



**Metro**

*One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012,  
3rd Floor, Metro Board Room*

**Agenda - Final**

**Wednesday, March 18, 2026**

**11:00 AM**

Watch online: <https://boardagendas.metro.net>  
Listen by phone: Dial 888-978-8818 and enter Access Code:  
5647249# (English) or 7292892# (Español)

To give written or live public comment, please see the top of page 4

## **Planning and Programming Committee**

*Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, Chair*

*Hilda Solis, Vice Chair*

*James Butts*

*Lindsey Horvath*

*Ara J. Najarian*

*Gloria Roberts, non-voting member*

*Stephanie Wiggins, Chief Executive Officer*

## **METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD AGENDA RULES**

(ALSO APPLIES TO BOARD COMMITTEES)

### **PUBLIC INPUT**

A member of the public may address the Board on agenda items, before or during the Board or Committee's consideration of the item for one (1) minute per item, or at the discretion of the Chair. A request to address the Board must be submitted electronically using the tablets available in the Board Room lobby. Individuals requesting to speak will be allowed to speak for a total of three (3) minutes per meeting on agenda items in one minute increments per item. For individuals requiring translation service, time allowed will be doubled. The Board shall reserve the right to limit redundant or repetitive comment.

The public may also address the Board on non-agenda items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board during the general public comment period, which will be held at the beginning and/or end of each meeting. Each person will be allowed to speak for one (1) minute during this General Public Comment period or at the discretion of the Chair. Speakers will be called according to the order in which their requests are submitted. Elected officials, not their staff or deputies, may be called out of order and prior to the Board's consideration of the relevant item.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and in accordance with the Brown Act, this agenda does not provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on any Consent Calendar agenda item that has already been considered by a Committee, composed exclusively of members of the Board, at a public meeting wherein all interested members of the public were afforded the opportunity to address the Committee on the item, before or during the Committee's consideration of the item, and which has not been substantially changed since the Committee heard the item.

In accordance with State Law (Brown Act), all matters to be acted on by the MTA Board must be posted at least 72 hours prior to the Board meeting. In case of emergency, or when a subject matter arises subsequent to the posting of the agenda, upon making certain findings, the Board may act on an item that is not on the posted agenda.

**TECHNOLOGY DISRUPTIONS** - Although staff will do their due diligence to restore service, if joining the meeting virtually, please be aware that the Committee or Board may continue its meeting notwithstanding a technical disruption that prevents members of the public from attending or observing the meeting via the two-way telephonic service or two-way audio visual platform.

**CONDUCT IN THE BOARD ROOM** - The following rules pertain to conduct at Metropolitan Transportation Authority meetings:

**REMOVAL FROM THE BOARD ROOM** - The Chair shall order removed from the Board Room any person who commits the following acts with respect to any meeting of the MTA Board:

- a. Disorderly behavior toward the Board or any member of the staff thereof, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
- b. A breach of the peace, boisterous conduct or violent disturbance, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
- c. Disobedience of any lawful order of the Chair, which shall include an order to be seated or to refrain from addressing the Board; and
- d. Any other unlawful interference with the due and orderly course of said meeting.

### **INFORMATION RELATING TO AGENDAS AND ACTIONS OF THE BOARD**

Agendas for the Regular MTA Board meetings are prepared by the Board Clerk and are available prior to the meeting in the MTA Records Management Department and on the Internet. Every meeting of the MTA Board of Directors is recorded and is available at <https://www.metro.net> or on CD's and as MP3's for a nominal charge.

## DISCLOSURE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

The State Political Reform Act (Government Code Section 84308) requires that a party to a proceeding coming before an agency involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use including all contracts (other than competitively bid contracts that are required by law, agency policy, or agency rule to be awarded pursuant to a competitive process , labor contracts, personal employment contracts, contracts valued under \$50,000, contracts where no party receives financial compensation, contracts between two or more agencies, the periodic review or renewal of development agreements unless there is a material modification or amendment proposed to the agreement, the periodic review or renewal of competitively bid contracts unless there are material modifications or amendments proposed to the agreement that are valued at more than 10 percent of the value of the contract or fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000), whichever is less, and modifications of or amendments to any of the foregoing contracts, other than competitively bid contracts), shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contributions in an amount of more than \$500 made within the preceding 12 months by the party, or the party's agent, to any officer of the agency. When a closed corporation is party to, or participant in, such a proceeding, the majority shareholder must make the same disclosure. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the assessment of civil or criminal penalties.

## ADA REQUIREMENTS

Upon request, sign language interpretation, materials in alternative formats and other accommodations are available to the public for MTA-sponsored meetings and events. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made at least three working days (72 working hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please telephone (213) 364-2837 or (213) 922-4600 between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Our TDD line is (800) 252-9040. Requests can also be sent to [boardclerk@metro.net](mailto:boardclerk@metro.net).

## LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

A Spanish language interpreter is available at all Committee and Board Meetings. All other languages must be requested 72 hours in advance of the meeting by calling (213) 364-2837 or (213) 922-4600. Live Public Comment Instructions can also be translated if requested 72 hours in advance.



**323.466.3876**

x2 *Español (Spanish)*

x3 *中文 (Chinese)*

x4 *한국어 (Korean)*

x5 *Tiếng Việt (Vietnamese)*

x6 *日本語 (Japanese)*

x7 *русский (Russian)*

x8 *Հայերէն (Armenian)*

## HELPFUL PHONE NUMBERS AND EMAIL

Copies of Agendas/Record of Board Action/Recordings of Meetings - (213) 922-4880 (Records Management Department) - <https://records.metro.net>

General Information/Rules of the Board - (213) 922-4600

Internet Access to Agendas - <https://www.metro.net>

TDD line (800) 252-9040

Board Clerk Email - [boardclerk@metro.net](mailto:boardclerk@metro.net)

**NOTE: ACTION MAY BE TAKEN ON ANY ITEM IDENTIFIED ON THE AGENDA**

### **Live Public Comment Instructions:**

Live public comment can be given by telephone or in-person.

The Meeting begins at 11:00 AM Pacific Time on March 18, 2026; you may join the call 5 minutes prior to the start of the meeting.

Dial-in: 888-978-8818 and enter  
English Access Code: 5647249#  
Spanish Access Code: 7292892#

***Public comment will be taken as the Board takes up each item. To give public comment on an item, enter #2 (pound-two) when prompted. Please note that the live video feed lags about 30 seconds behind the actual meeting. There is no lag on the public comment dial-in line.***

### **Instrucciones para comentarios publicos en vivo:**

Los comentarios publicos en vivo se pueden dar por telefono o en persona.

La Reunion de la Junta comienza a las 11:00 AM, hora del Pacifico, el 18 Marzo de 2026. Puedes unirse a la llamada 5 minutos antes del comienzo de la junta.

Marque: 888-978-8818 y ingrese el codigo  
Codigo de acceso en ingles: 5647249#  
Codigo de acceso en espanol: 7292892#

***Los comentarios del público se tomaran cuando se toma cada tema. Para dar un comentario público sobre una tema ingrese # 2 (Tecla de numero y dos) cuando se le solicite. Tenga en cuenta que la transmisión de video en vivo se retrasa unos 30 segundos con respecto a la reunión real. No hay retraso en la línea de acceso telefónico para comentarios públicos.***

### **Written Public Comment Instruction:**

Written public comments must be received by 5PM the day before the meeting.

Please include the Item # in your comment and your position of "FOR," "AGAINST," "GENERAL COMMENT," or "ITEM NEEDS MORE CONSIDERATION."

Email: BoardClerk@metro.net

Post Office Mail:

Board Administration

One Gateway Plaza

MS: 99-3-1

Los Angeles, CA 90012

## CALL TO ORDER

## ROLL CALL

APPROVE Consent Calendar Items: 5 and 6.

Consent Calendar items are approved by one motion unless held by a Director for discussion and/or separate action.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

5. **SUBJECT: ADOPT THE 2027 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY** [2026-0026](#)

### RECOMMENDATION

ADOPT the resolution for the 2027 Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement (TIP) Program as shown in Attachment A.

Attachments: [Attachment A - Resolution for the 2027 Los Angeles County TIP Presentation](#)

6. **SUBJECT: FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5310 GRANT PROGRAM AWARDS** [2026-0015](#)

### RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

- A. APPROVING Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 funding awards totaling \$10,752,739, as shown in Attachments A, B, and C, made available to Metro through the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program;
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to negotiate and execute pass-through funding agreements with the subrecipient agencies receiving the approved awards;
- C. DELEGATING to the CEO or their designee authority to administratively approve minor changes to the scope of approved Section 5310 awards;
- D. CERTIFYING that the Section 5310 funds are fairly and equitably allocated to eligible subrecipients and, where feasible, that projects are coordinated with transportation services assisted by other federal departments and agencies; and
- E. CERTIFYING that the Section 5310 projects selected for funding are

---

included in the Board-adopted 2025-2028 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan), in compliance with federal requirements.

**Attachments:**      [Attachment A - Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim Urbanized Area](#)  
[Attachment B - Lancaster-Palmdale Urbanized Area](#)  
[Attachment C - Santa Clarita Urbanized Area](#)  
[Attachment D - Evaluation Criteria](#)  
[Presentation](#)

## NON-CONSENT

7.    **SUBJECT:    K LINE NORTHERN EXTENSION (KNE) - LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (LPA)**      [2025-0846](#)

### **RECOMMENDATION**

APPROVE the San Vicente-Fairfax alignment evaluated in the 2024 Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the K Line Northern Extension (KNE) Project contingent upon the formation of an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) by the City of West Hollywood in coordination with Los Angeles County to provide additional local sources of funding (at least 25% of the capital cost estimate) per the Early Project Delivery Strategy with:

- A. an initial operating segment (IOS) from the Expo/Crenshaw Station at the E/K Line to Wilshire/Fairfax at the D Line;
- B. an adjusted tunnel alignment in Mid-City to continue to maximize use of public rights-of-way (ROW) to reduce subsurface easements, described as Crenshaw ROW: Option 2 in the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis Report (2025);
- C. a commitment to work with the owner of the Midtown Crossing Shopping Center to preserve the opportunity to relocate the supermarket at an alternate location on acquired property adjacent to the construction site, prior to the start of construction; and
- D. a terminus station at the Hollywood Bowl.

**Attachments:**      [Attachment A - Summary of Draft EIR Comments](#)  
[Attachment B - Summary of 2025 Community Engagement](#)  
[Attachment C - Metro Cost Benefit Analysis](#)  
[Attachment D - Map of Staff Recommendation for LPA](#)  
[Presentation](#)

**SUBJECT: GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

[2026-0193](#)

RECEIVE General Public Comment

Consideration of items not on the posted agenda, including: items to be presented and (if requested) referred to staff; items to be placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Committee or Board; and/or items requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Committee subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS OF PUBLIC INTEREST WITHIN COMMITTEE'S  
SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

**Adjournment**



## Board Report

File #: 2026-0026, File Type: Formula Allocation / Local Return

Agenda Number: 5.

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE MARCH 18, 2026

**SUBJECT: ADOPT THE 2027 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY**

**ACTION: ADOPT THE RECOMMENDATION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

ADOPT the resolution for the 2027 Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement (TIP) Program as shown in Attachment A.

#### **ISSUE**

As the designated County Transportation Commission for Los Angeles County, Metro is required every two years to submit a Metro Board adopted resolution to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) certifying that Los Angeles County has the resources to fund and is committed to implementing the projects included in the 2027 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) for Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2026/27 - 2031/32. Inclusion of projects in the FTIP is required for the allocation of federal funds, state and regional funds (as applicable), and for specific federal actions (including federal environmental clearance).

#### **BACKGROUND**

As the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the six-county region that includes Los Angeles County, SCAG is required, under federal and state law, to develop the FTIP. The FTIP is a six-year document that lists projects to be funded with federal, state, and local funds. The FTIP is required to advance the planning and construction of projects included in SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). This is achieved through the systematic programming of funds for RTP/SCS projects in accordance with federal and state requirements, including scheduling, financing, and the timely implementation of transportation control measures to help reduce air pollution. The Board is required to approve a resolution certifying that funds are committed to support Los Angeles County projects in the FTIP Adoption. NOTE: Board approval of the individual projects is not required as part of this action, as all the projects have been previously approved through other actions, such as Board approval for Metro projects, State approval for Active Transportation Program (ATP) projects, projects included in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), federal earmarks, and the SCAG Call for Projects.

## **DISCUSSION**

Projects from each of SCAG's six counties are included in their respective TIPs and then submitted to SCAG for inclusion in the FTIP. In California, the FTIP is updated every two years to comply with both state and federal requirements. SCAG's 2025 FTIP, which programs funds for FFY 2024/25 - 2029/30, was approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on December 16, 2024. SCAG is scheduled to adopt the 2027 FTIP in December 2026. A joint air quality conformity determination from the FHWA and the FTA is required for the approval of SCAG's 2027 FTIP and is also anticipated in December 2026. The 2027 Los Angeles County TIP includes nearly 995 projects valued at approximately \$33 billion for about 100 agencies. All the projects in the 2027 FTIP support both Metro's adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) as well as the local agencies' plans.

For the 2027 FTIP Adoption, Metro hosted several virtual workshops with local agencies to inform agency staff about the adoption schedule and the process for updating existing projects or adding new projects to the FTIP. Workshops occurred on September 8 and 15, 2025. All agencies that could potentially have federal funding programmed in the 2025 FTIP were invited. Metro also provided a step-by-step guide to support agencies through the adoption process. Metro submitted the list of Metro Board approved projects and projects from Los Angeles County agencies as part of the 2027 FTIP Adoption to SCAG on January 6, 2026. SCAG is currently reviewing these projects. After all technical comments are addressed, SCAG will post the projects on its website for public comment from July 9 to August 7, 2026.

## **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

Adoption of the resolution will have no direct impact on the safety of Metro customers or employees. The Los Angeles County TIP will allow Metro and other project sponsors to program and receive funding, enabling the timely realization of the projects' anticipated safety benefits.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Adoption of the resolution will allow Metro to program and secure federal, state, and regional funds for projects in Los Angeles County.

### Impact to Budget

Adoption of the resolution for the 2027 Los Angeles County TIP has no impact on the FY 2026 Budget.

## **EQUITY PLATFORM**

The 2027 FTIP incorporates multiple layers of accountability to ensure that disadvantaged communities are not left behind in transportation improvement projects. Many of Metro's projects in the FTIP are guided by the Equity Platform's four pillars for planning and implementing projects in

---

disadvantaged areas of Los Angeles County. In addition, Metro is collaborating with SCAG to further integrate the MPO's Racial Equity Early Action Plan, adopted in July 2020 by its Regional Council, into the FTIP for local agencies' projects.

Similar to the most recent adopted 2025 FTIP cycle, SCAG is implementing justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion considerations into the 2027 FTIP by working with County Transportation Commissions, including Metro, to incorporate new equity input. These considerations will assess how and where investments are being made across the region and address equity issues within transportation improvements in Environmental Justice areas, Disadvantaged Communities, Priority Equity Communities, and/or Communities of Concern.

### **VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED OUTCOME**

VMT and VMT per capita in Los Angeles County are lower than national averages, the lowest in the SCAG region, and on the lower end of VMT per capita statewide, with these declining VMT trends due in part to Metro's significant investment in rail and bus transit.\* Metro's Board-adopted VMT reduction targets align with California's statewide climate goals, including achieving carbon neutrality by 2045. To ensure continued progress, all Board items are assessed for their potential impact on VMT.

While the agency remains committed to reducing VMT through transit and multimodal investments, some projects may induce or increase personal vehicle travel. However, these individual projects aim to ensure the efficient and safe movement of people and goods. Although the highway project improvements included in the FTIP may not directly contribute to achieving the Board-adopted VMT Reduction Targets, the VMT Targets were developed to account for the cumulative effect of a suite of programs and projects within the Metro region, which, individually, may induce or increase VMT. Additionally, Metro has a voter-approved mandate to deliver multimodal projects that enhance mobility while ensuring the efficient and safe movement of people and goods. As part of these ongoing efforts, this item is expected to contribute to further reductions in VMT.

This item supports Metro's systemwide strategy to reduce VMT by providing funding to enhance transit systems and to support various multimodal plans, programs, and infrastructure improvements throughout the region. These investment activities will benefit and further encourage transit ridership, ridesharing, and active transportation. Metro's Board-adopted VMT reduction targets were designed to build on the success of existing investments, and this item aligns with those objectives.

\*Based on population estimates from the United States Census and VMT estimates from Caltrans' Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data between 2001-2019.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

Approval of these recommendations will support the following Strategic Plan Goals:

Goal 3: Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity by securing funding that will conduct planning, create and enhance programs, and build infrastructure that accelerates infill development that facilitates housing supply, choice, and affordability, affirmatively further fair housing, and reduce VMT.

Goal 4: Transform LA County through regional collaboration and national leadership by facilitating partnerships to deliver transportation projects with significant geographic or regionwide benefits.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board could elect not to adopt the resolution shown in Attachment A. Staff does not recommend this alternative. By not adopting the resolution, the Los Angeles County TIP will not be included in SCAG's 2027 FTIP. Therefore, Metro and other agencies in Los Angeles County will not be able to program and receive federal, state, and regional funding allocations for their projects. This may jeopardize the timely implementation of projects in Los Angeles County that have funds programmed through FFY 2031/32. It may also result in the loss of funding allocations due to federal and state lapsing and/or project inactivity policies, as well as in the ineligibility for future funding allocations.

### **NEXT STEPS**


With Board approval of our recommendation, staff will submit the resolution to SCAG by the March 31, 2026, deadline.

