granular material like sand, fairly geologically young, 11,000 years, and it's saturated and then you subject that to a strong earthquake; it pressurizes the water and loosens the soil. Liquefaction is definitely an issue in certain parts of LA but not necessarily in the mountain areas.

Committee member noted that lower Bel Air is a liquefaction zone, and one of the options brings the subway via tunnel to 40-50 feet as it approaches UCLA. All the residents are required to carry flood insurance because of it. He discussed the ways to think about liquefaction, and noted that there is no reason to think the tunnel will change the liquefaction risk. The liquefiable may go down 20 feet... if it does go through it, they'd probably do some ground improvement... that would make it better for the community.

Asked if the tunnel could be safely built due to liquefaction, he discussed the need for the liner to be impervious and noted that there is no liner yet at the face. By pressurizing that face, you are holding it back. They'd need to deal with water intrusion through that face... ground water. He doesn't know how they'd deal with it; he could guess. The design team would have to use their best option.

Asked about soil borings, he didn't encounter soil borings in any of the options in this report, noting that they usually those happen later on during the design phase... He thinks it is more about construction cost, utilization and non-geological factors that will drive the route.

Asked regarding the composition of our hills, with loose sandstone and layers of shale, if he compare and contrast the susceptibility with the cycles of drought and then heavy rain, we see on the surface fairly catastrophic impacts, will the stability of the tunnel vs. the footings for the monorail. He noted that these wet-dry cycles of are more likely with climate change; the main impact of that would be landslides, shallow landslides that could be damaging; these landslides would be above the alignment of the tunnel, and he doesn't think the tunnel would impact them and that it is unlikely it is unlikely to be impacted by them. As to the footing of the monorail, he noted that if you have a surface structure like that and you think that a land slide could impact that area, you'd mitigate the land slide.

Co-Chair Hall thanked Dr. Stewart for coming tonight and that we really appreciate it.

Co-Chair Hall then introduced David Karwaski, who noted that he is Director of Mobility Planning and Traffic Systems at UCLA since 2006, and has worked at the Purple Line that became the D-Line with stations at UCLA. He has been a Transportation Planner for 30 years. He has been following the Draft EIR and was available for questions.

Co-Chair Hall noted that we have been trying to obtain the perspectives of institutional players or people impacted and asked him to speak on UCLA's priorities or preferences with regard to having a stop at the school.

Mr. Karwaski related that UCLA is a public university, they are interested in serving our constituents, in California and LA, and that part of the mix of is getting to and from UCLA; access is a critical component. Their perspective is what they can do to make it easier especially for students less costly to get to and from the campus. Having an opportunity to opine and be a stakeholder on the possibility of having a station at the campus is a positive. Their main focus is getting a "one seat" and a connection to the D-Line down Wilshire Boulevard. They are not splitting hairs as to the options (naming). He noted that the crux of it is the fact that they are public university and the need for improved access.

Asked if he has an opinion on ridership forecast for UCLA's stakeholder group. Some comments were that the ridership numbers to some of the alternatives is very large, even enormous, potentially achieving 120,000 trips per day, doubled of an existing rail line that exists today. One could quibble on travel demand modeling, which ends up the tool used to generate such estimates... Mr. Karwaski discussed the population of the SFV, being 1.8 million people, approximately the same population as Phoenix. The SFV would be one of the 10 largest cities in the country if it was its own municipality. There is no other connection from the Valley to the Westside besides the 405 pass, and he feels that putting a rail line there and seeing the large numbers, this project is late and should have happened a decade or several decades ago, pointing out that there is significant travel demand.

Asked if this would increase housing opportunities for students and employees, he noted that we make our travel decisions based on travel time, construction and convenience... One thinks about the reliability of the travel time, and it could be shorter - if you consider where you can get from the Valley to UCLA in 60 minutes is "nowhere."

Mr. Karwaski discussed travel times for the Valley and in LA, where he said we think about travel time not the distance and the quality of life benefit for people who live in the SFV, and the access which is gained in a short time from the Valley to the Westside. He described the short time from an equity and opportunity perspective.

