



Westside
Regional
Alliance of
Councils

westsidecouncils.com

Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council
Brentwood Community Council
Del Rey Neighborhood Council
Mar Vista Community Council
Neighborhood Council of Westchester-Playa
North Westwood Neighborhood Council
Pacific Palisades Community Council

Palms Neighborhood Council
South Robertson Neighborhoods Council
Venice Neighborhood Council
West LA-Sawtelle Neighborhood Council
Westside Neighborhood Council
Westwood Community Council
Westwood Neighborhood Council

DRAFT MINUTES
WRAC Special Meeting
of the Board of Directors
July 7, 2025 – 6:30pm

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84095705158?pwd=JGw2s8bM4JsNzlaaLacZJuAMaxt0Md.1#success>

Or Dial (669) 900 9128 **Meeting ID** 872 7511 1207

Items on the Agenda may be taken in any order at the discretion of the Chair – Attendees who do not identify themselves upon request of the Chair will be removed (see Item 2 below).

1. Welcome/Introductions

- a. Call to Order and Certification of Quorum** - Chair Greenberg (BABCNC) called the meeting to order at 6:32 pm, with roll call taken by Host & WRAC Secretary/Treasurer Tyler Laferriere. Quorum was met.

11 Board Members Present

BABCNC Robin Greenberg, Chair,

PPCC Chris Spitz, Vice-Chair,

BCC Carolyn LoBuglio

NWNC Connor Webb,

PalmsNC Reza Akef,

SORONC Jason Plummer,

WNC Terri Tippit,

WCC Steve Sann,

WWNC Lisa Chapman

DRNC Ravi Sankaran left at 7:30 PM when Quenton Richards stepped in as Alternate.

WLASNC Jay Handal was present until 7:14 PM, with **10 members remaining**.

Nonvoting Alternates Present: Nickie Miner (BABCNC), Barbara Broide (WNC), and Larry Watts (BCC)

Also Present: Selena Inouye, MTC Chairwoman, Phillip Brown, Bob Anderson, Debbie Nussbaum, and Robert Schlesinger.

- b. From the Chair:** Government Reports, Board Member Updates, Committee Reports (except as related to Item 3a below), Approval of Minutes and Old Business are deferred to a later meeting.

2. Public Comment:

Philip Brown offered the following comments:

- 1) Westside 405 lack of frontage road is the main problem.
- 2) It is too early to pick a solution from the information of Metro because various EIRs are needed, the costs are very important and because of the travel demand that is being serviced by each

alternative.

3) There are new 405 express lanes. Mr. Brown attended a meeting at Wilshire Methodist, showing that they are adding two lanes in each direction in this proposal. He believes there is room to add a frontage road straddling the 405 and that would solve the congestion in the communities east and west of the 405.

4) The LA Basin communities need an improvement in the community scale for mobility, livability opportunity and sustainability. Mr. Brown discussed how these goals can be achieved through adding a frontage road to the 405 alignment on the west side, included in Metro's requirement to study all realistic alternatives.

Bob Anderson, Vice President and Chair, Transportation Committee, Sherman Oaks

Homeowners Association (SOHA) www.SOHA914.com. Mr. Anderson noted that he has been studying this project since 2015, and was involved in Measure M when it was written. His position and that of his HOA is in agreement with Phillip in one key way: They do *not* believe that the project has been thoroughly studied and that the information in the DEIR is sufficient to make a decision at this time. SOHA sent a letter to Stephanie Wiggins of Metro, saying that Metro should do additional analyses and give information to the public before it makes a decision. Mr. Anderson mentioned the DEIR from last June for the K-line Extension, North/South, and that this would be the northern extension up to and including possibly the Hollywood Bowl. Mr. Anderson also noted that Metro came up with not having enough info and believes that this is 10 times worse. He read the entire DEIR, looked at every one of the 21,000 pages, and put a letter together that he sent to Robin, where he noted that he has found eight (8) fatal flaws:

- 1 Insufficient Funding for Any Alternative
- 2 Inept Alternative Selection Method
- 3 Unrealistic Costs & Schedules
- 4 Suspicious & Insufficient Ridership Analysis
- 5 Zero Public-Private Partnership Detail
- 6 No Early Public Input into Alternatives
- 7 Inconsistent Heavy Rail Technologies
- 8 Trivial Public Presentation Content

Mr. Anderson's letter is linked at <https://www.shermanoakshomeownersassociation.com/transit>.

3. New Business:

a. Motion (MTC; Steve Sann) -- Support the Heavy Rail Underground Subway Mode of Transportation for the Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor project

"The _____ NC/CC, a member of the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC), supports the proposed underground heavy rail subway mode of transportation through the Sepulveda Pass because it will carry more passengers than the proposed monorail mode of transportation. The heavy rail mode of transportation is described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor project, released by Metro on June 2, 2025, in the discussion of alternatives 4, 5 and 6."

Refers to:

<https://www.metro.net/projects/sepulvedacorridor/>

Moved by Sann (WCC) and seconded by Member Chapman (WWNC)

MTC Chairwoman Selena Inouye noted that the MTC members picked the mode of transportation that they think everyone can agree on. The MTC wanted to see what got more people moving faster.