### **ATTACHMENT**

Attachment A      Resolution for the 2027 Los Angeles County TIP

Prepared by:      Michael Richmai, Senior Manager, (213) 922-2558  
Nancy Marroquin, Senior Director, (213) 418-3086  
Mark Yamarone, Executive Officer, (213) 418-3452  
Laurie Lombardi, Senior Executive Officer, (213) 418-3251  
Nicole Ferrara, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, (213) 547-4322

Reviewed by:      Ray Sosa, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 547-4274



Stephanie Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer



**A RESOLUTION OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (LACMTA) WHICH CERTIFIES THAT LOS  
ANGELES COUNTY HAS THE RESOURCES TO FUND THE PROJECTS IN THE  
FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2026/27 – 2031/32 TRANSPORTATION  
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND AFFIRMS ITS COMMITMENT TO IMPLEMENT  
ALL PROJECTS IN THE PROGRAM**

**WHEREAS**, Los Angeles County is located within the metropolitan planning boundaries of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG); and

**WHEREAS**, the Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act (IIJA) requires SCAG to adopt a regional transportation improvement program for the metropolitan planning area; and

**WHEREAS**, the IIJA also requires that the regional transportation improvement program include a financial plan that demonstrates how the transportation improvement program can be implemented, indicates resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation improvement program, and recommends any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs; and

**WHEREAS**, LACMTA is the agency responsible for short-range capital and service planning and programming for the Los Angeles County area within SCAG; and

**WHEREAS**, as the responsible agency for short-range transportation planning, LACMTA is responsible for the development of the Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), including all projects utilizing federal and state highway/road and transit funds; and

**WHEREAS**, LACMTA must determine, on an annual basis, the total amount of funds that could be available for transportation projects within its boundaries; and

**WHEREAS**, LACMTA has adopted the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2026/27 - 2031/32 Los Angeles County TIP with funding for FFY 2026/27 and FFY 2027/28 available and committed, and reasonably committed for FFY 2028/29 through FFY 2029/30.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by LACMTA that it affirms its continuing commitment to the projects in the FFY 2026/27 - 2031/32 Los Angeles County TIP; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the FFY 2026/27 - 2031/32 Los Angeles County TIP Financial Plan identifies the resources that are available and committed in

the first two years and reasonably available to carry out the Program in the last four years, and certifies that:

1. Projects in the FY2026/27 - 2031/32 Los Angeles County TIP are consistent with the 2026 State Transportation Improvement Program scheduled to be approved by the California Transportation Commission in March 2026; and
2. The local match for projects funded with federal STBG Program and CMAQ Program funds is identified in the Los Angeles County TIP; and
3. All the Federal Transit Administration-funded projects are programmed within the IIJA Guaranteed Funding levels.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_.

CERTIFICATION

\_\_\_\_\_  
COLLETTE LANGSTON  
LACMTA Board Clerk

DATED:  
(SEAL)

The background features a large, stylized graphic of the letters 'M' and 'A' in a light beige color, set against a dark green circular backdrop. This is further framed by a large, curved orange shape that sweeps across the middle of the page. The overall design is modern and professional.

# 2027 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Adoption

Planning and Programming Committee

March 18, 2026

File No. 2026-0026



**Metro**

## Recommendation

**ADOPT** the resolution for the 2027 Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement Program as shown in Attachment A.

# Background

- SCAG, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the six-county region that includes Los Angeles County, is required under federal and state law to develop the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) every two years
- The 2027 FTIP is a required six-year programming document that advances the planning and construction of projects funded with federal, state, and local funds



# Background

- The 2027 FTIP covers the period from Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 27 to FFY32, with nearly 995 projects in Los Angeles County totaling \$33 billion for about 100 agencies
- Adopting the Resolution for the 2027 FTIP would allow agencies in Los Angeles County to program and receive funding allocations for the on-time delivery of projects

## Next Steps

- Upon Board approval of the recommendation, staff will submit the resolution to SCAG by the March 31, 2026, deadline.



## Board Report

File #: 2026-0015, File Type: Program

Agenda Number: 6.

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE MARCH 18, 2026

**SUBJECT: FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5310 GRANT PROGRAM AWARDS**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

- A. APPROVING Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 funding awards totaling \$10,752,739, as shown in Attachments A, B, and C, made available to Metro through the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program;
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to negotiate and execute pass-through funding agreements with the subrecipient agencies receiving the approved awards;
- C. DELEGATING to the CEO or their designee authority to administratively approve minor changes to the scope of approved Section 5310 awards;
- D. CERTIFYING that the Section 5310 funds are fairly and equitably allocated to eligible subrecipients and, where feasible, that projects are coordinated with transportation services assisted by other federal departments and agencies; and
- E. CERTIFYING that the Section 5310 projects selected for funding are included in the Board-adopted 2025-2028 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan), in compliance with federal requirements.

#### **ISSUE**

The FTA apportions Section 5310 formula funding to Urbanized Areas (UZAs) as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. As the Designated Recipient for the UZAs within Los Angeles County, Metro is responsible for administering these funds.

Following [Board adoption of the 2025-2028 Coordinated Plan](https://metro.legistar.com/Board%20adoption%20of%20the%202025-2028%20Coordinated%20Plan) <https://metro.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7479858&GUID=2C9B6E2A-9CC0-406E-A545-4189393476F8&Options=ID%7cText%7c&Search=2025-0475> and [authorization to release the](#)

---

[Section 5310 solicitation <https://metro.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7660409&GUID=4AF34985-B57C-41B6-A2D9-2798033FF217&Options=ID|Text|&Search=2025-0610>](https://metro.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7660409&GUID=4AF34985-B57C-41B6-A2D9-2798033FF217&Options=ID|Text|&Search=2025-0610), Metro conducted a competitive solicitation for the 2025 funding cycle. This report seeks Board approval of the funding awards resulting from the solicitation, as detailed in Attachments A, B, and C.

## **BACKGROUND**

The Section 5310 program is intended to enhance mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities by reducing transportation barriers and expanding access to specialized transportation services. In California, the Governor designates a public entity to serve as the recipient of federal transportation formula funds. For Los Angeles County, Metro serves as the Designated Recipient for FTA Section 5310 funds apportioned to the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, Lancaster-Palmdale, and Santa Clarita UZAs.

Funds apportioned to the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim UZA are shared among Metro, the Orange County Transportation Authority, and Omnitrans, with each agency administering its respective service area. This UZA spans portions of Los Angeles County, Orange County, and a small area of San Bernardino County, with funds allocated based on the eligible population within each jurisdiction's service area.

Every two to three years, Metro programs available Section 5310 funds through a combination of a competitive solicitation for eligible subrecipients, a formula-based allocation to Access Services, and funding for Metro's program administration. The Metro Board reaffirmed this approach in 2025 by allocating Section 5310 funds to Access Services and approving the solicitation that informed these funding award recommendations.

As the Designated Recipient, Metro is responsible for the planning, programming, distribution, management, and oversight of these funds in accordance with federal requirements.

## **DISCUSSION**

The FTA Section 5310 program provides capital and operating assistance to support public transportation projects that; a) are planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of seniors (age 65 and older) and individuals with disabilities when public transportation is insufficient, inappropriate, or unavailable; b) exceed the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990; c) improve access to fixed route service and decrease reliance on ADA-complementary paratransit, and d) provide alternatives to public transportation projects for seniors and individuals with disabilities.

Per federal requirements, all projects funded through this solicitation are required to align with the priorities identified in the 2025-2028 Coordinated Plan, as adopted by the Metro Board in July 2025.

Section 5310 funds may be used for traditional capital, other capital, and operating projects. Eligible applicants include: (1) private nonprofit organizations recognized under 26 U.S.C. 501(c) and exempt from taxation under 26 U.S.C. 501(a) or recognized as a nonprofit under State law with proper documentation; (2) state or local governmental authorities; and (3) operators of public transportation.

### Funding Availability

Metro made a total of \$10,752,739 in Section 5310 funds available through the competitive solicitation released on September 26, 2025. This amount consists of Federal Fiscal Years 2024 and 2025 Section 5310 apportionments authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 117-58).

Of this total, \$10,218,282 was allocated to the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim UZA for a total of 22 awards out of 42 applications, \$311,667 to the Lancaster-Palmdale UZA for the one application received, and \$222,790 to the Santa Clarita UZA for the one application received.

### Competitive Application Process

As the Designated Recipient, Metro allocates Section 5310 funds fairly and equitably to projects that demonstrate the greatest mobility need and potential benefit. This approach ensures effective use of federal funds and compliance with FTA requirements.

On September 26, 2025, Metro released the Board-approved 2025 Section 5310 Solicitation for Proposals. Applications were due on November 14, 2025. Eligible applicants were permitted to submit one or more applications across eligible funding categories, subject to a maximum request of \$800,000 per applicant.

Applications were evaluated, scored, and ranked based on consistency with Section 5310 program eligibility, the priorities in the Board-adopted Coordinated Plan, and the evaluation criteria outlined in the solicitation, including projects within Metro's Equity Focus Communities.

### Solicitation Outreach

Metro implemented a robust outreach and engagement strategy to promote awareness of the funding opportunity and encourage broad participation throughout Los Angeles County. Outreach efforts built upon engagement conducted during development of the Coordinated Plan and included email notifications to more than 5,700 stakeholders, website postings, and targeted outreach to nonprofit organizations serving seniors and individuals with disabilities.

Solicitation notices were also shared with all Los Angeles County Councils of Governments and presented to Metro advisory subcommittees, including the Bus Operations Subcommittee, Local Transit Systems Subcommittee, Accessibility Advisory Committee, Aging and Disability Transportation Network, and Streets & Freeways Subcommittee. In addition, 11 community-based organizations that participated in the Coordinated Plan process assisted in publicizing the opportunity through their networks.

Metro also hosted a potential applicant webinar on October 7, 2025, attended by more than 56 participants representing all five Los Angeles County Supervisorial Districts. This webinar provided an overview of eligibility requirements, the application process, post-award compliance expectations, and an opportunity for questions.

### Evaluation of Proposals

Metro received 42 applications requesting more than \$19.6 million in federal funding. Applications were evaluated by a panel of internal and external reviewers using the Board-approved evaluation criteria included in Attachment D.

Project rankings were established based on the average scores assigned by panel members. Funding awards were made based on the applicants' requested amounts, not to exceed \$800,000 per applicant, and allocated to projects ranked from highest to lowest until funds were committed. A minimum score of 70 points was required for a project to be considered eligible for funding. Final project rankings are presented in Attachments A, B, and C.

### Preliminary Funding Recommendations and TAC Appeals

On January 9, 2026, Metro issued preliminary funding recommendations representing approximately 95 percent of the available Section 5310 funds. The remaining \$510,914 was reserved for the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) appeals process.

On February 4, 2026, TAC heard appeal presentations from the Pomona Valley Transportation Authority, ARC Los Angeles & Orange Counties, and the City of Glendale. These eligible applicants met the minimum score threshold but were not initially recommended for funding due to funding constraints. Following the appeal presentations, TAC approved a motion recommending that the Pomona Valley Transportation Authority receive set-aside funds to support two years of its proposed operating project, compared to the three years requested, and that the remaining set-aside amount be split evenly between ARC Los Angeles & Orange Counties and the City of Glendale to support a portion of their requested replacement vehicles. Metro staff incorporated TAC's recommendations into the final funding determinations.

The recommended funding awards presented in Attachments A, B, and C reflect the results of the competitive solicitation and TAC appeals process. The recommended awards collectively represent all five Los Angeles County Supervisorial Districts, providing broad geographic coverage and countywide benefits.

### Administrative Scope Changes

Grant subrecipients may request re-scoping of their project(s) from what is approved by the Board. The proposed recommendation will delegate to the CEO or their designee authority to administratively approve minor changes to the scope of work. Minor changes include those that meet all of the following criteria: 1) The scope change is consistent with defined project limits approved by the Board; 2) the scope of work, as modified, continues to meet the original intent of the approved project scope; 3) if the scope change results in a reduced total project cost, the new total project cost shall be within 20% of the original total project cost; and 4) the parties shall maintain the original grant-to-grantee funding commitment ratio (for example, if the grantee originally committed 20% of the total project cost, with the remaining 80% comprised of Section 5310 funds, those percentages shall apply to the new total project cost).

## **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

Approval of the recommendation will have no impact on the safety of Metro's customers and employees.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

There is no financial impact to Metro for FY 2026. As these are multi-year projects, the Cost Center Manager for 0441 (Subsidies to Others) and the Chief Planning Officer will be responsible for including the necessary budget in future years. The Section 5310 funds must be obligated by the end of FY 2026 to avoid lapsing. Project number 500005.

### Impact to Budget

All recommended actions will be fully funded by FTA Section 5310 program funds and awardee local match funds. No other Metro funds will be required. Section 5310 funds are not eligible for Metro's bus and rail operating and capital expenditures.

## **EQUITY PLATFORM**

The 2025 Section 5310 Competitive Solicitation process and resulting funding awards aligned with and advanced Metro's Equity Platform through the application of three core pillars: Define and Measure, Listen and Learn, and Focus and Deliver. The planning, outreach, evaluation, and award determination for this funding opportunity demonstrated Metro's continued commitment to equitable access to mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities.

In alignment with Define and Measure, the Section 5310 program incorporated equity-based analyses into the solicitation and evaluation process, including ZIP Code-level demographic mapping and the prioritization of designated Equity Focus Communities (EFCs), to identify areas with the greatest unmet transportation needs. These areas include low-income neighborhoods and communities of color with high concentrations of seniors and individuals with disabilities. The application evaluation criteria explicitly rewarded projects proposing continued, new, enhanced, or expanded services in EFCs, reinforcing Metro's commitment to communities with the greatest need.

Consistent with Listen and Learn, outreach for the funding opportunity built upon extensive community engagement conducted during the development of the 2025-2028 Coordinated Plan. Metro conducted targeted outreach through multiple channels, including email notifications to more than 5,700 active stakeholders, postings on the Section 5310 page of Metro's website, and direct outreach to nonprofit organizations that serve seniors and individuals with disabilities. The solicitation was also shared with Metro advisory subcommittees, Los Angeles County Councils of Governments, and 11 community-based organizations that supported public engagement during the Coordinated Plan process. These organizations, which serve a broad range of equity priority populations and geographic areas, helped expand awareness of the funding opportunity and encourage broad participation.

---

Through Focus and Deliver, the Section 5310 solicitation applied a prioritized project framework that directed funding toward services with the greatest potential to close mobility gaps for seniors and individuals with disabilities. Evaluation criteria emphasized projects that improved geographic coverage, service quality, and access to opportunities, particularly in underserved communities. By funding projects that aligned with community-identified priorities in the Board-adopted Coordinated Plan, Metro advanced its goal of reducing transportation disparities and improving quality of life in underserved areas.

### **VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED OUTCOME**

VMT and VMT per capita in Los Angeles County are lower than national averages, the lowest in the SCAG region, and on the lower end of VMT per capita statewide, with these declining VMT trends due in part to Metro's significant investment in rail and bus transit.\* Metro's Board-adopted VMT reduction targets align with California's statewide climate goals, including achieving carbon neutrality by 2045. To ensure continued progress, all Board items are assessed for their potential impact on VMT.

While the agency remains committed to reducing VMT through transit and multimodal investments, some projects may induce or increase personal vehicle travel. However, these individual projects aim to ensure the efficient and safe movement of people, goods, and communities with unique transportation needs

This Board item will likely increase VMT in Los Angeles County, as it includes funding awards for projects that implement new, enhanced, and expanded on-demand, door-to-door, and other demand-responsive transportation services for seniors and individuals with disabilities. These specialized transportation services often involve individualized routing and vehicle trips that may increase VMT. However, they provide critical mobility for populations who are not effectively served by fixed-route transit and fill essential transportation gaps. These services are vital for enhancing mobility, safety, and independence among some of the County's most underserved residents.

Although this item may not directly contribute to the achievement of the Board-adopted VMT Reduction Targets, the VMT Targets were developed to account for the cumulative effect of a suite of programs and projects within the Metro region, which individually may induce or increase VMT. Additionally, Metro has a voter-approved mandate to deliver multimodal projects that enhance mobility while ensuring the efficient and safe movement of people and goods. The FTA Section 5310 program reflects Metro's responsibility to deliver projects and programs that balance the goal of reducing VMT with the necessity to provide transportation options that effectively serve all Los Angeles County residents.

\*Based on population estimates from the United States Census and VMT estimates from Caltrans' Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data between 2001-2019.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The recommendation supports the following goals of the Vision 2028 Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling; and

Goal 3: Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board could choose not to approve of some or all of the recommended actions. However, this alternative is not recommended. Failure to approve and allocate the proposed Section 5310 funds would jeopardize specialized transportation services for seniors and individuals with disabilities. It would also place Metro in non-compliance with federal transit law under the FTA Section 5310 Program, and prevent the agency from fulfilling its responsibilities as the Designated Recipient of Section 5310 funds. As a result, Metro could become ineligible to receive future Section 5310 funding. Additionally, the agency risks forfeiting currently available funds, due to lapsing, if they are not obligated on time.