Asked about the feasibility as to where the money comes from to do this, Mr. Karwaski had responses, including from federal funding, for the travel demand from the Valley to LA, it is hard to beat, comparing this to what happened in 2010, for the Purple D-Line, when they didn't have federal funding secure, to the extent that they'd need to build the line. He talked about this in terms of a partnership with the federal and sometimes state government, that funding is allocated for projects with great benefit/cost ratios. He thinks this will happen with this line, as it did for the Purple Line and is sure this will happen with this line.

Asked what else we should know about UCLA's perspective, Mr. Karwaski suggested that we should be cognizant of the opportunity for certain quid pro quo from Metro, ask yourselves what your community wants, that Metro could assist with... Look at this as a bit of a negotiation with Metro; what are the communities concerns. He cautions against dealing in absolutes, rather be a little more nuanced and find things that they can enable for you.

Asked for information on potential impacts on canyon traffic, along Beverly Glen and Roscomare, which have had increased traffic, and that demand for transportation to the Westside and the Valley has increased, Mr. Karwaski answered that there are certain community members in Bel Air who have fears about underground tunneling and reduction of quality of life and other elements. He thinks listening to Dr. Stewart this is less of a concern than before the meeting. He opined that what should be a concern is that Alt 1 will impact 405 traffic. The freeway lanes will be trimmed from 13 to 11 feet width and not have shoulders; narrow lanes often result in a higher crash rate. During the 6-1/2 years of construction, there would likely be more incidents on the freeway. Given there are potential alternative roads, anticipate diversion, people will find some equilibrium to shift their trips off the freeway and anticipates traffic will go up.

Mr. Karwaski reiterated that during the D-line nobody felt anything and thinks the concern should be on traffic on the surface rather than tunneling.

Asked if UCLA has done studies or surveys whether their students, faculty and visitors would use either the monorail or subway and approximately how many trips per day, he responded, no, because it is very clear that they will use it. Mr. Karwaski discussed how each of us is a transportation planner, to decide on how you're going to get to where you're going that day. He noted that the student body is extremely enthused about the rail line coming to campus. He noted that within the past two years, the first version happened earlier; both student bodies by referendum, voted student fees for transit passes. Now last fall, they sold almost 19,000 transit passes and 7,000 grad students. They have more than 25,000 students who use a transit pass. He is quite sure they'll use it.

Further discussion was held on travel time for the various alternatives as well as ridership. Asked about possible obsolescence of the options and whether they should not be built, when there may be flying taxis or other new technology, to which he noted that he doesn't see it and that in LA we don't need one or the other; but both.

Discussion was held on whether UCLA supports a station at Getty Center, to which Mr. Karwaski noted that it is part of Alt 3 and UCLA is not against it. Their interest is in what serves UCLA. He doesn't take a stance on individual stations.

Asked about Metro never having met expectation on ridership and why in this case; what more measures for the tunneling \$30-40 billion dollars, would take 35-years, and has UCLA considered costs and time for other alternatives, talking about the Purple Line. Mr. Karwaski refuted this, noting the demand is certainly there. He doesn't expect ridership to be an issue. He noted that cost estimates are nowhere near \$35 to 100 billion.

Committee member comment was made that while UCLA may be the center of the universe for UCLA, it is also a part of LA, and asked why are we taking so many people from LA to UCLA? He noted that when planning a rail line, one has to consider where the activity centers are, where life is going on, and those are the places you want to serve. It is an investment to meet travel demand and they are not trying to steer people elsewhere.

Committee member noted that if the project was initially sold to the project as a north to south direct route, that there would be an ability for the people in the Northern Valley to go to LAX to serve their needs, all of the stops would serve LAX, and that deviating from the direct route to go to UCLA does not serve that.

The question arose, as to the significance of “one seat.”

Committee member asked further, that while UCLA is a great place to go that offers great things, how much has he considered the rest of the people who don’t want to go back to UCLA? He responded that he went back to his public mission statement, to get people, enabling people to get to the campus; the ridership numbers go up; the demand is there. It isn’t just about UCLA. He noted that this is to provide an equity benefit that is missing currently. He noted that Phase 2 is where it gets down to the LAX area. He noted that it was split by Metro... and hopefully it will get there one day. He noted that we are talking about the late 2030s for the first phase, 2nd phase something like 2050.