Member Sann (WCC) gave a detailed presentation. He spoke earlier with Selena and would like to offer a brief but friendly amendment of his own motion that Selena supports.

Member Sann explained that some councils may wish to endorse one or two alternatives only, but now that we have the Draft EIR, he hopes that WRAC member councils will oppose the two remaining monorail alternatives. He noted that WRAC has already unanimously voted to eliminate Alternative 1, which leaves only Alternative 3.

Amended motion

a. Motion (**WRAC Board on recommendation of the** MTC; Steve Sann) -- Support the Heavy Rail Underground Subway Mode of Transportation **and Oppose the two proposed Monorail Options** for the Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor **Project (STCP).**

“The _____ NC/CC, a member of the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC), **opposes the two proposed Monorail Options (Alternative 1 and Alternative 3) due to their significantly lower ridership projections and lower capacities, and their significantly slower speeds and longer travel times,** and supports the proposed underground **Heavy Rail** subway mode of transportation through the Sepulveda Pass because it will carry **significantly** more passengers than the proposed **Monorail** mode of transportation. The **Heavy Rail** mode of transportation is described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor **Project**, released by Metro on June 2, 2025, in the discussion of **Alternatives 4, 5 and 6.**”

Refers to: <https://www.metro.net/projects/sepulvedacorridor/>

Member Sann reiterated that the amended motion opposes the two monorail options, Alternative 1 and Alternative 3, studied by the Metro board, due to significantly lower ridership projected for the monorail.

The Amended Motion was moved by Member Sann and seconded by Member Chapman. Discussion was held on the proposed amendment with some comments including from Member Plummer (SORONC), who supports the heavy rail option but is not opposed to monorail and is concerned to nix an option entirely. Member Webb (NWNC) thinks Member Sann’s amendment is a great addition to the motion, being explicit that these monorail options don’t have any advantage over heavy rail.

Member Sann asked that everyone on the board consult his second email sent before the meeting because of costs and timetable of delivery. He sent 8 slides mostly from the last Metro presentation, which he showed and discussed during the meeting.

The **amendment passed** 8-0-2 with the abstentions from Chair Greenberg and Member LoBuglio. (Jay Handal was absent for the vote at 7:14 PM.)

Member Sann was able to screen share the slides he had sent by email. Member Plummer then shared his screen with projections on ridership and updated numbers, timeline, as well as new information including headways, important for heavy rail. Member Plummer noted that he is a big proponent of 4 & 5 and that a two and a half minute peak time seems good to him. He discussed average operating speeds, vehicle miles traveled, and noted that Alternatives 4, 5 and 6 blow monorails out of the water. Greenhouse gas pollutions will be avoided, doubling Alternative 3. Member Plummer noted that since there will be more riders, you'll be avoiding more cars on the road. He discussed walking distance to each station to nearest commercially-zoned property. He noted that all of the stops for the monorail are right next to the freeways, and that transfer times are better for heavy rail than monorail options. Peak load will be better. He reiterated end to end travel times, and stressed that heavy rail is the better option here; he doesn't see a reason to go with the monorail as to the number of people it can serve and time to get there more quickly.

Member Broide (WNC) shared information on LA Metro Redline depths. Member Miner (BABCNC) expressed concerns about possible impacts to the hillsides, e.g., springs in the hills and all kinds of things that go on in the hills that cannot be tested. She noted that the hills are being compromised and there is overbuilding as it is, and we don't know if, after time, the hills will collapse because of tunneling; it could go from hill to hill to hill, and then why do this? Houses are falling down, etc. She asked how you know there aren't little faults in there or other unknown factors, e.g., maybe they'll run out of money, and have a turnover of workers who are not as smart. She feels the whole thing doesn't make sense but what makes sense to her is having something immediately that would help alleviate the traffic, which could be a lane dedicated to just buses; no digging, tunneling, waiting 10 years, in which time the whole thing could be obsolete. She thinks we don't have to choose from any of these options. Member Sann responded that this project has been promised 50 years, and we know the need. Buses do not have the capacity for the massive ridership and the travel times are so much slower. This is an incredible opportunity to make the difference. He urged her support.

The motion **passed as amended** by 7 yeses from Members Richards, Webb, Akef, Tippet, Sann, Chapman and Plummer, 0 noes, and 3 abstentions from Chair Greenberg, Vice-Chair Spitz, and Member LoBuglio.

4. Adjournment –

Selena Inouye reminded everyone that the deadline to submit comments to the DEIR is August 30th. She hopes if our councils pass this motion, that we pass this before the 30th so WRAC can submit a position letter. Member Chapman asked that the information on the 30th of August deadline be shared with us all so we can share them with our councils. Vice-Chair Spitz related that this is a recommended motion to our member councils; it is not yet a WRAC position. The meeting **adjourned at approximately 8:05 PM** with the **next meeting** to be held on **July 21, 2025** – a special in-person breakfast meeting for Board members only.