### **NEXT STEPS**


Upon Board approval, Metro will submit a Section 5310 grant application to the FTA on behalf of all approved projects. Following FTA approval, Metro will execute pass-through funding agreements and oversee project implementation to ensure Section 5310 program consistency and federal compliance.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim Urbanized Area  
Attachment B - Lancaster-Palmdale Urbanized Area  
Attachment C - Santa Clarita Urbanized Area  
Attachment D - Evaluation Criteria

Prepared by: Ruben Cervantes, Senior Manager, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 547-4323  
Dustin Sifford, Principal Transportation Planner, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-4817  
Anne Flores, Senior Director, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922- 4894  
Isidro Panuco, Deputy Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 547-4372  
Fanny Pan, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418- 3433  
Laurie Lombardi, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3251  
Nicole Ferrara, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, (213) 547-4322

Reviewed by: Ray Sosa, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 547-4274



Stephanie Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer

**FTA SECTION 5310 PROGRAM**  
LOS ANGELES/LONG BEACH/ANAHEIM  
URBANIZED AREA

Rank	Applicant	Projects Recommended for Funding Award	Vehicles	Project Cost	Local Match	Recommended Award
1	City of Pasadena	<b>Pasadena Mobility Management Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Implement Pasadena Mobility Management Project for Three (3) Years.	0	\$638,633	\$63,864	\$574,769
2	City of San Fernando	<b>Truman Street Mobility Enhancement Project:</b> Other Capital Assistance to Enhance Physical Infrastructure on Truman Street to Improve Access to Bus Stops and Routes.	0	\$889,000	\$89,000	\$800,000
3	Braille Institute of America, Inc.	<b>Braille Institute Travel Training Project:</b> Operating Assistance to Implement a Disability-Focused Travel Training Program for Two (2) Years.	0	\$650,000	\$162,500	\$487,500
4	AltaMed Health Services Corporation	<b>AltaMed Vehicle Replacement and Expansion Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Two (2) Class B Buses for Replacement and Four (4) Class B Buses for Expansion.	6	\$840,000	\$84,000	\$756,000
5	City of Santa Monica Big Blue Bus	<b>Mobility on Demand Every Day (MODE) Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue Operating the On-Demand MODE Program for Two (2) Years with Expanded Service Hours.	0	\$281,490	\$70,490	\$211,000
6	City of Downey	<b>Downey Accessible Doors Project:</b> Other Capital Assistance to Purchase and Install Two (2) Automatic Opening Doors to Improve Access to Fixed Route and Dial-A-Ride Services.	0	\$28,500	\$2,850	\$25,650
7	Los Angeles Jewish Health	<b>LAJH Vehicle Expansion Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Three (3) Class B Buses for Expansion.	3	\$461,574	\$46,156	\$415,418
8	City of El Monte	<b>El Monte Vehicle Replacement Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Two (2) Class B Buses and Three (3) Class P Vans for Replacement.	5	\$990,000	\$190,000	\$800,000
9	City of Whittier	<b>Whittier Vehicle Replacement Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Five (5) Class C Buses and One (1) Class D Van for Replacement.	6	\$850,000	\$85,000	\$765,000
10	Haynes Family of Programs	<b>Haynes Family of Programs Vehicle Replacement:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Two (2) Class V Vans for Replacement.	2	\$220,000	\$22,000	\$198,000
11	Valley Village	<b>Valley Village Vehicle Replacement and Expansion Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase One (1) Class D Van for Replacement and Two (2) Class D Vans and One (1) Class V Van for Expansion.	4	\$566,000	\$56,600	\$509,400
12	Los Angeles County Aging & Disability Department (LACAD) <sup>1</sup>	<b>New Freedom Transportation Operations:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue the Volunteer Driver Mileage Reimbursement Program and Taxicab Services Program for up to Two (2) Years.	0	\$354,391	\$88,848	\$265,543
13	PIH Health Foundation	<b>Good Samaritan Hospital Transportation Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue the Good Samaritan Hospital Transportation Program for Three (3) Years.	0	\$647,568	\$247,568	\$400,000
14	PIH Health Foundation	<b>Whittier-Downey Hospital Transportation Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue the Whittier-Downey Hospital Transportation Program for Two (2) Years.	0	\$784,128	\$384,128	\$400,000
15	City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)	<b>LADOT Vehicle Replacement Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Six (6) Class Z-1 Electric Vans for Replacement.	6	\$889,000	\$89,000	\$800,000
16	Community Partners	<b>Move LA Travel Training Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Implement a Travel Training Program for Individuals with Disabilities for Two (2) Years.	0	\$500,000	\$125,000	\$375,000

**FTA SECTION 5310 PROGRAM**  
**LOS ANGELES/LONG BEACH/ANAHEIM**  
**URBANIZED AREA**

17	Institute for the Redesign of Learning	<b>IRL Vehicle Replacement Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Five (5) Class A Buses for Replacement.	5	\$700,000	\$70,000	<b>\$630,000</b>
18	City of Pasadena	<b>Pasadena Mystery Rider Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Implement a Pasadena Mystery Rider Program for Two (2) Years to Improve Fixed-Route and Dial-A-Ride Services for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities.	0	\$160,000	\$40,000	<b>\$120,000</b>
19	Villa Esperanza Services	<b>Villa Esperanza Vehicle Replacement Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Three (3) Class A Buses and One (1) Class C Bus for Replacement.	4	\$570,000	\$57,000	<b>\$513,000</b>
20	New Horizons	<b>New Horizons Vehicle Expansion Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Four (4) Class D Vans for Expansion.	4	\$400,000	\$40,000	<b>\$360,000</b>
21	Los Angeles Jewish Health	<b>LAJH Transportation Operations Expansion Project:</b> Operating Assistance to support Three (3) Drivers to Operate New Expansion Buses for Two (2) Years.	0	\$311,503	\$31,150	<b>\$280,353</b>
22	Pomona Valley Transportation Authority	<b>PVTA Travel Training Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue a Travel Training Program for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities in the Pomona Valley for Two (2) Years.	0	\$246,275	\$61,569	<b>\$184,706</b>
23	The ARC Los Angeles & Orange Counties	<b>ARC Vehicle Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Two (2) Class D/V Vans for Replacement.	2	\$192,747	\$19,275	<b>\$173,472</b>
24	City of Glendale	<b>Glendale Vehicle Replacement Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase One (1) Class G Bus for Replacement.	1	\$192,747	\$19,275	<b>\$173,472</b>
<b>Totals</b>			<b>48</b>	<b>\$12,363,556</b>	<b>\$2,145,273</b>	<b>\$10,218,282</b>

<sup>1</sup> Supported by multiple Urbanized Area funding sources

Rank	Applicant	Projects <u>Not Recommended</u> for Funding Award	Vehicles	Project Cost	Local Match	Requested Award
25	Momentum Agencies	<b>Momentum Vehicle Replacement Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Five (5) Class B Buses for Replacement.	5	\$700,000	\$80,000	\$620,000
26	Valley Village	<b>Valley Village Mobility Management Program:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Enhance the Mobility Management Program for Two (2) Years.	0	\$120,000	\$24,000	\$96,000
27	San Fernando Valley InterCommunity Council	<b>SFVIC Vehicle Replacement Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Five (5) Class C Buses for Replacement.	5	\$1,570,992	\$820,992	\$750,000
28	Therapeutic Living Centers for the Blind	<b>TLC Vehicle Replacement and Expansion Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Two (2) Class D and Four (4) Class V Vans for Replacement and One (1) Class D Van for Expansion.	7	\$740,000	\$74,000	\$666,000
29	Torrance Transit Systems	<b>Connect Torrance Microtransit:</b> Operating Assistance to Support On-Demand Microtransit in Torrance for Two (2) Years.	0	\$1,000,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
30	Pomona Valley Transportation Authority	<b>PVTA Ready Now Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue the Ready Now Transportation Program for Three (3) Years.	0	\$990,000	\$490,000	\$500,000

**FTA SECTION 5310 PROGRAM**  
**LOS ANGELES/LONG BEACH/ANAHEIM**  
**URBANIZED AREA**

31	City of Monrovia	<b>GoMonrovia Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue GoMonrovia Program for Two (2) Years.	0	\$800,000	\$200,000	\$600,000
32	Disabled Resources Center, Inc.	<b>DRC Travel Training Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue a Travel Training Program for Three (3) Years.	0	\$525,738	\$131,435	\$394,303
33	New Horizons	<b>New Horizons Transportation Operations Expansion Project:</b> Operating Assistance to Support New Expansion Vans for Three (3) Years.	0	\$742,392	\$342,392	\$400,000
34	Junie's House Nonprofit	<b>Junie's House Vehicle Expansion Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Three (3) Class V Vans for Expansion.	3	\$344,500	\$34,450	\$310,050
35	City of Malibu	<b>Malibu Dial-A-Ride Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Support the City's Dial-A-Ride Program for Two (2) Years.	0	\$866,667	\$216,667	\$650,000
36	Mass Liberation	<b>Mass Liberation Vehicle Expansion Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase One (1) Class C Bus for Expansion.	1	\$150,000	\$15,000	\$135,000
37	AgingNext, Inc.	<b>AgingNext Mobility Management Program:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Continue a Mobility Management Program for Three (3) Years.	0	\$624,700	\$156,175	\$468,525
38	AgingNext, Inc.	<b>AgingNext Volunteer Driver Program:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue a Volunteer Driver Program for Three (3) Years.	0	\$441,966	\$110,491	\$331,474
39	YWCA Greater Los Angeles	<b>Empowered Journeys Transportation Operations Project:</b> Operating Assistance to Support New Expansion Vehicles for Two (2) Years.	0	\$570,140	\$140,714	\$429,426
40	Tarzana Treatment Center, Inc.	<b>TTC Youth Services Vehicle Expansion Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase (One) 1 Class V Van to Expand Youth Services Program.	1	\$110,000	\$11,000	\$99,000
41	YWCA Greater Los Angeles	<b>Empowered Journeys Vehicle Expansion Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase Four (4) Class D Vans for Expansion.	4	\$358,500	\$43,020	\$315,480
42	Tarzana Treatment Center, Inc.	<b>TTC Senior Services Vehicle Expansion Project:</b> Traditional Capital Assistance to Purchase (One) 1 Class D Van to Expand Program for Homeless Seniors.	1	\$100,000	\$10,000	\$90,000
<b>Totals</b>			<b>27</b>	<b>\$10,755,595</b>	<b>\$3,150,336</b>	<b>\$7,605,259</b>

**FTA SECTION 5310 PROGRAM**  
LANCASTER/PALMDALE  
URBANIZED AREA

Rank	Applicant	Projects <u>Recommended</u> for Funding Award	Vehicles	Project Cost	Local Match	Recommended Award
1	Los Angeles County Aging & Disability Department (LACAD) <sup>1</sup>	<b>New Freedom Transportation Operations:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue its Volunteer Driver Mileage Reimbursement Program and Taxicab Services Program for up to Two (2) Years.	0	\$415,556	\$103,889	\$ 311,667
<b>Totals</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>\$415,556</b>	<b>\$103,889</b>	<b>\$ 311,667</b>

<sup>1</sup> Supported by multiple Urbanized Area funding sources

# FTA SECTION 5310 PROGRAM

SANTA CLARITA  
URBANIZED AREA

Rank	Applicant	Projects <u>Recommended</u> for Funding Award	Vehicles	Project Cost	Local Match	Recommended Award
1	Los Angeles County Aging & Disability Department (LACAD) <sup>1</sup>	<b>New Freedom Transportation Operations:</b> Operating Assistance to Continue its Volunteer Driver Mileage Reimbursement Program and Taxicab Services Program for up to Two (2) Years.	0	\$297,054	\$74,264	\$222,790
<b>Totals</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>\$297,054</b>	<b>\$74,264</b>	<b>\$222,790</b>

<sup>1</sup> Supported by multiple Urbanized Area funding sources

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The following summarizes the project narrative application requirements and the corresponding maximum points possible for each section (100 points total).

### **A. Scope of Work, Need, Objectives, Coordination and Outreach (Up to 35 points)**

- Existing services and target populations served; description of transportation need; proposed scope of work including new, continued, enhanced, or expanded services; project objectives; alignment with Section 5310 program goals; project readiness, schedule, and use of requested funds; completion of required supporting forms and documentation, as applicable (30 points).
- Project development and/or implementation coordination with transportation providers, human services agencies, and other stakeholders to improve coordination and avoid duplication (3 points).
- Marketing, outreach, and public awareness strategies to promote the project and encourage participation (2 points).

### **B. Coordinated Plan and Equity Focus Communities (Up to 25 points)**

- Priority ranking of the proposed project based on the 2025 - 2028 Coordinated Plan prioritization table, including consideration of Designated Priority Areas and Equity Focus Communities, and proportional allocation across multiple priorities, if applicable (20 points).
- Demonstration of how the project addresses identified gaps and barriers and aligns with goals and strategies in the Plan, supported by qualitative and quantitative data (5 points).

### **C. Project Delivery Plan (Up to 20 points)**


- Project delivery approach, implementation schedule and milestones; experience providing transportation or human services; experience delivering federally funded projects; roles and qualifications of key personnel; and proposed procurement approach for third-party contracts, if applicable (10 points).
- Contingency planning to avoid service disruptions, including staffing, mechanical, and technical considerations, as well as driver training and fleet maintenance practices, as applicable (5 points).
- Experience managing federal and non-federal grants, including invoicing, reimbursement, reporting practices, and internal controls (5 points).

### **D. Performance Measures (Up to 10 points)**

- Identification of required quantitative and qualitative performance measures applicable to the project type, including methodology used to develop performance estimates (6 points).
- Use of performance measures to evaluate project effectiveness and strategies to mitigate underperformance (2 points).
- Tools and procedures to collect, track, and report project performance (2 points).

### **E. Budget and Project Readiness (Up to 10 points)**

- Completion of the Project Financial Plan; budget assumptions and cost basis; identification of all funding sources; eligibility and amount of requested Section 5310 funds; and documentation of required local cash or in-kind match (7 points).
- Demonstration that the proposed project schedule is realistic and allows for full project completion within the funding period (3 points).



# FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5310 PROGRAM AWARDS

Planning and Programming Committee

March 18, 2026



File# 2026-0015

# Approve Recommendation

## Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Program Awards

### Recommendation:

- A. APPROVING Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 funding awards totaling \$10,752,739, as shown in Attachments A, B, and C, made available to Metro through the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program;
- B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to negotiate and execute pass-through funding agreements with the subrecipient agencies receiving the approved awards;
- C. DELEGATING to the CEO or their designee authority to administratively approve minor changes to the scope of approved Section 5310 awards;
- D. CERTIFYING that the Section 5310 funds are fairly and equitably allocated to eligible subrecipients and, where feasible, that projects are coordinated with transportation services assisted by other federal departments and agencies; and
- E. CERTIFYING that the Section 5310 projects selected for funding are included in the Board-adopted 2025–2028 Coordinated Public Transit–Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan), in compliance with federal requirements



# FTA Section 5310 Background

- > Metro is LA County's Designated Recipient and Administrator of FTA Section 5310 funds for the Los Angeles–Long Beach–Anaheim, Lancaster–Palmdale, and Santa Clarita Urbanized Areas.
- > Section 5310 funds support capital and operating projects serving seniors and individuals with disabilities.
- > Following [Board adoption of the 2025–2028 Coordinated Plan](#) and [authorization to release the Section 5310 solicitation](#), Metro conducted a competitive solicitation for the 2025 funding cycle.
- > Board approval is required to proceed with funding awards identified in Attachments A, B, and C.
- > All recommended awards align with the Board-adopted Coordinated Plan to improve and expand mobility options for seniors and individuals with disabilities throughout LA County.



# Funding Availability and Outreach

- > \$10.75 million in Section 5310 funds are available through the 2025 competitive solicitation.
- > Funds were allocated by Urbanized Area: Los Angeles–Long Beach–Anaheim (\$10.22M), Lancaster–Palmdale (\$311,667), and Santa Clarita (\$222,790).
- > The Board-approved 2025 Section 5310 Solicitation was released on September 26, 2025, with applications due November 14, 2025 (up to \$800,000 per applicant).
- > Extensive countywide outreach efforts included:
  - Notifications to 5,700+ public and non-profit stakeholders
  - Distribution through the networks of 11 community-based organizations and all LA County Councils of Governments
  - An applicant webinar with 56 participants representing all five LA County Supervisorial Districts
  - Presentations to five Metro advisory subcommittees



# Evaluation and Preliminary Awards

- > 42 applications were received and evaluated, requesting \$19.6 million; projects scoring 70+ points are eligible.
- > 23 projects totaling \$10.75 million are recommended following the evaluation and Metro TAC appeals process.
- > Recommended awards support both public and nonprofit providers, including 10 governmental and 13 nonprofit projects.
- > 48 paratransit vehicles will be replaced or added through capital projects to improve service capacity and reliability.
- > 9 operating projects will support volunteer driver, on-demand, and door-to-door transportation services.
- > 4 mobility management and travel training projects will enhance trip planning, rider education, and independent mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities.
- > Recommended awards provide benefits throughout LA County and ensure geographic equity across all five LA County Supervisorial Districts



# Next Steps

- > Approve Staff Recommendations for Section 5310 Awards.
- > Submit a Section 5310 grant application to the FTA on behalf of all approved projects.
- > Execute pass-through funding agreements and oversee project implementation to ensure program consistency and federal compliance.





## Board Report

File #: 2025-0846, File Type: Project

Agenda Number: 7.

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE MARCH 18, 2026

**SUBJECT: K LINE NORTHERN EXTENSION (KNE) - LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (LPA)**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

APPROVE the San Vicente-Fairfax alignment evaluated in the 2024 Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the K Line Northern Extension (KNE) Project contingent upon the formation of an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) by the City of West Hollywood in coordination with Los Angeles County to provide additional local sources of funding (at least 25% of the capital cost estimate) per the Early Project Delivery Strategy with:

- A. an initial operating segment (IOS) from the Expo/Crenshaw Station at the E/K Line to Wilshire/Fairfax at the D Line;
- B. an adjusted tunnel alignment in Mid-City to continue to maximize use of public rights-of-way (ROW) to reduce subsurface easements, described as Crenshaw ROW: Option 2 in the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis Report (2025);
- C. a commitment to work with the owner of the Midtown Crossing Shopping Center to preserve the opportunity to relocate the supermarket at an alternate location on acquired property adjacent to the construction site, prior to the start of construction; and
- D. a terminus station at the Hollywood Bowl.

#### **ISSUE**

The KNE is a Measure M project with a groundbreaking date of FY2041 and project completion date in FY2047. Metro published a Draft EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the KNE Project that was released in July 2024. The preparation of the Draft EIR was authorized by the Board in [August 2020 <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2020-0174/>](https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2020-0174/) in accordance with Metro's [Early Project Delivery Guidelines <https://www.metro.net/about/early-project-delivery/>](https://www.metro.net/about/early-project-delivery/) to position the project for additional funding and/or financing opportunities for potential acceleration prior to 2041 when funds become available for construction per the Measure M Expenditure Plan. The Board action to approve a LPA is a necessary step in the planning process initiated under the

Early Project Delivery framework for future planning, funding, and coordination purposes, while acknowledging that further planning, design and construction remain subject to Board approval related to formal acceleration. Selection of an LPA is not approval of the project.