A committee member asked if there is only going to be one rail line that goes from the Valley to the airport. Mr. Karwaski doesn’t know, and doesn’t know how many round trips, noting that the K-line is going there now and that you’ll always have two tracks, either build more tunnel or have a larger single tunnel with two sets of tracks. It will be several hundred feet under Mulholland Drive

Asked how will people get out, he noted that it depends on the alternatives.

A committee member asked how much cost is being diverted exclusively for UCLA and another for Getty when it appears they should be able to share one station at the intersection of the Purple Line and utilize a transit system, e.g., a bus, to get to the Getty.

Asked why we would spend the resources, to which Mr. Karwaski noted that UCLA has a medical center... Committee member asked if the financial resources to having a Getty stop and a UCLA stop has been discussed, as it is in close proximity for them to share a line. The Getty is adept at using a shuttle system. He noted that it sounds like Alt 1, and the same with the Getty, walk a thousand feet to the tram, that will continue. You do have that cost available; about \$15 billion. If the goal line would be the airport, he noted that it is a longer route. If you look at it is circuitous... underground it is a straight shot. It is much more direct. Asked again, if they were able to share the stop how much closer can we get to closer to LAX which affects a lot more people than UCLA and Getty, he responded that this suggestion is not likely to occur.

A committee member asked further as to the advantage or benefit to the community, and why can't this be done underneath the 405 or a second road on top of the 405, to which he answered that we are in the middle but that doesn't mean we won't benefit. We will have the same number of lanes, but narrower lanes (during construction). The line will take some traffic off the 405; particularly if the construction doesn't add traffic to the canyon roads. Spoke about toxicity from the driving in contrast to the underground or over-ground, noting that air pollution isn't a good thing. It floats out of the Sepulveda pass.

Public Comment:

Maureen Levinson noted that she is a fan of the monorail and lives in Bel Air, and noted that those at UCLA also need to go to LAX; mentioned Pauley Pavilion having public access for people wanting to stop at UCLA. Mr. Karwaski answered questions about if open to the public. Referenced using subways for a mob taking over the campus?

He noted that this is something they have thought about. They would push them to think about as at least as much coordination that area is busier than other parts of campus.

They have some experience working with Metro, collaborating with them. He noted that mobs can already show up a UCLA. We would not want to see that again; need to prepare as best as you can, collaborate with the transit agency. He doesn't want to say we don't want to have a connection at UCLA because we are fearful that at some point this might happen, and eschew the extraordinary benefit that the train would bring... look at the resources you have, prepared as best you can to mitigate, plan for it.

Steven Sann introduced himself this evening as speaking as one of the very active volunteers with the Sepulveda Transit Corridor (STC) Coalition for All which has more than 100 organizations who have joined and stand for regardless of which option you choose, we are calling for 1) there must be an on-campus UCLA station and 2) there must be a seamless connection with the Purple D-Line; that eliminates Alt 1, skips the UCLA campus, skips Westwood and doesn't have a connection to the Purple Line. You would have to go to a bus to get to the Village and campus. As to the question raised on what benefit to this would be to the Bel Air community, he noted that would be the great reduction in cut-through traffic on Roscomare, Beverly Glen, Benedict Canyon, and Laurel Canyon, significant benefits as it was noted that these neighborhoods are being crushed with the cut-through traffic. He spoke on the numbers, that the UCLA station will be the busiest station... and discussed the largest enrollment in the State of CA. He noted that the Getty has very tiny projected ridership: 1,300 a day compared to 18,000 a day using UCLA or 30,000 at the Purple Line at Wilshire and Westwood. He noted that it is not correct that bringing a station to UCLA it isn't serving the community.

Co-Chair Hall gave thanks to Mr. Karwaski, responded that he appreciates the conversation; the interesting questions, and hopes to have provided information that is useful to us. Hall thanked him.

Following the list, Mr. Sann suggested if you run Chat GPT, some of the notes attributed to Karwaski were his comments.

Templeton stated that she was going to try to reach someone at BYD or Bechtel, and the email bounced back. She found two videos and Jamie asked her to send them to Cathy. She tried to download the DEIR and said it didn't work.

5. Committee Discussion of Planning, Procedures and Priorities of the Ad Hoc Committee

Notes collected from the group as outlined by Co-Chair Jamie Hall:

Dr. Jonathan Stewart (UCLA)

- His specialty is geotechnical engineering and earthquake engineering. He is a civil engineer.
- He believes that Metro has capacity to solve earthquake, liquefaction and water issues that may be encountered.
- Believes that EIR as to the topics he read was adequate - largely because the project must adhere to existing regulations that have been put in place.
- In boring the tunnels before the implementation of the impermeable membranes Metro will accommodate or solve for whatever unforeseen circumstances they encounter.
- He emphasized that the technology has improved significantly in all aspects over the 25 years. We are unlikely to see tunnel collapses like occurred when the Red Line was constructed.
- Heightened engineering standards would be required within 50 feet of the fault lines.
- Monorail and subway system would recognize earthquake and stop cars.
- Cars would not fall off the monorail.
- Unlikely to see bridge collapses due to improvements in structural design.
- Less movement deeper underground.
- Talked about experiences of other countries in earthquake prone areas with tunnels - they have not experienced major issues due to improvements in technology and design.
- If liquefaction were encountered, there would likely be mitigation in the form of improvements to the ground surface in certain areas. This would help adjacent structures.
- Liquefaction not as much of an issue in the hills than the flats.

David Karwaski (UCLA)

- UCLA gave away 25,000 transit passes last year.
- Gave a justification for why a stop in the middle of the campus was justified.
- Suggested that BABCNC proposed mitigation in its letter - especially as it related to traffic on canyon streets.
- UCLA was not concerned about a Getty stop
- UCLA was technology agnostic - they just want a stop in the middle of campus.
- They want a one seat ride from the Valley to UCLA.
- Options with an increased travel time will have decreased ridership
- Not too concerned about where funding will come at this point - the federal government will likely provide money in the future (just like they did for the Purple Line/D Line)
- Residential communities will benefit by having traffic taken off canyon streets resulting in better air quality.
- UCLA has not done independent ridership studies or forecasts.

- Provided statistics regarding the number of students (48,000) plus employees (40,000).
- No answer on methods to exit from tunnels during emergency.
- Under certain alternatives, the lanes of the 405 would be narrow from 14 feet to 11 feet and the shoulders would be eliminated. He states this would be a bad thing for the community.
 - Irene is skeptical that the narrower is a byproduct of this project. Rather, it is a result of HOV land creation.
- Not feasible to think Metro will elongate line if a stop is removed.
- UCLA stop would be the second busiest stop in the Metro system (18,000) if it was in operation today. Wilshire would be the busiest stop in the Metro stop (30,000 people). Getty has just 1300 people per day forecasted.
- Extension to LAX not likely to occur until 2050.
- Highlighted campus support for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor (with a stop in the middle of UCLA). Said student body was strongly in support.

Public Comments

Maureen Levinson

- Maureen talked about the usage of the New York subway system by protestors and questioned what procedures/security measures were being planned to ensure a similar occurrence does not occur at UCLA.
- Mr. Karwaski stated that UCLA was taking this issue seriously and would be addressing some of these issues in its comment letter.

Steven Sann

- Mr. Sann said he was representing the STC Coalition for All. Mr. Sann the priorities of the Coalition. He said they wanted a stop at UCLA and a seamless connection to the Purple Line. He said this eliminates Alternative 1.

Attention was turned back to Agenda Item #2, for a “Motion to Reconsider” the approval of the 08/04/2025 Minutes. (See above.)

Good of the Order & Adjournment - Dr. Longcore thanked everyone who attended, the people who gave public comments, our speakers from UCLA, and for everyone being present for three hours on a work night, caring for your community. He also admonished us to be respectful of other peoples’ time: to give everyone else the benefit of the doubt that they are advocating for their communities as this is the way it works. He noted that we have other issues in the world that we can worry about and we can get along. He apologized that we didn’t get to some questions, particularly from the chat, noting that we are all doing the absolute best that we can and that he appreciates that.

Co-Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 9:26 PM.

Next Meeting: August 18th at 6:30 PM *Subsequent Meeting:* August 25th at 6:30 PM

www.babcnc.org / info@babcnc.org