## **BACKGROUND**

By closing a gap in the regional rail network, the entire K Line would serve dozens of communities between the South Bay and Hollywood, transforming the way people could travel across LA County. The project would deliver significant regional and local benefits in the future, including:

- Attracting between 47,200 to 59,700 daily project trips.
- Increasing overall ridership on the *entire* K Line with between 85,200 to 98,000 boardings per day between Torrance and Hollywood.
- Attracting between 11,400 to 15,100 *new* daily trips.
- Reducing between 127,500 to 135,500 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) daily, which reduces greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, air pollution, and regional energy use to meet climate goals.
- Improving access for people living in Equity Focus Communities (EFCs), with 67% of trips projected to be made by low-income riders.

### Project History

Transit feasibility studies for a north-south transit corridor connecting South Bay Cities, Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and central Los Angeles County date back to the 1990s and have evolved over the years from the 2001 Crenshaw-Prairie Corridor Major Investment Study, followed by the 2009 Wilshire/La Brea Light Rail Study, and more recent alternatives analysis studies through 2020 for a northern extension of the K (Crenshaw) Line, summarized in Appendix 2-A of the Draft EIR. In 2022, the K Line opened for operation. This was followed by the opening of the LAX/Metro Transit Connector (MTC) station in 2025 and modification of operations to provide service between the Redondo Beach Station and the E Line. In January 2026, the Metro Board approved the K Line South to Torrance project which will extend the K Line south to the Cities of Lawndale, Redondo Beach and Torrance as funding becomes available. On the northern end, the K Line currently terminates at the Expo/Crenshaw E Line Station in an underground configuration. Previous studies included extending the line north and included at-grade, underground, and aerial configurations to connect to the current D Line. In lieu of a direct connection to the D Line at Crenshaw and Wilshire Boulevards due to the decision not to build an additional D Line station at that location because of the close proximity to the Wilshire/Western Station, lack of activity centers, and lower residential density, alternatives extending north between the E Line and D Line were required to be in an underground configuration to connect to the D Line at La Brea or Fairfax Avenues. Aerial and at-grade configurations between the E Line and Venice Boulevard were deemed infeasible due to the community impacts associated with insufficient width of public right-of-way in some segments and related property acquisitions and traffic circulation impacts.

The Measure M Expenditure Plan allocated \$2.24 billion (in 2015 dollars) to the project and identified 2041 as the ground-breaking year when project funds would be available for construction, with the goal of opening between 2047-2049. Local jurisdictions have been exploring additional funding and

---

financing strategies to accelerate project delivery through [Metro's Early Project Delivery Strategy <https://www.metro.net/about/early-project-delivery/>](https://www.metro.net/about/early-project-delivery/). Any acceleration of the project timeline would require Metro Board approval and cannot negatively impact the schedules and funding allocated to other Measure M projects.

Since the passage of Measure M in 2016, the City of West Hollywood has expressed strong support for the project, advocated for acceleration, and taken actions per the Early Project Delivery Strategy to identify strategies to support acceleration. In 2018, the City of West Hollywood passed Resolution No.18-5055 committing the City to transit-supportive actions including value capture, permit streamlining, and expansion of first/last mile options to support project advancement. Since then, the City has conducted funding and project delivery studies to evaluate tax increment financing through an EIFD to generate a new local source of funding to support project acceleration. The City also has advanced land use planning, rail integration, and first/last mile studies to support early station area planning around proposed KNE stations within the City of West Hollywood.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Environmental Review Process**

In August 2020, the Board directed staff to begin work on environmental clearance under CEQA and prepare a Draft EIR. On April 15, 2021, Metro initiated public scoping for an environmental document with a 45-day scoping period, which ended on May 28, 2021. Following public scoping, Metro prepared advanced conceptual engineering (ACE) drawings for project alignments and design options including refinements and advanced environmental analysis and technical studies. On July 23, 2024, Metro released the Draft EIR for public review over a 60-day comment period that extended to September 20, 2024. In addition to the Draft EIR, Metro published several technical studies in 2023 including ridership projections, projects benefits, and preliminary cost estimates, all available on the Project website at [metro.net/projects/kne](https://www.metro.net/projects/kne). [<https://www.metro.net/projects/kline-northern-extension/>](https://www.metro.net/projects/kline-northern-extension/)

### **Alignments and Options Studied in Draft EIR**

The Draft EIR evaluates three underground light rail alignments (Figure 1) that range from six to ten miles from the Expo/Crenshaw (E/K Line) Station to the Hollywood/Highland (B Line) Station: 1) San Vicente-Fairfax, 2) Fairfax, and 3), La Brea. All alignments could include an optional terminus station farther north to serve the Hollywood Bowl.

The Project would be constructed using pressurized tunnel boring machines (TBMs) for tunnel segments and cut and cover for station areas. Due to the scale of the project, it would be constructed in two or three sections, depending on the alignment selected, with an initial operating segment (IOS) from the K/ E Line to the D Line on Wilshire Boulevard at either Fairfax or La Brea Avenues. Each section is estimated to take eight to twelve years to construct based on Metro's experience with similar underground rail projects. Each section would require its own TBM launch site to support tunneling activities. Connecting to the D Line for the IOS would require modifications to Metro's Division 16, an existing maintenance and storage facility (MSF) serving the K Line. A larger expansion of the MSF would be needed for section 2/3 when the K Line operates north of Wilshire Blvd.

Figure 1. Map of Alignments Studied in the Draft EIR



### Preliminary Cost Estimates

Metro’s technical team prepared preliminary capital cost estimates, which were peer reviewed in consultation with the Metro Cost Estimating Department. The cost estimates are based on early engineering (approximately 15% design) and include (1) baseline construction costs in 2023\$ including labor, materials, professional services and (2) contingency (~40%) to account for known and unknown project risks based on guidance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The cost estimates range from \$14.8B for San Vicente-Fairfax, \$12.47B for Fairfax and \$10.99B for La Brea, not including the Hollywood Bowl Design Option, which adds approximately \$1.12B to the capital cost estimate for any of the alignments. As part of the cost estimating process, Metro also prepared estimates for an IOS to connect to the D Line, which ranges from \$4.67B (Wilshire/Fairfax) to \$4.45B (Wilshire/La Brea) in 2023\$. Escalation was not included in the capital cost estimates and would be assigned based on a future funding plan and construction schedule.

### Ridership Projections & Travel Benefits

With the release of the Draft EIR in 2024, Metro published a ridership and travel benefits summary report. The analysis assumed a future travel horizon of 2045 based on a regional travel model developed for Metro in coordination with the FTA using demographic data for the region from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Daily project trips are estimated to range from 47,200 (La Brea) to 59,700 (San Vicente-Fairfax). Over 50% of the estimated daily project trips (33,000) would be generated by the initial phase of operations, connecting the E Line to the D Line (either at Fairfax Avenue or La Brea Avenue). When considering the entire K Line build out from Torrance to Hollywood, the K Line would serve between 85,200 (La Brea) to 98,000 (San Vicente-Fairfax) daily trips in 2045. The ridership model focuses on daily trips during commuting hours to/from work and may not fully capture additional trips generated by cultural and entertainment districts and venues in the study area (e.g. museums, nightlife, performance venues such as the

Hollywood Bowl).

*Table 1. Travel Benefits Projected in 2045 for Project Alignments in Draft EIR*

<b>Travel Benefits Projected in 2045</b>	<b>San Vicente Fairfax</b>	<b>Fairfax</b>	<b>La Brea</b>
<b>Tunnel Alignment Length</b>	9.7 miles	7.9 miles	6.2 miles
<b>Proposed Stations</b>	9	7	6
<b>Travel time E Line to B Line (Hollywood/Highland)</b>	19 mins	15 mins	12 mins
<b>Daily Project Trips</b>	59,700	52,900	47,200
<b>Daily Project Trips by Low-Income Riders</b>	39,200	35,200	31,000
<b>Daily Trips by New Riders</b>	15,100	12,800	11,400
<b>Daily Hours of User Benefits (Travel Savings)</b>	18,800	15,700	13,800
<b>Daily Reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</b>	135,000	127,400	135,500
<b>Daily Trips to D Line Station (at Fairfax or La Brea)</b>	33,000	33,000	33,000
<b>Daily Trips on Entire K Line (Torrance to Hollywood)</b>	98,000	91,200	85,200
<b>Projected residents within half-mile of stations in 2045</b>	131,500	106,800	94,200
<b>Projected jobs within half-mile of stations in 2045</b>	125,700	75,200	56,200

*Data does not include Hollywood Bowl Station design option in Draft EIR.*

Community Feedback on Draft EIR

During the public comment period for the Draft EIR, Metro received over 1,300 submissions by email, mail, and phone. The City of West Hollywood shared a survey with their residents and received over 600 comments on the Project, which they attached to their comment letter on the Draft EIR. Of the over 1,300 submissions received on the Draft EIR, 95% came from individuals, while the remaining came from public agencies, elected offices, community groups, and businesses. Metro received a high number of comments in support of the project (489), and over 570 comments in support of specific alignments and options. Metro received very few comments in opposition to the project (20). However, within the southern part of the project area, Metro received a high number of comments from residents of historic Mid-City communities, including Wellington Square and Lafayette Square, in opposition to the proposed Draft EIR tunnel alignment that would travel below homes between West Adams and Venice Boulevards. Table 2 illustrates the types of comments Metro received on the alignments and options studied and notes which came from a particular geography.

*Table 2. Support & Opposition for Project Alignments, Options & Alternatives*

Support & Opposition for Project Alignments, Options & Alternatives	# of Submissions	# from Mid-City communities*	# from Other communities
Project Support	489	15	474
San Vicente–Fairfax Support	282	5	277
Fairfax Support	63	2	61
La Brea Support	63	2	61
Hollywood Bowl Design Option Support	168	2	166
High Frequency Bus Alternative Support	14	3	11
Opposition to Project (No Project Alternative)	20	3	17
Opposition to Mid-City Alignment (between I-10 and Midtown Crossing Station)	138	117	21

\*Mid-City communities includes comments from residents of historic residential neighborhoods between Interstate 10 and Venice Blvd including Wellington Square and Lafayette Square.

During public meetings and in written comments during the Draft EIR comment period, residents of Mid-City historic communities (including Lafayette Square and Wellington Square) expressed concerns related to:

- tunnel safety,
- building damage to older homes in historic neighborhoods, and
- changes to property rights and values.

Mid-City community members also expressed concerns regarding a lack of notification and engagement in the development of the alignments in an area that has suffered from historic injustices in the past, specifically as part of the construction of Interstate 10.

Metro also received a large number of comments (399) sharing concerns with the proposed station at Hollywood/Highland as the Draft EIR identified significant impacts to historic resources with the demolition of two to four historic structures to stage construction to connect the K Line to the B Line. Community members opposed the loss of historic structures and requested that Metro further analyze ways to minimize impacts to historic structures and the historic district as part of the proposed new entrance for the Hollywood/Highland Station. Other key themes included comments and questions about ways to reduce project costs and support to accelerate the project to realize project benefits sooner than the Measure M schedule of operations (2047-2049). See Attachment A for summary of Draft EIR comments.

Comparison of the Alignments, Options & Alternatives Studied

The following section discusses the alignments evaluated in the Draft EIR from west to east and south to north, as well as alternatives to the project.

*San Vicente-Fairfax*

The San Vicente-Fairfax alignment is the longest alignment (9.7 miles) with the most stations (nine). In part due to the greater distance and multiple communities served, it generates the highest travel benefits of the alignments studied with approximately 59,700 daily project trips and 5,100 new daily riders. The San Vicente-Fairfax alignment serves the greatest number of residents and projected jobs within a half-mile of stations including major jobs centers and cultural destinations such as Cedars-

---

Sinai Medical Center, the West Hollywood Design District, and the Santa Monica Rainbow District. Both the City of West Hollywood and Los Angeles have approved plans for transit-supportive zoning around the proposed station areas.

Due to its length, the San Vicente-Fairfax alignment would require three sections of construction. This alignment has the highest project costs, greatest number of real estate acquisitions and subsurface (underground) easements, and highest number of significant environmental impacts. Construction of the second section would require demolition of the LA County Sheriff's Station in West Hollywood (public facility) and the Santa Palm Carwash (historic resource) to stage construction for the TBM launch site and station entrance. Relocating the LA County Sheriff's station (either temporarily or permanently) within the City of West Hollywood would be costly and complex to identify a suitable site in a dense, built out urban area.

### *Fairfax*

The Fairfax alignment is 7.9 miles with seven new stations, all of which are the same as the San Vicente-Fairfax alignment except for the La Cienega/Beverly and San Vicente/Santa Monica stations. It provides strong mobility benefits with 52,900 daily project trips and attracts 12,800 new daily riders. It unlocks access to major local and regional activity centers that are not served by rail, including the Los Angeles Original Farmers Market, the Grove, CBS Studios, and the Santa Monica Blvd commercial corridor in West Hollywood between Fairfax and La Brea Avenues. The Fairfax alignment stations are located in areas with transit-supportive zoning and land-uses to accommodate future growth and leverage public transit investments for greater economic and community benefits. Unlike the San Vicente-Fairfax alignment, the Fairfax alignment would only require two phases of construction, which reduces overall construction costs, risks, and related real estate acquisitions and utility relocations.

### *La Brea*

The La Brea alignment is the shortest alignment (6.2 miles) with the fewest stations (six) and lowest travel benefits of the alignments studied. It would serve 47,200 daily project trips and attract 11,400 new daily riders in 2045. However, it provides the most direct north/south connection between Central LA and Hollywood with a 12-minute trip from the E Line to the B Line. It has the lowest construction cost of the alignments. It serves the fewest residents, jobs, and activity centers of the alignments studied and has the least transit-supportive zoning around station areas. As the shortest alignment, it has the fewest number of acquisitions and subsurface easements. Construction of the proposed La Brea/Beverly Station would impact religious institutions within the Orthodox Jewish community. Like the Fairfax Alignment, it requires two phases of construction. The La Brea alignment has the lowest construction costs and operations and maintenance costs of the alignments studied.

### *Hollywood Bowl Design Option*

The Hollywood Bowl terminus station was studied as a design option and would extend the K Line north of the Hollywood/Highland Station approximately 0.8 miles to the Hollywood Bowl, a major cultural events venue for the region. The Hollywood Bowl has a capacity to seat approximately 17,500 people and the venue hosts around 100 events per year, attracting approximately one million visitors a year in a highly congested area. Construction would be staged on the Hollywood Bowl parking lots. The size of the parking lots and their proximity to a freeway make it an efficient site to

launch the TBM for the final stage of constructed, as recommended by the Metro Tunnel Advisory Panel. The Hollywood Bowl Design Option received strong support from the public during the Draft EIR comment period including from the LA County Department of Recreation and Parks and LA Philharmonic.

#### *High Frequency Bus Alternative (HFB)*

The Draft EIR evaluated a High Frequency Bus (HFB) Alternative to consider rapid bus service instead of light rail within the KNE project area to connect the Metro K Line to the Metro B Line in Hollywood. The HFB Alternative would travel along La Brea Avenue as the shortest, most direct route with stops spaced approximately every half-mile based on Metro bus rapid transit in urban corridors. The HFB Alternative does not have the same capacity to carry passengers as light rail, and would not be able to significantly reduce travel times in this highly congested project area, as the buses would travel along public streets. A fast, frequent, high-capacity transit alternative is needed to shift people from driving to taking transit to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, air pollutants, and energy use, and to expand access. The HFB Alternative is not recommended as it does not have the same ability to meet the project objectives compared to any of the rail alignments studied. The primary purpose of the KNE project is to provide a fast and reliable rail option that connects multiple rail lines, closing a north/south gap in the rail network between the Metro E and B Lines. This need cannot be met with bus service.

#### *No Project Alternative*

The Draft EIR also evaluated a No Project Alternative, which would fail to meet the project objectives, realize project benefits and would also have significant and unavoidable impacts for air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, and transportation related to inconsistency with the regional and local plans that assume the project would be constructed and operated.

#### Additional Studies & Community Engagement Following Draft EIR

In an effort to provide more information to concerns raised by commenters in Mid-City residential neighborhoods around the proposed tunnel alignment, tunnel safety and property concerns, Metro prepared three technical reports: Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis, Tunnel Safety Report, and Property Considerations Memo, published in August 2025.

#### *Tunnel Safety and Property Considerations*

Key takeaways from the Tunnel Safety Report and the Property Consideration Memo, discussed in the September 17, 2025, Board Report include:

- Modern tunnel construction practices, which include pre-construction surveys, the use of pressurized tunnel boring machines, construction monitoring, and mitigation measures have successfully built tunnels below sensitive structures, including historic buildings without damage in Los Angeles, as well as internationally.
- Tunnels are proposed at depths of 40 to 120 feet below surface within the project area and approximately 80 to 120 feet below surface in the Mid-City neighborhoods of Wellington Square and Lafayette Square. At these depths, noise and vibration are found to be well below the threshold of damage to structures above, and below levels of human perception.
- Metro has successfully tunneled in similar ground conditions (e.g. gases, high groundwater) with no measurable settlement at the surface and no damage to buildings above tunnels.

- Tunnels would not impact underground oil or mineral rights in Mid-City, which are thousands of feet below the surface, compared to proposed subway tunnels, which would be 80 to 120 feet below the surface.
- Tunnel easements would not change zoning, historic designation status, and development rights for owners.
- Tunnel easements also would not negatively impact home values, as shown in a recent study of property sale prices in Westwood, comparing homes without and without tunnel easements above the D Line Extension.
- Research in Los Angeles and other American cities shows a positive correlation between home values and proximity to transit for properties within a half-mile of stations.

Metro released FAQs, a [StoryMap](https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/74d39323fb764be38ab0a0a0f3093276) <<https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/74d39323fb764be38ab0a0a0f3093276>> website, and presentation materials to share findings with Mid-City communities. Between spring 2025 and winter 2026, Metro hosted four small community conversations with Mid-City leadership from Wellington Square, Lafayette Square, Victoria Park Circle, 16<sup>th</sup> Place and LaFayette Road, in order to foster dialogue and to help tailor broader outreach to Mid-City community members' specific needs. Incorporating guidance from these neighborhood representatives, Metro hosted four community meetings in Summer/Fall 2025 to share findings, gather feedback, and answer questions about the project, as well as a talk n' ride tour to visit Metro neighborhoods along the D Line Extension where tunnels were constructed under and adjacent to homes and sensitive uses without damage or impacts to properties. Over 310 people attended these meetings. See Attachment B for a summary of community engagement in 2025.

#### *Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis Report Findings*

Based on comments on the Draft EIR and subsequent community conversations and meetings with residents from Mid-City historic residential neighborhoods, Metro conducted a study of 12 alignment options in Mid-City between West Adams and Venice Boulevards, including analysis of the Midtown Shopping Center. These 12 alignments were a combination of previously studied alignments and routes suggested by the community during public meetings held after the Draft EIR circulation. The study's purpose was to explore alternate routes to minimize tunneling below historic neighborhoods and minimize impacts to businesses during construction, specifically the Ralph's supermarket at the Midtown Shopping Center, which is an important neighborhood business that is identified as a construction staging site for the TBM and a future station called Midtown Crossing. The 12 alternate alignment options were presented to the community during public meetings and small group briefings and published in reports on the Metro website in August 2025 to receive feedback.

Key findings of this study included the following:

- There were no alternatives that did not require subsurface easements under some residential properties (historic or non-historic) to get from the K/E Line terminus to the Midtown Crossing Station location.
- Many of the alternative alignments increased the total number of subsurface easements and resulted in greater tunnel distances and travel time.
- All alternative alignments required use of the Midtown Shopping Center as a TBM launch site

and future station as it was the only non-residential site between the E and D Lines that had sufficient size to accommodate TBMs without requiring acquisition and demolition of residential properties in the Mid-City area. Currently there are no full residential acquisitions identified as part of the project; only commercial and industrial properties are identified for construction sites.

- While maximizing tunneling under public rights-of-way like Crenshaw Boulevard reduces the number of subsurface easements under these communities, some subsurface easements will be required. More detailed engineering would need to be undertaken to pursue further reductions in subsurface easements.

For this issue, during the public meetings and in written emails, a majority of residents favored options that would travel below public streets to minimize tunnels below residential neighborhoods, and strategies to preserve the neighborhood supermarket during construction. The alignment alternative that would best achieve these goals is the Crenshaw ROW alignment (Option 2) as described in the Report.

#### Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)

At the July 2025 Board meeting, the Board approved a methodology framework for a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to be conducted on Metro capital projects at key milestones to support investment and funding decisions. The CBA methodology includes two related components: Weighted Benefits Analysis and Benefit-Cost Ratio. The KNE CBA, conducted in Winter 2025, found that the San Vicente-Fairfax alignment performed the best of the three alignments studied in the Draft EIR under the Weighted Benefits Analysis, which assigns 40% of the total score to mobility and accessibility benefits. The San Vicente-Fairfax alignment performed best largely due to having the highest ridership, greatest number of stations and most activity centers served. The Fairfax and La Brea alignments have a higher projected Benefit-Cost Ratio due to their high local and regional monetized benefits paired with lower capital and operational costs and shorter construction periods, which allow benefits to be delivered sooner than the San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment. The CBA results are further described in Attachment C.

#### Community Poll on Project Awareness and Support

In Winter 2025, Metro worked with a market research company to conduct a community poll (phone and online) with 800 residents in and around the project area to understand levels of awareness and support for the project. The poll found that approximately 36% of respondents were familiar with the project. A majority of respondents (over 90%) expressed support for the project and 69% support a connection to the Hollywood Bowl.

#### Staff Recommendation for Locally Preferred Alternative

The staff recommendation is based on findings from the Draft EIR and technical studies, capital cost estimates, constructability analysis, funding available, comments on the Draft EIR, stakeholder engagement, additional technical analysis and input from Mid-City communities after the Draft EIR, Metro's Cost Benefit Analysis, and local commitments to pursue an EIFD per the Early Project Delivery Strategy. See Attachment D for map of the staff recommendation.

---

The San Vicente-Fairfax alignment provides the strongest mobility benefits of the alignments studied as it connects to the most activity centers and serves the highest numbers of jobs and residents with nine stations, including a station at Cedars Sinai Medical Center, one of the largest private employers in Los Angeles County, as well as the western edge of West Hollywood with access to the Pacific Design Center, West Hollywood Park and nightlife along Santa Monica Blvd and Sunset Blvd to the north. Similar to the Fairfax alignment, the San Vicente-Fairfax alignment serves the Museum District, Los Angeles Original Farmers Market, The Grove, and CBS Studios. These activity centers are not served by the La Brea alignment, which provides the fewest mobility benefits. The San Vicente-Fairfax alignment received significant support from community members as did the Fairfax alignment.

The San Vicente-Fairfax alignment is the only alignment studied with a local commitment to identify additional funding sources to support project costs. As discussed above, the City of West Hollywood has advocated for acceleration of the project since the passage of Measure M and invested local resources into studies to improve land use/transportation planning policies and studies to evaluate local funding and financing strategies (2019 and 2024) to generate revenues through the formation of an EIFD. The intent of the EIFD is to provide a new local source of funding to fund construction of the San Vicente-Fairfax alignment per the Early Project Delivery Strategy. The EIFD could help offset the higher cost of the San Vicente alignment compared to the Fairfax alignment, which also provides strong benefits. For these reasons, staff recommends the San Vicente-Fairfax alignment, contingent upon funding from a future EIFD as the LPA.

Within Mid-City, staff recommends an adjusted tunnel alignment, referred to as the Crenshaw ROW (Option 2) in the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis Report in response to the technical analysis and community input received to minimize tunneling below historic neighborhoods and provide opportunities to preserve the neighborhood supermarket at the proposed Midtown Crossing Station. The tunnels would travel below Crenshaw Blvd north of West Adams before turning northwest towards Venice Blvd and San Vicente Blvd. This route eliminates all 29 tunnel easements below Wellington Square and minimizes tunnel easements below Lafayette Square (estimated reduction from 29 to 22), a historic preservation overlay zone (HPOZ) and other neighborhoods. This alignment alternative also reduces the number of subsurface easements overall for the project. The staff recommendation also includes a commitment to work with the owner of the Midtown Crossing Shopping Center to preserve the opportunity to relocate the supermarket to an alternate location on acquired property adjacent to the Midtown Crossing construction site, prior to the start of construction. This would allow for the supermarket to continue operations during and after construction, serving nearby residential neighborhoods. Metro would continue to refine the Option 2 alignment and station plan with the intent of further reducing subsurface easements as part of further engineering, and prior to any Board approval of the project.

The Hollywood Bowl is recommended as the terminus of the LPA to connect riders to a major entertainment center in a highly congested area and provide an optimal construction staging site for the TBM as part of the final phase of construction.

#### *Wilshire/Fairfax Initial Operating Segment (IOS)*

As part of the LPA, when the project moves to the next stage of development, staff recommends

---

including the IOS, as funding allows, which would serve 33,000 trips a day and bring riders to the heart of cultural destinations in the growing Museum District along Miracle Mile and connect people to office towers and dense residential neighborhoods along Wilshire Blvd and Fairfax Avenue. While the ridership projections are the same connecting the E Line to the D Line at either Wilshire/Fairfax and Wilshire/La Brea, travel projections show that more riders would use the K Line to travel from the south to the westside (via the D Line) and central parts of LA County.

### Funding

The preliminary capital cost estimates range from \$10.99B to \$14.8B (in 2023\$), which far exceed the funds identified in the Measure M Expenditure Plan (\$2.24B of Measure M, other local, and state and federal funding in 2015\$) and included in the Metro 2020 Long Range Transportation Plan and 2025 Short Range Transportation Plan. As such, Metro anticipates the need for additional federal, state, and local support if any of the Project alignments are pursued. Federal funding would require additional environmental clearance under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Entry into the NEPA process would not occur until after selection of an LPA, completion of the CEQA process, and direction from the Metro Board to pursue federal funding. The pursuit of additional funding will align with the Measure M schedule unless acceleration is approved by the Board at a future date, per the Early Project Delivery Strategy. Should acceleration be approved, the funding plan must not compete with the funding for other Metro projects, including the Pillar Projects, which are pursuing additional state and federal funding beyond what was assumed needed in the Measure M Expenditure Plan or 2020 Long Range Transportation Plan.

### **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

The selection of an LPA will not impact the safety of Metro's customers or employees.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The Fiscal Year 2025-2026 budget assigned funding to the project (No. 475558) for professional services, including support for technical analysis and community engagement in response to community concerns on the 2024 Draft EIR. Additional technical studies and community engagement, conducted between Fall 2024 to Winter 2026 have been completed. Further environmental review will be based on the Measure M schedule to begin construction in 2041, unless directed by the Board to accelerate.

### Impact to Budget

Funding for this project comes from Measure M 35% Transit Capital, which is not eligible for bus and rail operations.

### **EQUITY PLATFORM**

The Project would close a gap in the regional rail network, providing a rapid north/south rail connection from the South Bay to Hollywood, increasing access to employment, education, housing, and regional centers. The project will improve access for people living in Equity Focus Communities (EFCs), with 67% of trips projected to be made by low-income riders. It would also serve many people living in EFCs in areas such as West Adams, Mid-City, West Hollywood and Hollywood along

---

the K Line Northern Extension and connect to the D and B Lines. Ridership data shows that the project would attract regional riders coming from the neighborhoods south of the project area, expanding access for people living in the South Bay, Inglewood, and South LA who want to access jobs in the central part of Los Angeles via the project.

To increase awareness of the Project and engage hard to reach groups who do not typically participate in community meetings, Metro circulated materials and notices in English and Spanish and held pop-up events at community events and transit rider intercepts at bus stops in the project area. In 2025, Metro focused on additional engagement with Mid-City communities to address concerns about historic inequities. As part of future stages of project development, Metro would expand partnerships with community-based organizations (CBOs) to help disseminate project information, advise on outreach methods, and engage a diverse set of project stakeholders as Metro advances the Project. Metro will build upon existing relationships established with project stakeholders and neighborhood groups, including historic Mid-City communities to help shape the next stages of community engagement, encourage greater participation and increase awareness of the project and key milestones. Furthermore, Metro is committed to expanding community outreach to include additional languages spoken in EFCs and beyond, and to ensuring meaningful connections with riders of all ages and abilities, including seniors, people with disabilities, and those with mobility challenges.

### **VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED OUTCOME**

VMT and VMT per capita in Los Angeles County are lower than national averages, the lowest in the SCAG region, and on the lower end of VMT per capita statewide, with these declining VMT trends due in part to Metro's significant investment in rail and bus transit.\* Metro's Board-adopted VMT reduction targets align with California's statewide climate goals, including achieving carbon neutrality by 2045. To ensure continued progress, all Board items are assessed for their potential impact on VMT.

As part of these ongoing efforts, this item is expected to contribute to further reductions in VMT.

This project supports Metro's systemwide strategy to reduce VMT through planning activities that will improve and further encourage transit ridership, ridesharing, and active transportation. Metro's Board-adopted VMT reduction targets were designed to build on the success of existing investments, and this item aligns with those objectives.

Metro conducted a preliminary analysis to show that the net effect of this project is to decrease VMT. The Draft EIR identifies that the project would help reduce auto use by approximately 127,500 to 135,500 VMT daily. This would help the region meet climate change goals by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and regional energy use.

*\*Based on population estimates from the United States Census and VMT estimates from Caltrans' Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data between 2001-2019.*

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The Project supports the following strategic plan goals identified in Vision 2028:

- Goal 1: Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling,
- Goal 3: Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity, and
- Goal 5: Provide responsive, accountable, and trustworthy governance within the Metro organization.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board may choose to defer selection of an LPA and IOS. This is not recommended as it would delay community partners in their pursuit of forming an EIFD that could potentially produce additional funding and financing sources to support the Project.

The Board could select other alignments evaluated in the 2024 Draft EIR and 2025 Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis as the LPA, the High Frequency Bus Alternative, or the No Project Alternative. The High Frequency Bus Alternative and No Project Alternative are not recommended as they do not meet the project needs and objectives to close a north/south gap in the regional rail network between the Metro E, D, and B Lines.

### **NEXT STEPS**

With Board approval of an LPA, staff will hold further environmental analysis and engineering while additional project funding is pursued to avoid creating premature liability exposure and uncertainty for potentially affected property owners.


Per the Early Project Delivery Strategy, multiple actions are needed for staff to recommend that the Metro Board consider acceleration, including demonstrating that project acceleration would not negatively impact other Measure M projects. Following the formation of a tax increment financing district through an EIFD and/or the commitment of additional local funds in an amount greater than 25% of the capital cost estimate, led by the City of West Hollywood in coordination with LA County, staff would return to the Metro Board to consider a project acceleration plan and next steps for environmental clearance and engineering. Acceleration requires two-thirds of the Metro Board members to vote in support to amend the schedule of funds in the Measure M Expenditure Plan and must not delay or negatively impact other projects.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment A - Summary of Draft EIR Comments
- Attachment B - Summary of 2025 Community Engagement
- Attachment C - Metro Cost Benefit Analysis
- Attachment D - Map of Staff Recommendation for LPA

Prepared by: Roger Martin, Senior Manager, Mobility Corridors, (213) 922-3069  
Cristina Ungureanu, Senior Manager, Mobility Corridors, (213)- 922-2507

Georgia Sheridan, Senior Director, Mobility Corridors, (213) 547-4255  
Craig Hoshijima, Executive Officer, Strategic Financial Planning, (213) 547-4290  
Dolores Roybal, Deputy Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and  
Development, (213) 922-3024  
Allison Yoh, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development,  
(213) 922-4812  
David Mieger, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development,  
(213) 922-3040  
Mary Kohav, Manager, Community Relations, (213) 435-7982  
Mark Dierking, Director, Community Relations, (213)922-2426  
Anthony Crump, Executive Officer, Community Relations, (213) 418-3292  
Ray Sosa, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 547-4274



Stephanie Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer

# Draft EIR Public Comment Period Summary Memorandum

## K LINE NORTHERN EXTENSION



**Metro**

November 2025

# K LINE NORTHERN EXTENSION TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

Contract No. AE64930000

---

## DRAFT EIR PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD SUMMARY MEMORANDUM

Prepared for:



Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Prepared by:



888 S. Figueroa Street, Floor 18  
Los Angeles, California 90017

November 2025

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Report Purpose .....	1-1
1.2 Project Overview .....	1-1
1.3 Draft EIR Public Hearing and Meetings.....	1-2
1.4 Public Comment Data Results Summary .....	1-3
<b>SECTION 2: DRAFT EIR PUBLIC HEARINGS AND MEETINGS .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Draft EIR Public Hearings .....	2-2
2.2 September 4th Mid-City Community Meeting .....	2-2
<b>SECTION 3: DRAFT EIR PUBLIC COMMENT DATA RESULTS.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Public Comments and Submissions .....	3-1
3.2 Submissions by Affiliation.....	3-3
3.3 Draft EIR Submission Themes .....	3-6
3.3.1 Project Support and Alignment Preference .....	3-6
3.3.1.1 Project Support.....	3-7
3.3.1.2 Alignment Support.....	3-7
For San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment .....	3-7
For Fairfax Alignment.....	3-7
For La Brea Alignment.....	3-8
For Hollywood Bowl Design Option .....	3-8
3.3.1.3 Opposition to Mid-City Alignment.....	3-8
3.3.1.4 Project Opposition .....	3-9
3.3.2 Key Themes.....	3-9
3.3.2.1 Removal of Historic Structures at Hollywood/Highland Station .....	3-9
3.3.2.2 Mid-City Historic Residential Communities.....	3-10
3.3.2.3 Tunneling .....	3-11
3.3.2.4 Noise and Vibration .....	3-11
3.3.2.5 Geology and Soils.....	3-11
3.3.2.6 Property Values.....	3-12
3.3.2.7 Project Cost and Schedule .....	3-12
3.3.2.8 Overengineering/Crossovers .....	3-12
3.3.2.9 Additional Topics Identified .....	3-13

**SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WITH MID-CITY COMMUNITIES ..... 4-1**

## APPENDIX

Appendix A Summary of Comments from 2021 Public Scoping for EIR

## TABLES

Table 1. Public Review Hearings ..... 2-2

Table 2. Mid-City Community Meeting..... 2-2

Table 3. Number of Submissions Received by Submission Format..... 3-2

Table 4. Count of Commenter Types ..... 3-2

Table 5. Organizations and Elected Officials That Commented on the Draft EIR ..... 3-3

Table 6. Key Stakeholder Draft EIR Comment Topics ..... 3-4

Table 7. Number of Key Submissions with Project Support/Opposition and Alignment Preference ..... 3-6

Table 8. Number of Submissions Received per Key Theme ..... 3-9

## FIGURES

Figure 1. K Line Northern Extension Project Map and Construction Sections from Draft EIR (2024) ..... 1-2

## ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

ACE	Advanced Conceptual Engineering
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
EIFD	Enhanced Infrastructure Funding District
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
FAQs	Frequently Asked Questions
HPOZ	Historic Preservation Overlay Zone
KNE	K Line Northern Extension
LPA	Locally Preferred Alternative
Metro	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
NOP	Notice of Preparation
Project	K Line Northern Extension Project
ROW	right-of-way
TBM	tunnel boring machine

# SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

---

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) prepared and circulated a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the K Line Northern Extension (KNE) Transit Corridor Project in Summer 2024. The KNE Draft EIR was released for public review over a 60-day comment period, which occurred between July 23 and September 20, 2024. KNE would provide a northern extension of the Metro light rail transit K Line from the Metro E Line (Expo) to the Metro D (Purple) Line and B (Red) Line heavy rail transit lines. Metro is leading the environmental review process for KNE under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Public scoping for the EIR was initiated in Spring 2021 (see Appendix A of this memorandum).

## 1.1 REPORT PURPOSE

This memorandum summarizes the community input received during the Draft EIR public comment period, including written submissions and comments taken at public hearings and additional community meetings Metro held for the Draft EIR. The memorandum provides a high-level summary of the major themes and topics that were heard from the public, local organizations, stakeholder groups, elected officials, and government agencies during the public comment period.

## 1.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

As shown in Figure 1, KNE would provide a northern light rail extension of the Metro K Line from its current terminus at the Metro E Line Expo/Crenshaw Station to a northern terminus at either the Metro B Line Hollywood/Highland Station or the optional Hollywood Bowl Station. KNE would serve as a critical regional connection, linking the South Bay, the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) area, South Los Angeles, Inglewood, and the Crenshaw corridor to Mid-City, Central Los Angeles, West Hollywood, and Hollywood, allowing for further connections to points north in the San Fernando Valley. It would connect major activity centers and areas of high population and employment density. From the existing Expo/Crenshaw Station, KNE would travel north in underground tunnels, connecting to the Metro D Line at Wilshire Boulevard and the Metro B Line at the Hollywood/Highland Station. KNE would operate entirely underground except for the station entrances, which provide access to riders at the street level. At the respective transfer stations, transfers between the K Line and the D and B Lines would be entirely underground and riders would be able to access both lines from any of the station entrances.

The following alignments are under consideration for KNE:

- San Vicente–Fairfax Alignment
- Fairfax Alignment
- La Brea Alignment

There is one design option under consideration, the Hollywood Bowl Design Option, for each of the alignments. The Hollywood Bowl Design Option includes an alternate terminus station at the Hollywood Bowl, north of the Hollywood/Highland Station.

The project would be constructed using tunnel boring machines (TBMs) and would be implemented in two or three sections (phases), depending on the alignment selected. The first section would connect the E Line to the D Line for all alignments studied.

**FIGURE 1. K LINE NORTHERN EXTENSION PROJECT MAP AND CONSTRUCTION SECTIONS FROM DRAFT EIR (2024)**



Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2024

### 1.3 DRAFT EIR PUBLIC HEARING AND MEETINGS

To inform the public about the project and gather input, Metro used multiple outreach strategies, including in-person and virtual meetings with local stakeholders, information tables at community events, social media posts, and email blasts to the project’s mailing list. Outreach activities were conducted at locations and events along the project corridor in the Cities of West Hollywood and Los Angeles, as well as along the existing K Line corridor in South Los Angeles.

Between publication of the project’s Notice of Preparation (NOP) in April 2021 and publication of the Draft EIR in July 2024, Metro held eight community update meetings to solicit public input on the project:

- Three NOP scoping meetings (virtual) in Spring 2021
- Two community update meetings (virtual) in Summer 2022
- Three community update meetings (two in-person, one virtual) in Fall 2023

After the Draft EIR was published in July 2024, Metro held three public hearings in various locations along the project corridor to gather public input on the Draft EIR:

- Public Hearing #1 (in-person): Saturday, August 10, 2024
- Public Hearing #2 (in-person): Tuesday, August 13, 2024
- Public Hearing #3 (virtual): Thursday, August 15, 2024

Based on comments and concerns raised during the public hearings, on September 4, 2024, Metro hosted an additional community meeting with the Mid-City communities, including the historic residential neighborhoods of Lafayette Square and Wellington Square, to address concerns about the effects of tunneling under homes in those neighborhoods.

In addition to the public hearings and meetings, the Draft EIR was made available online at Metro’s project website ([www.metro.net/kne/](http://www.metro.net/kne/)) and at 14 libraries within the project corridor and along the existing Metro K Line. The public had the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR at the public hearings or provide written comments via email or mail during the 60-day comment period.

Additional information on public hearings and other meetings, as well as where the Draft EIR was available for review, can be found below in Section 2: Draft EIR Public Hearings and Meetings, and in Chapter 6, Public Outreach, of the Draft EIR.

## 1.4 PUBLIC COMMENT DATA RESULTS SUMMARY

Over the 60-day public comment period for the KNE Draft EIR, Metro received 1,333 submissions from various members of the public, agencies, elected officials, and organizations. The project team reviewed and organized the data to identify the major themes and topics of concern received from stakeholders. Common themes heard from the public included:

- Support for the overall project
- Support for specific alignments and the Hollywood Bowl Design Option
- Concerns regarding the proposed removal of historic structures at the Hollywood/Highland Station, where the K Line would connect to the existing B Line
- Concerns regarding tunneling under historic residential properties within Mid-City communities, specifically Lafayette Square and Wellington Square
- Concerns with “overengineering” (due to including high number of crossovers at stations, which increase project costs)
- Support for an accelerated construction timeline

## SECTION 2: DRAFT EIR PUBLIC HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

On July 23, 2024, the KNE Draft EIR was released for a 45-day public comment period, from July 23, 2024 to September 5, 2024. To address community concerns and respond to a request for additional time for public comment by Supervisor Holly Mitchell, the public comment period was extended to September 20, 2024, increasing the public comment period to a total of 60 days. Metro used multiple strategies to notify the public of the Draft EIR's availability, including in-person and virtual meetings with local stakeholders, information tables at community events, social media posts, advertisements in local newspapers (English and Spanish), and project email blasts.

During the Draft EIR public comment period, Metro participated in local community events and hosted public meetings and hearings to solicit feedback from community members and stakeholders. These meetings and hearings were hosted to collect public input on the content and findings of the Draft EIR, which can then inform refinements to the project as well as responses to comments in the Final EIR. Separately, public meetings were hosted by Metro with local communities to inform and address concerns about the project.

The Draft EIR and supporting technical reports were made available online at Metro's project website at [www.metro.net/kne/](http://www.metro.net/kne/). Hard copies of the Draft EIR (with electronic copies of the supporting technical reports) were made available for public review at the following libraries, which are all located within the project area or along the existing K Line:

- Metro Headquarters, Dorothy Peyton Gray Transportation Library, One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012
- Baldwin Hills Branch Library, 2906 S La Brea Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90016
- Hyde Park Miriam Matthews Branch Library, 2205 W Florence Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90043
- Angeles Mesa Branch Library, 2700 W 52nd Street, Los Angeles, CA 90043
- View Park Bebe Moore Campbell Library, 2854 W 54th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90043
- Washington Irving Branch Library, 4117 W Washington Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90018
- Jefferson - Vassie D. Wright Memorial Branch Library, 2211 W Jefferson Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90018
- Fairfax Branch Library, 161 S Gardner Street, Los Angeles, CA 90036
- Will & Ariel Durant Branch Library, 7140 W Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90046
- Frances Howard Goldwyn Hollywood Regional Branch, 1623 Ivar Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90028
- West Hollywood Library, 625 N San Vicente Boulevard, West Hollywood, CA 90069
- Russian Language Public Library, 7362 Santa Monica Boulevard, West Hollywood, CA 90046
- Margaret Herrick Library, 333 S La Cienega Boulevard, Beverly Hills, CA 90211
- Inglewood Public Library, 101 W Manchester Boulevard, Inglewood, CA 90301

## 2.1 DRAFT EIR PUBLIC HEARINGS

In mid-August 2024, three public hearings (two in-person hearings and one virtual hearing) were held during the public comment period at locations along the project alignments to ensure public accessibility and to collect as much community input as possible. A court reporter was present at each hearing to transcribe the proceedings. Spanish language translation was available at every hearing and Russian language translation was available at Hearing #2 (in-person) and Hearing #3 (virtual). Responses to comments and questions made at the hearings will be formally provided in the Final EIR. Refer to Table 1 for a summary of the three public hearing dates, times, and locations.

**TABLE 1. PUBLIC REVIEW HEARINGS**

DETAILS	HEARING 1	HEARING 2	HEARING 3
Date	Saturday, August 10, 2024	Tuesday, August 13, 2024	Thursday, August 15, 2024
Time	10 a.m. – 12 p.m.	6 p.m. – 8 p.m.	12 p.m. – 1 p.m.
Location	Susan Miller Dorsey Senior High School 3537 Farmdale Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90016	Pan Pacific Park Recreation Center 7600 Beverly Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90036	Virtual via Zoom
Number of Attendees	70	97	151
Number of Submissions Received <sup>1</sup>	18 (14 verbal, 4 written)	36 (32 verbal, 4 written)	143 (38 verbal, 105 virtual chat)

<sup>1</sup> Each person who spoke, or provided written, video, or audio input, is considered a single commenter providing one submission. Each submission has been reviewed and divided into multiple “comments” as appropriate for responses in the Final EIR. Therefore, there may be multiple topics and multiple responses within each submission.

## 2.2 SEPTEMBER 4TH MID-CITY COMMUNITY MEETING

Metro hosted an additional public meeting during the Draft EIR comment period with residents of Lafayette Square, Wellington Square, and Victoria Park, three historic neighborhoods in the southern segment of the project vicinity whose residents voiced concerns regarding the proposed alignment beneath their homes (Table 2). The public meeting was held to address the communities’ specific concerns and answer questions about the project’s characteristics, history, and tunneling methods. A copy of the presentation and meeting materials were posted to the project website (<https://metro.net/kne>) following the meeting.

**TABLE 2. MID-CITY COMMUNITY MEETING**

DETAILS	MID-CITY COMMUNITY MEETING
Date	Thursday, September 4, 2024
Time	6 p.m. – 8 p.m.
Location	Nate Holden Performing Arts Center, 4718 W. Washington Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90016
Number of Attendees	270
Number of Submissions Received	43 (33 verbal, 6 written, 2 audio, 2 video)



## SECTION 3: DRAFT EIR PUBLIC COMMENT DATA RESULTS

---

### 3.1 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SUBMISSIONS

During the public comment period for the Draft EIR, members of the public and project stakeholders had the opportunity to provide input on issues related to the project. As noted above, a total of 1,333 submissions were received on the Draft EIR during the public comment period. Each person or party who spoke, or provided written, video, or audio input, is considered a single commenter providing one submission. Each submission has been reviewed and divided into multiple “comments” as appropriate for responses in the Final EIR. Therefore, there may be multiple topics and multiple responses within each submission.

- *Commenters* are individuals or groups who provided input during the public comment period
- *Submissions* are whole letters, emails, verbal testimony during public meetings, voicemails, video submissions, virtual meeting chats, and written comment cards from public outreach events that were submitted by the public or stakeholders on the Draft EIR
- *Comments* are subsets of the submissions that may include one or more topics identified in the Draft EIR; they can be as short as one sentence or as long as a paragraph or more

This memorandum focuses on summarizing the submissions received on the Draft EIR. The unique comments that comprise each submission will be identified in the Final EIR along with responses provided for each comment.

The number of submissions received by method of commenting is presented in Table 3. The types of commenters are presented in Table 4. When a submission was received in duplicate from the same individual, with the identical content, that submission was only counted once.

**TABLE 3. NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BY SUBMISSION FORMAT**

FORMAT RECEIVED	NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED
<b>Email or Letter Submission</b>	<b>1,063</b>
<b>Voicemail</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Verbal</b>	<b>117</b>
Public Hearing #1 (In-Person)	14
Public Hearing #2 (In-Person)	32
Public Hearing #3 (Virtual)	38
September 4 Mid-City Community Meeting	33
<b>Written (Comment Cards)</b>	<b>14</b>
Public Hearing #1 (In-Person)	4
Public Hearing #2 (In-Person)	4
CicLAvia Outreach Event	3
September 4 Mid-City Community Meeting (Handwritten)	6
<b>Virtual Chat (Public Hearing #3 only)</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Audio and Video Comments</b>	<b>4</b>
September 4 Mid-City Community Meeting Audio Comments	2
September 4 Mid-City Community Meeting Video Comments	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,333</b>

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

**TABLE 4. COUNT OF COMMENTER TYPES**

TYPE OF COMMENTER	NUMBER <sup>1</sup>
Elected Officials	9
Agencies	8
Organizations	32
Businesses	2
Individuals	1,275
Tribes	0

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

<sup>1</sup> Commenter types do not add up to 1,333 as several elected officials and organizations submitted multiple distinct letters, though each of those only counted once as a commenter.

### 3.2 SUBMISSIONS BY AFFILIATION

Table 5 lists the elected officials, agencies, and organizations that Metro received submissions from during the Draft EIR public comment period (July 23, 2024 to September 20, 2024). Some organizations provided multiple submissions, but the organization was only counted once below.

**TABLE 5. ORGANIZATIONS AND ELECTED OFFICIALS THAT COMMENTED ON THE DRAFT EIR**

ELECTED OFFICIALS	AGENCIES	ORGANIZATIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congressman Adam Schiff, 30<sup>th</sup> Congressional District</li> <li>• Assemblymember Rick Chavez Zbur, 51<sup>st</sup> Assembly District</li> <li>• State Senator Ben Allen, 24<sup>th</sup> District</li> <li>• Supervisor Holly Mitchell, Los Angeles County, 2<sup>nd</sup> District</li> <li>• Councilmember Hugo Soto-Martinez, City of Los Angeles, 13<sup>th</sup> District</li> <li>• Councilmember Heather Hutt, City of Los Angeles, 10<sup>th</sup> District</li> <li>• Mayor John Erickson, City of West Hollywood</li> <li>• Mayor James Butts, City of Inglewood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Department of Transportation</li> <li>• California Public Utilities Commission</li> <li>• City of West Hollywood</li> <li>• Los Angeles County Department of Recreation and Parks and LA Philharmonic</li> <li>• Los Angeles Department of Transportation</li> <li>• Los Angeles Department of Water and Power</li> <li>• Los Angeles Unified School District</li> <li>• Westside Cities Council of Governments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16<sup>th</sup> Place Neighborhood Association</li> <li>• American Institute of Architects Los Angeles</li> <li>• Art Deco Society of Los Angeles</li> <li>• Carthay Circle Neighborhood Association</li> <li>• Cedars-Sinai Medical Center</li> <li>• Citizens Preserving Venice</li> <li>• Crenshaw Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>• Franklin Corridor Communities</li> <li>• Friends of Historic Miracle Mile</li> <li>• Friends of the Green Line</li> <li>• Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council</li> <li>• Hollywood Heights Association</li> <li>• Hollywood Heritage</li> <li>• Hollywood United Methodist Church</li> <li>• Inglewood Board of Realtors</li> <li>• Lafayette Square Neighborhood Assn. Greater Los Angeles Realtors</li> <li>• LAX Coastal Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>• League of Women Voters Los Angeles</li> <li>• Los Angeles City Historical Society</li> <li>• Los Angeles Conservancy</li> <li>• Los Angeles Historic Theatre Foundation</li> <li>• Los Angeles LGBT Center</li> <li>• Move LA</li> <li>• Sierra Club, Angeles Chapter</li> <li>• Spaulding Square Neighborhood Assn.</li> <li>• Streets For All</li> <li>• The Transit Coalition</li> <li>• Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>• Transportation Communications Union/IAM Local 1315</li> <li>• United Neighborhoods of the Historic Arlington Heights, West Adams and Jefferson Park Communities Neighborhood Council</li> <li>• West Adams Heritage Association</li> </ul>

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

Table 6 shows the key issues raised by these stakeholders, categorized into the following topics: Project Support, Alignment Preference, Hollywood/Highland Preservation, Mid-City Concerns, Agency Coordination, and Other (topics noted below).

**TABLE 6. KEY STAKEHOLDER DRAFT EIR COMMENT TOPICS**

COMMENTER	MAJOR TOPICS <sup>1</sup>
<b>ELECTED OFFICIALS</b>	
Congressman Adam Schiff, 30 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
Assemblymember Rick Chavez Zbur, 51 <sup>st</sup> Assembly District	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
State Senator Ben Allen, 24 <sup>th</sup> District	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
Supervisor Holly Mitchell, Los Angeles County, 2 <sup>nd</sup> District (Metro Board Director)	Mid-City Concerns, Other (Request to Extend Comment Period)
Councilmember Hugo Soto-Martinez, City of Los Angeles, 13 <sup>th</sup> District	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
Councilmember Heather Hutt, City of Los Angeles, 10 <sup>th</sup> District	Mid-City Concerns (Alignment Preference Under Public Right-of-Way, Tunneling Concerns)
Mayor John Erickson, City of West Hollywood	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
Mayor James Butts, City of Inglewood (Metro Board Director)	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
<b>AGENCIES</b>	
California Department of Transportation	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax and Fairfax Alignment Preference, Agency Coordination, Other (Hollywood Bowl Design Option Support, Junction Box Design)
California Public Utilities Commission	Agency Coordination
City of West Hollywood	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference, Agency Coordination, Other (Ridership Methodology Questions, Sheriff Station Relocation, First/Last Mile Planning, Paleontological Resources, Cultural Resources, Biological Resources, Transportation)
Los Angeles County Department of Recreation and Parks and LA Philharmonic	Project Support, Other (Hollywood Bowl Design Option Support, Hollywood Bowl Parking)
Los Angeles Department of Transportation	Project Support, Other (Project Acceleration, Job Access Analysis)
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	Agency Coordination
Los Angeles Unified School District	Agency Coordination, Other (Construction Effects on Schools)
Westside Cities Council of Governments	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
<b>ORGANIZATIONS</b>	
16 <sup>th</sup> Place Neighborhood Association	Mid-City Concerns
American Institute of Architects Los Angeles	Project Support
Art Deco Society of Los Angeles	Project Support, Hollywood/Highland Preservation
Carthay Circle Neighborhood Association	Other (Request for Information)
Cedars-Sinai Medical Center	Project Support, Other (Potential Effects on Facilities and Operations)
Citizens Preserving Venice	Hollywood/Highland Preservation
Crenshaw Chamber of Commerce	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
Franklin Corridor Communities	Hollywood/Highland Preservation

COMMENTS	MAJOR TOPICS <sup>1</sup>
Friends of Historic Miracle Mile	Hollywood/Highland Preservation
Friends of the Green Line	Project Support, La Brea Alignment Preference
Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council	Other (Design of Wilshire/La Brea Station)
Greater Los Angeles Realtors	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference, Other (Hollywood Bowl and Expo/Crenshaw Station Design; Construction Effects on Businesses)
Hollywood Heights Association	Hollywood/Highland Preservation
Hollywood Heritage	Hollywood/Highland Preservation
Hollywood United Methodist Church	Other (Seismic Concerns during Tunneling)
Inglewood Board of Realtors	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
Lafayette Square Neighborhood Association	Mid-City Concerns
LAX Coastal Chamber of Commerce	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
League of Women Voters Los Angeles	Project Support, Fairfax and La Brea Alignment Preference
Los Angeles City Historical Society	Hollywood/Highland Preservation
Los Angeles Conservancy	Hollywood/Highland Preservation, Other (Santa Palm Carwash)
Los Angeles Historic Theatre Foundation	Hollywood/Highland Preservation
Los Angeles LGBT Center	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
Move LA	Project Support
Sierra Club, Angeles Chapter	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference, Other (Groundwater Concerns; Crossover Design)
Spaulding Square Neighborhood Association	Hollywood/Highland Preservation
Streets For All	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference, Other (Hollywood Bowl Design Option Support)
The Transit Coalition	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
Transportation Communications Union/IAM Local 1315	Project Support, San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment Preference
United Neighborhoods of the Historic Arlington Heights, West Adams and Jefferson Park Communities Neighborhood Council	Mid-City Concerns, Other (Consultation, Traffic, Vibration, Upzoning)
West Adams Heritage Association	Mid-City Concerns, Hollywood/Highland Preservation, Other (Consultation)

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

<sup>1</sup> Major topics include the following: Project Support, Alignment Preference (any of the three Draft EIR alignments and the Hollywood Bowl Design Option), Hollywood/Highland (preservation of historic resources), Mid-City Concerns (effects on neighborhoods), Agency Coordination, and Other (all other Draft EIR technical and procedural comments).

Among submissions from elected officials, agencies, and organizations, the following list shows how many included each of the six major topic categories identified in Table 6 (Project Support, Alignment Preference, Hollywood/Highland, Mid-City, Agency Coordination, and Other):

- **Project Support:** 6 Elected Officials, 5 Agencies, 16 Organizations
- **Alignment Preference:** 6 Elected Officials, 3 Agencies, 12 Organizations
- **Hollywood/Highland Concerns:** 11 Organizations
- **Mid-City Concerns:** 2 Elected Official, 4 Organizations

- **Agency Coordination:** 5 Agencies
- **Other:** 1 Elected Official, 5 Agencies, 10 Organizations

### 3.3 DRAFT EIR SUBMISSION THEMES

This section presents a distillation of the most prevalent types of comments and themes of all submissions received on the Draft EIR, based on counts of written submissions and topics heard during public hearings and meetings. Metro received many comments in support of the project and preferences on specific alignment options, outlined in Table 7. In addition, Metro received comments on different topics or themes, outlined in Table 8. The threshold for considering a theme as “prevalent” was 50 submissions or greater. Although one submission could have repeated keywords or multiple topics within it, mention of a particular theme was only counted once per submission. In addition, the sum of the submission counts below does not represent the total number of submissions received on the Draft EIR. For example, a submission counted for the “Tunneling” theme could also be counted under the “Mid-City historic residential communities” theme depending on the content of comments in that submission. The tables differentiate between submission topics received from Mid-City communities where specific issues were raised and those submission topics received from outside Mid-City.

#### 3.3.1 PROJECT SUPPORT AND ALIGNMENT PREFERENCE

Table 7 shows the breakdown of submissions received that were related to overall project support and specific alignment preference.

**TABLE 7. NUMBER OF KEY SUBMISSIONS WITH PROJECT SUPPORT/OPOSITION AND ALIGNMENT PREFERENCE**

SUBMISSION THEME	TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS	TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED FROM MID-CITY HISTORIC RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES <sup>3</sup>	TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED FROM OTHER COMMUNITIES
Project Support	489	15	474
For San Vicente–Fairfax	282	5	277
For Fairfax	63	2	61
For La Brea	63	2	61
For Hollywood Bowl Design Option	168	2	166
For High Frequency Bus Alternative <sup>2</sup>	14	3	11
Opposition to Mid-City Alignment (E Line to Midtown Crossing)	138	117	21
Project Opposition (No Project Alternative) <sup>1</sup>	20	3	17

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

<sup>1</sup> Project Opposition was included in the counts even though fewer than 50 submissions were received to provide a contrast with the Project Support category. This category represents opposition to the entire project, and not those comments that oppose a specific alignment.

<sup>2</sup> “For High Frequency Bus Alternative” was included in the counts even though fewer than 50 submissions were received to provide a contrast with support for the other alignments.

<sup>3</sup> Represents commenters who self-identified as Mid-City residents in their submissions, as well as others who raised concerns relevant to Mid-City without self-identifying as residents.

### 3.3.1.1 PROJECT SUPPORT

As shown in Table 7 above, 489 submissions expressed general support for the project (“Project Support”). Any submission that expressed preference for a specific alignment was coded as “Support Project” in addition to the comment code for the respective alignment(s). Recurring reasons for project support include the following:

- Access to major destinations, entertainment, arts, and commerce
- Access to jobs/easier commute
- Better access to the rest of the Metro transit system
- Generally supportive of public transit
- Good for environment
- Access to Hollywood Bowl
- Alternative to cars
- Traffic reduction
- Increased Metro system ridership

### 3.3.1.2 ALIGNMENT SUPPORT

#### **Number of submissions with support for one or more alignments: 357**

There were 357 submissions received in support of one of the three alignments presented in the Draft EIR. Of the 357 submissions expressing support for a particular alignment, the San Vicente–Fairfax Alignment received 282 submissions of support (79% of all alignment support submissions), while the Fairfax Alignment and La Brea Alignment received 63 (18%) and 63 (18%) submissions showing support, respectively.

The following four subsections identify key submission themes associated with support of the alignments and the Hollywood Bowl Design Option.

#### FOR SAN VICENTE-FAIRFAX ALIGNMENT

##### **Number of submissions: 282**

Many of those expressing support for the San Vicente–Fairfax Alignment included the following reasons:

- Projected highest ridership of alignments studied
- A route that would serve multiple popular destinations and employment centers in the project area, including Museum Row, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, and nightlife in West Hollywood

#### FOR FAIRFAX ALIGNMENT

##### **Number of submissions: 63**

Many of those expressing support for the Fairfax Alignment included the following reasons:

- A more direct transit connection between Metro E, D, and B Lines, compared to the longer San Vicente–Fairfax Alignment
- A route that would serve multiple popular destinations and employment centers, including Museum Row and the Original Farmers Market and the Grove
- A balance between a relatively direct transit connection and serving more regional destinations

### FOR LA BREA ALIGNMENT

#### **Number of submissions: 63**

Many of those expressing support for the La Brea Alignment included the following reasons:

- A route that would provide the fastest, most direct connection between Metro E, D, and B Lines
- A shorter alignment with fewer stations would be quicker and less expensive to construct

### FOR HOLLYWOOD BOWL DESIGN OPTION

#### **Number of submissions: 168**

Supporters of the Hollywood Bowl Design Option noted the following reasons:

- Improvement to high traffic congestion during Hollywood Bowl events
- Difficulty accessing the Hollywood Bowl by other non-auto means (walking, bicycling, other public transit, etc.)

### 3.3.1.3 OPPOSITION TO MID-CITY ALIGNMENT

#### **Number of submissions: 138**

Residents of historic Mid-City neighborhoods, particularly Lafayette Square and Wellington Square, provided written and email comments expressing opposition specifically to the tunnel alignment passing beneath their neighborhood and properties, between the proposed Crenshaw/Adams Station and Midtown Crossing Station. Their reasons for opposition focused on several similar concerns about the environmental process and the project alignment:

- Insufficient public outreach to/notification of residents in the Lafayette Square and Wellington Square communities, lack of notification regarding the alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard
- Concerns about potential damage to historic homes due to vibration, ground settlement, groundwater levels, and seismic risk resulting from construction and operation of the project
- Concerns about potential reduction of property values

Metro has engaged with community members of Mid-City neighborhoods to discuss their issues of concern since the Draft EIR was published. Metro completed additional technical analysis in Summer and Fall 2025, as the alignment in Mid-City is common to all three alignment alternatives and would be part of the initial phase of project implementation.

### 3.3.1.4 PROJECT OPPOSITION

This category represents opposition to the entire project, and not those comments that oppose a specific alignment but generally support the project if the alignment were located elsewhere. Only 20 submissions expressed opposition to the overall project. Reasons included suggestions that existing transit is adequate and the project would be too costly and would take too long to build, as well as concerns about crime on the Metro systems and increased risks associated with earthquakes.

### 3.3.2 KEY THEMES

Table 8 provides the ten key Draft EIR submission themes that received the most input from the public, in order of the number of submissions received on each topic. The loss of historic buildings at the proposed Hollywood/Highland Station location received the highest number of submissions. Issues related to Mid-City historical residential communities, including Lafayette Square and Wellington Square, received the second highest number of submissions.

**TABLE 8. NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED PER KEY THEME**

KEY SUBMISSION THEME	TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS	TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED FROM MID-CITY HISTORIC RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES	TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED FROM OTHER COMMUNITIES
Removal of Historic Buildings at Hollywood/Highland	399	1	398
Mid-City Historic Residential Communities	252	252	0
Tunneling <sup>1</sup>	148	127	21
Public Outreach and Noticing	137	111	26
Noise and Vibration	105	90	15
Geology and Soils	92	82	10
Property Values	77	70	7
Project Cost	79	17	63
Project Schedule	50	0	50
Overengineering/Crossovers	74	5	69

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

<sup>1</sup> The Tunneling category incorporates general concerns regarding tunneling, which could include settlement, noise and vibration, seismic risk, groundwater, etc.

#### 3.3.2.1 REMOVAL OF HISTORIC STRUCTURES AT HOLLYWOOD/HIGHLAND STATION

##### Number of submissions: 399 (1 from Mid-City communities)

There were 399 submissions from individuals and local historic preservation groups related to potential removal of up to four historic buildings at Hollywood Boulevard and Highland Avenue, identified in the Draft EIR as potentially impacted properties, to construct a new station entrance to connect the K Line to

the B Line. The historic buildings are contributing resources to the Hollywood Boulevard Commercial and Entertainment District, which is a historic district listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

- 6806 Hollywood Boulevard
- Rexall Drug Store, Lee Drug Company (6800 Hollywood Boulevard)
- Bank of America (6780 Hollywood Boulevard)
- Hollywood Theater (6766 Hollywood Boulevard)

While many of these submissions did not directly indicate opposition to the project, their comments included:

- Suggestions to adapt or reuse the facades of the current historic buildings to integrate into the proposed new station entrances
- Analysis of a “preservation alternative”, in order to avoid removal of the historic resources. However, the preservation alternative was generally not defined
- Requests to minimize removal of historic buildings and concerns that removal of any of these historic buildings would impact the integrity of the designated historic district, which is located along Hollywood Boulevard between El Cerrito Place to the west and Argyle Avenue to the east

### 3.3.2.2 MID-CITY HISTORIC RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES

#### **Number of submissions: 252 (all from Mid-City communities)**

Residents of the Mid-City historic residential neighborhoods, including Lafayette Square (a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone [HPOZ]) and Wellington Square, expressed concerns about tunnel construction activities and project operation under older homes in historic neighborhoods, and potential other effects to property rights and historic designation status as a City of Los Angeles HPOZ.

- Concerns about potential damage to historic residences due to tunneling, including:
  - ▶ Potential for vibration-related damage to homes
  - ▶ Concerns over structural damage due to ground settlement and increased risk during seismic events (i.e., earthquakes)
  - ▶ Potential to encounter previously unidentified water sources and methane gas pockets that could damage homes or foundations
- Concerns about lack of community engagement and awareness of the project and changes to alignments between the beginning of scoping and the Draft EIR publication, and requests for additional engagement and exploration of alignment options that could minimize tunneling below homes
- Concerns regarding loss of access to grocery stores due to the Ralphs removal for construction of the proposed Midtown Crossing Station
- Request to analyze more alternatives that do not pass beneath Mid-City neighborhoods
- Concerns regarding Lafayette Square neighborhood/HPOZ status in the Draft EIR; several Lafayette Square residents felt that the analysis ignored their neighborhood, or that their HPOZ designation warranted special consideration regarding underground transit projects

### 3.3.2.3 TUNNELING

**Number of submissions: 148 (127 from Mid-City communities)**

The “Tunneling” theme included submissions that specifically used the word tunneling (or similar words such as boring or drilling), without necessarily identifying specific tunneling concerns. Most (85%) of the tunneling submissions came from Mid-City communities. Concerns regarding tunneling, when identified, include location of the tunnels beneath private properties, tunneling safety, noise and vibration, settlement, seismicity, methane gas, groundwater and other geotechnical considerations.

### 3.3.2.4 PUBLIC OUTREACH AND NOTICING

**Number of submissions: 137 (111 from Mid-City communities)**

Commenters expressed concerns regarding a perception of insufficient public outreach and engagement during the Draft EIR public comment period, particularly to the Lafayette Square and Wellington Square neighborhoods:

- Lack of awareness of the project’s status within the Lafayette Square and Wellington Square neighborhoods and lack of consultation during the planning process on alignments studied in the Draft EIR
- Failure to notify or engage certain local organizations that may have relevance to the project, such as the Lafayette Square and Wellington Square Neighborhood Associations, West Adams Heritage Association, Art Deco Society of Los Angeles, and Cultural Heritage Commission

### 3.3.2.5 NOISE AND VIBRATION

**Number of submissions: 105 (90 from Mid-City communities)**

Commenters expressed concerns about vibration from TBM use and train operations that could potentially result in damage to homes and cause human annoyance:

- Potential vibrations from TBM use during project construction and train pass-bys during operation could create vibration effects that could cause disruptions at the surface
- Potential structural impacts or other damage to homes where TBMs and trains pass directly under residences

### 3.3.2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

**Number of submissions: 92 (82 from Mid-City communities)**

Commenters expressed concerns regarding seismic risks and soil instability in areas where TBMs would operate to construct the tunnel alignment:

- Tunneling in a seismically active area
- Potential for soil settlement and unanticipated ground movement under historic homes that may have more fragile foundations or fewer seismic retrofitting improvements

### 3.3.2.7 PROPERTY VALUES

**Number of submissions: 77 (70 from Mid-City communities)**

Submissions under this theme expressed concerns regarding the potential for decreases in property values for residences located above the proposed tunnel alignment. The vast majority of submissions received under this theme were from Mid-City residents, though a few were either from West Hollywood or from unspecified locations. Specifically, commenters were concerned that Metro’s purchase of subsurface easements under each affected property would lower the property value. Other concerns include:

- Any homeowners whose properties would have a tunnel underneath would be required to disclose that to potential buyers
- The loss of generational wealth previously acquired by homeowners in the neighborhood, as a result of the proposed tunnel alignment

### 3.3.2.8 PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE

**Number of submissions for Project Cost: 79 (17 from Mid-City communities) and Schedule: 50 (0 from Mid-City communities)**

Submissions regarding schedule and cost/funding reflected the following issues:

- Expressed a desire for construction to begin and be completed sooner than currently programmed
- Requested that Metro identify funds to expedite construction and operation of the project and called for the City of West Hollywood and City of Los Angeles to form an Enhanced Infrastructure Funding District (EIFD) to raise funds for project construction

Comments regarding project cost from Mid-City communities were primarily concerned with the cost difference between the Draft EIR alignment and the alignment under Crenshaw Boulevard. There were no comments associated with project schedule from Mid-City communities.

### 3.3.2.9 OVERENGINEERING/CROSSOVERS

**Number of submissions: 74 (5 from Mid-City communities)**

Submissions under this theme expressed concerns regarding “over-engineering” of the project, which were received after a local transit advocate posted a YouTube video on the project design, primarily concerned about the station footprint and rail crossovers included in the advanced conceptual engineering drawings presented with the Draft EIR. Comments received on this topic included:

- Suggestions to reduce the size of station boxes and the size and number of crossovers
- Some commenters expressed that they did not think crossovers are necessary at every station and that their lengths should be reduced to be more in line with other Metro light rail lines
- Commenters also stated that large crossovers would unnecessarily inflate the cost of the project

### 3.3.2.10 ADDITIONAL TOPICS IDENTIFIED

In addition to the themes listed above, which generally appeared in at least 50 submissions, there were other comment categories that appeared in multiple submissions but did not reach the threshold for identification as a “theme.” These topics included the following:

- Plan for future rail and bus connections: Desire for connections to more transit opportunities/stations, or for more than one of the alignments to be built
- Safety on trains and in stations: Concerns about crime and the presence of homeless populations on the trains, in stations, and in surrounding areas
- Availability of restrooms: A group of commenters supported having restrooms in transit stations
- Consider different station locations: Commenters suggested station locations that were not identified in the Draft EIR; while many alternate station locations were suggested, common locations included Beverly/Fairfax, San Vicente/La Cienega, and an unspecified location farther north in Burbank

## SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WITH MID-CITY COMMUNITIES

---

Following the close of the Draft EIR public comment period and in response to comments raised by residents of historic Mid-City neighborhoods, in October 2024 the Metro Board authorized additional technical analysis and community engagement to address concerns regarding the tunnel alignment in Mid-City. This alignment is common to all three alignment alternatives studied and would be implemented as part of the first phase of the project.

In August 2025, Metro published three technical reports to respond to the common questions and concerns: Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis, Tunnel Safety Report, and Property Considerations Summary.<sup>1</sup> In addition, Metro published Tunneling Safety Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and Property Considerations FAQs, which condensed the information provided in the longer Tunnel Safety Report and Property Considerations Summary, respectively. Between Summer and Fall 2025, Metro held four community meetings to share the findings:

- Meetings focused on Mid-City Alignment Analysis and Property Considerations Summary:
  - ▶ In-person meeting on August 23, 2025, 9 a.m. – 12 p.m.
  - ▶ Virtual meeting on August 26, 2025, 12 p.m. – 2 p.m.
- Meetings focused on Tunnel Safety Report:
  - ▶ Virtual meeting on October 1, 2025, 12 p.m. – 2 p.m.
  - ▶ In-person meeting on October 4, 2025, 9 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Refer to Metro’s *Summary of 2025 Community Engagement* report for a detailed description of outreach activities.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis, Tunnel Safety Report, and Property Considerations Summary are available for download at [https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/77p64ve9aljgc2sofdlpp/AB7\\_s20Rs0bbpCXXO6Cifuo?rlkey=m922ulvqno3yiyazosozh5xmj&e=1&st=68eolm7e&dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/77p64ve9aljgc2sofdlpp/AB7_s20Rs0bbpCXXO6Cifuo?rlkey=m922ulvqno3yiyazosozh5xmj&e=1&st=68eolm7e&dl=0).

# APPENDIX A SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS DURING 2021 PUBLIC SCOPING FOR EIR

---

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the public scoping period was published on April 15, 2021, and extended through May 28, 2021, for a 45-day public review period for preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The NOP extended an invitation for public participation in the EIR scoping process and announced scheduled NOP scoping meetings. To notify the public and stakeholders of the NOP's availability, Metro posted meeting notices on the project's website, sent email blasts to the project's stakeholder database, and distributed approximately 130,000 notices to communities along the project corridor through social media advertisements, newspaper advertisements, and targeted outreach to specific stakeholder groups.

Over the 45-day scoping period, Metro held three virtual scoping meetings, in late April and early May 2021 (April 29, May 6, and May 8, 2021), to provide an overview of the project and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, and to receive comments on the scope of environmental analysis from agencies, stakeholders, and the public.

Major themes heard from the public during the NOP scoping period included:

- Support for specific alignments
- Higher costs associated with the San Vicente-Fairfax Alignment
- Importance of a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio in decision-making
- Importance of travel time in decision-making
- Urgency for project acceleration
- Preferences for underground construction
- Concerns for green space preservation
- Concerns regarding property devaluation
- Expectations for well-placed transit hubs
- Increasing job accessibility
- Environmental benefits
- Concerns regarding traffic issues during construction
- Concerns regarding the project's operational impacts



# Community Engagement Summary 2025

On October 31, 2024, Metro’s Board of Directors approved additional funding for contract modifications to support further environmental analyses, engineering, and community engagement. This action followed the close of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) public comment period on September 20, 2024. During that period, many residents of historic Mid-City neighborhoods voiced concerns about the proposed tunnel alignment beneath residential areas. Community members referenced past injustices, such as the displacement of Black families during construction of the Santa Monica Freeway (I-10) and requested a more inclusive planning process before any alignment was selected.

Key concerns included potential effects to older homes, property values, and issues related to tunneling such as noise, vibration, settlement, seismic safety, groundwater, and oil rights. Residents expressed a preference for tunnels to travel beneath public streets rather than private properties and called for Metro to explore alternate tunnel options that could reduce tunneling below historic neighborhoods. Residents also requested more engagement as part of the decision-making process prior to selecting a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA).

Responding to these concerns, Metro conducted additional technical analyses and developed new outreach strategies to solicit input from Mid-City leaders on how to better engage residents and share findings from new studies. In August 2025, Metro published three technical reports and two Frequently Asked Question (FAQs) documents addressing key concerns that historic Mid-City residents raised during the Draft EIR public comment period.

The technical reports and FAQs included:

- > **Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis:** evaluated community-suggested alternate tunnel alignments to reduce subsurface tunnel easements beneath homes while maintaining transit service quality.
- > **Tunnel Safety Report:** outlined tunnel construction methods, safety standards, and case studies where tunneling has occurred below historic homes and sensitive uses. The report addresses key concerns related to tunneling including settlement, seismic safety, groundwater, vibration, and oil wells.
- > **Property Considerations Report:** examined questions about property values, rights, and easements, supported by a literature review and local case examples.
- > **Tunnel Safety FAQ:** summarized common questions about tunnel construction and operations.
- > **Property Considerations FAQ:** explained real estate topics such as subsurface easements and potential effects on property value.

Metro worked closely with Mid-City community leaders to develop an engagement plan for releasing the findings. Leaders advised on how to break down technical information for all residents. Their input shaped a phased outreach approach: previewing content with trusted Mid-City leaders, coordinating notifications, and hosting community meetings for historic Mid-City residents at large.

Building on this plan, the project team carried out a multi-pronged outreach effort throughout the summer and fall. Activities included tabling at community events, hosting additional coffee conversations with Mid-City leaders, and distributing updated materials like a refreshed Story Map, fact sheet, and FAQs. Metro also created a Mid-City specific stakeholder list for targeted updates and meeting invitations.

In August, Metro held two community meetings to present the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis findings, followed by two more meetings in October on Tunnel Safety (requested by community leaders) to give residents more time to review and discuss the technical content.

## Engagement Overview

Between January and October 2025, Metro conducted extensive outreach to inform and engage stakeholders on the K Line Northern Extension. The effort included five (5) briefings with key stakeholders, eleven (11) tabling events, three (3) coffee conversations with Mid-City leaders, four (4) community update meetings, and an optional tunnel safety tour.

Activity Type	Dates	Participants
Five (5) Stakeholder Briefings	January 2025 - July 2025	Westside/Central Service Council, Technical Advisory Committee, Cedars-Sinai, LA County Sheriff, Council District 10: Office of Councilwoman Heather Hutt
Eleven (11) Tabling Events	February 2025 - September 2025	1,460+ engaged
Three (3) Coffee Conversations	March 2025 - August 2025	24 unique participants (not including Metro staff)
Four (4) Community Update Meetings	August 2025 - October 2025	234+ participants (not including Metro staff)

### CicLAvia West Adams meets University Park – February 23, 2025

Tabling for this outreach period began with the CicLAvia—West Adams Meets University Park event on February 23, 2025. During the event, the team engaged more than 170 participants. Residents expressed enthusiasm for the project while also raising questions about project timing, potential route alternatives, funding, and opportunities to stay involved. Twenty attendees signed up to receive project updates.



### Coffee Conversation #1 – March 5, 2025

On March 5, 2025, Metro hosted its first Coffee Conversation with Mid-City community leaders from historic neighborhoods, including Lafayette Square and Wellington Square, as well as members of the Mid-City Neighborhood Council, with Director Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker and her staff also in attendance, at Palm Grove Social (4660 W Washington Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90016). The session brought together more than six participants and aimed to provide updates on the additional studies underway, share context on the Measure M funding timeline, and reestablish a productive working relationship with neighborhood stakeholders. Participants asked about tunneling depth, why the project will be entirely underground, and whether above-ground options were previously studied. Other questions focused on property values, land use around stations, and examples from other cities with older homes. Metro staff discussed how demographic data informs ridership modeling and highlighted business support programs such as Eat Shop Play and the Business Interruption Fund. The meeting concluded with Metro’s commitment to return in the coming months to share study findings and next steps.



## CicLAvia Koreatown Meets Hollywood – April 5, 2025

On April 5, 2025, the team participated in CicLAvia—Koreatown Meets Hollywood, engaging with more than 200 attendees, including residents and visitors. Conversations focused on the project’s long timeline, with many participants expressing interest in community meetings and ways to stay involved. Thirty-one attendees signed up to receive project updates.

## Original Farmers Market – May 26, 2025

On May 26, 2025, the team staffed a table during peak visiting hours at the Original Farmers Market (6333 W 3rd St, Los Angeles, CA 90036), engaging with more than 50 residents, employees, and visitors. Many attendees learned about the project for the first time and expressed curiosity about tunneling methods and alignment options. Fourteen participants signed up to receive project updates.



## West Hollywood Pride Festival – May 31 & June 1, 2025

On May 31 and June 1, 2025, the team participated in the City of West Hollywood’s Pride Festival, where more than 650 visitors stopped by the KNE booth. Attendees expressed strong overall support for the project, with many asking about the Locally Preferred Alternative timeline and showing particular interest in the San Vicente–Fairfax alignment. Sixty-two participants signed up to receive project updates.

## Markets at Leimert Park – June 21, 2025

On June 21, 2025, during the Markets at Leimert Park Grand Opening, the outreach team engaged with more than 25 attendees. Most conversations centered on the upcoming LAX Transit Center, while several visitors collected project materials to learn about the KNE Project for the first time. Two participants signed up to receive project updates.

## Mid-City Arts and Music Festival – June 28, 2025

On June 28, 2025, the team engaged with more than 225 visitors at the Mid-City Arts and Music Festival. Attendees raised questions about funding, project timelines, and potential effects from tunneling, while Lafayette Square residents voiced both support and opposition. Thirty-nine participants signed up to receive project updates, and all were added to the Mid-City–specific stakeholder list in preparation for the August Community Update Meetings.



## Coffee Conversation #2 – July 23, 2025

The second Coffee Conversation took place at Palm Grove Social and brought together 14 participants, including Mid-City leaders from Lafayette Square, Wellington Square, and the Mid-City Neighborhood Council, along with Supervisor Holly Mitchell, Director Dupont-Walker, and staff representing Supervisor Mitchell, Supervisor Lindsey Horvath, and Director Dupont-Walker (who was also representing City of Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass).

Metro provided an update on ongoing work to address issues raised at previous meetings, including tunneling, potential changes to properties, tunnel easements, and property values. Metro also shared current outreach plans and solicited additional input from attendees on the best ways to share information in the historic Mid-City communities. Attendees emphasized the need for Metro to provide plain-language materials that allow for meaningful public input. Mid-City leaders also recommended scheduling meetings before Labor Day, expanding outreach beyond the immediate neighborhoods, offering walking tours of proposed tunneling routes, and inviting testimony from residents currently living above existing Metro tunnels.

## Coffee Conversation #3 – August 5, 2025

Held at Palm Grove Social, the third Coffee Conversation brought together 18 participants, including Mid-City leaders from Lafayette Square, Wellington Square, and the Mid-City Neighborhood Council, as well as Director Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker and staff representing Supervisor Holly Mitchell,

Supervisor Lindsey Horvath, and Director Dupont-Walker. Residents from Lafayette Road, Victoria Park, and the 16th Place Neighborhood Association were also invited to join. The conversation focused on alignment analysis, property considerations, and tunnel safety. Metro staff previewed findings from the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis, explained how tunnel boring machines (TBMs) operate, and described the real estate process for underground easements. Residents raised questions about tunnel width, construction phasing, potential business displacement at locations such as Midtown Crossing, tunnel safety, and whether the new alignment options, specifically the West Boulevard option, could be adjusted further to avoid homes in Wellington Square. Residents shared concerns on property values and oil rights. Suggestions included breaking the technical findings from the alignment analysis and tunnel safety into separate community meetings, as well as creating executive summaries of technical reports, and conducting walking tours to make the information more tangible. Metro staff committed to incorporating community feedback into the upcoming August meetings and beyond.



## **Wellington Square Farmer’s Market – August 10, 2025**

To build awareness of the August meetings, the team coordinated with the Wellington Square Farmer’s Market manager to table at the market in the weeks leading up to the August meetings. On August 10, 2025, the outreach team engaged with more than 50 local residents at the Wellington Square Farmer’s Market. Many raised concerns about tunneling beneath Wellington Square and Lafayette Square, while others asked about nearby projects such as the LAX Transit Center. Seventeen participants signed up to receive project updates.

## **Wellington Square Farmer’s Market – August 17, 2025**

On August 17, 2025, the team returned to Wellington Square for follow-up tabling, engaging with more than 30 residents. Conversations again centered on tunneling, the upcoming community meetings, and the LAX Transit Center.

Members of the Lafayette Square Association assisted with flyer distribution. Eight participants signed up to receive project updates.

## **Mid-City Community Update Meeting #1 – August 23, 2025**

On August 23, 2025, the team held its first Mid-City Community Update Meeting at Johnnie L. Cochran Jr. Middle School, drawing more than 85 attendees, including residents of Lafayette Square, Wellington Square, Victoria Park, the 16th Place Neighborhood Association, the Mid-City Neighborhood Council, and other nearby historic neighborhoods, along with Director Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker and staff from the offices of Supervisor Holly Mitchell, Supervisor Lindsey Horvath, and City of Los Angeles Council District 10: Office of Councilwoman Heather Hutt. The two-hour meeting started with an open house, followed by a presentation and question-and-answer session, then returned to the open house for additional conversations with technical staff.

Metro presented findings from the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis and Property Considerations Reports, highlighting efforts to reduce subsurface easements in historic neighborhoods. During this meeting, staff shared new information regarding potential adjustments to the West Blvd alignment option based on comments received during the coffee conversation. Discussion focused on concerns about tunneling beneath historic homes, with participants emphasizing that older houses in Mid-City are more vulnerable than newer construction in areas such as Westwood. Attendees raised questions about the safety of tunnels below homes and concerns of cracks, vibration, earthquakes, CEQA compliance, and property protections. Additional concerns included potential business closures at Midtown Crossing (a proposed construction staging site), particularly Ralphs and CVS, as well as questions about compensation, construction timelines, and insurance. A total of 32 comments were received.





## Mid-City Community Update Meeting #2 – August 26, 2025

The second meeting was held virtually via Zoom on August 26, 2025, with 58 attendees, including staff from the offices of Supervisor Holly Mitchell, Supervisor Lindsey Horvath, and Los Angeles City Council District 10: Office of Councilwoman Heather Hutt, as well as Mayor Chelsea Byers and Councilmember John Erickson from the City of West Hollywood. This meeting featured the same presentation as the in-person session held on August 23, followed by a question-and-answer segment. Participants shared comments on transparency and decision-making, and technical questions about potential alignment options, tunnel depths, and tunnel boring machine (TBM) launch sites. Participants asked who would select the final alignment, how public input would influence that decision, and when Metro expected to announce next steps. Property impacts remained a central concern, with questions about the difference between subsurface easements and eminent domain, as well as potential business and parking impacts at Midtown Crossing. Several participants also raised concerns about relocation, compensation, and project timing. A total of 39 comments were received.

## Comment Themes

The following table summarizes the 12 major themes used to categorize public comments received during the four community meetings.

Theme	Description
Tunnel Safety and Engineering	Tunneling impacts, vibration, seismic, and structural safety
Property Impacts and Rights	Easements, compensation, valuation, and homeowner rights
Construction and Staging	Duration, disruption, traffic, staging areas
Alignment Options	Route selection, travel time, ridership, cost tradeoffs
Funding and Project Costs	Cost and funding sources
Historic and Community Equity	Cultural/historic sensitivity, fairness, displacement
Business and Retail Impacts	Impacts to local businesses and retail continuity
Environmental Review and Compliance	CEQA and other environmental approvals
Project Process and Timeline	Schedule, decision-making, and phasing
Public Engagement and Communication	Outreach, transparency, and access to info
Public Safety and Accessibility	Pedestrian and community safety, accessibility
Economic and Workforce Considerations	Jobs, employment, and local economy

Key Themes from August<sup>1</sup>  
Community Meetings




Chart 1. The chart reflects comments from both August meetings.  
(1) Some comments addressed multiple themes and were counted under more than one category.

## Wellington Square Farmers Market – September 21, 2025

To support outreach for the upcoming October Tunnel Safety Meetings, the team returned to the Wellington Square Farmers Market on September 21 to share updates and distribute flyers for the October Tunnel Safety meetings. More than 30 individuals stopped by to ask questions or engage in conversation, not including several residents who had spoken with the team during previous visits. Most attendees were already aware of the upcoming meetings and mentioned having received a flyer. Six people requested to be added to the Mid-City stakeholder list. The most common questions focused on whether tunneling is still happening, which route will be selected, what comes next, and what Metro has done since the last meeting.

## Wellington Square Farmers Market – September 28, 2025

Building on ongoing engagement in Mid-City, the team returned to the Wellington Square Farmers Market on September 28 to provide information and answer questions about the upcoming Tunnel Safety Meetings. More than 34 individuals stopped by to engage in conversation, not including several residents previously spoken with during earlier visits. Conversations focused on the purpose of the upcoming meetings, next steps for the project, and whether tunneling is still happening. Overall, six people requested to be added to the Mid-City stakeholder list; and attendees expressed continued interest and awareness of upcoming events.

### Tunnel Safety Testimonials Video

In response to requests to hear from individuals who had experienced tunneling on Metro projects, Metro prepared a [video of testimonials](#) from residents, business owners and agency leaders who had experienced tunneling on past Metro projects, which was shared during the October Tunnel Safety meetings.

### Addendum to Mid-City Alignment Analysis Report on West Blvd Alignment Option

In response to community feedback, Metro published the [West Boulevard Addendum](#) to the [Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis Report](#). The report provides a summary of additional analysis of two variations of the West Boulevard option to shift the tunnel alignment closer to West Blvd to minimize potential easements below Wellington Square, as requested during the August 5th coffee conversation with Mid-City leaders.

### Responding to Community Input

The testimonial video and West Blvd Addendum reflect two of the many ways Metro incorporated community feedback into the project. Metro also hosted the October meetings, which included a guided tour, in direct response to feedback from Mid-City leaders. Based on additional community input, meetings were scheduled at times most convenient for residents, outreach was expanded through e-blasts, flyers, and mailers, additional time was dedicated for questions and answers, one Metro staff member was designated as a consistent point of contact, and executive summaries of technical reports were developed to make information more accessible to the public.

## Mid-City Tunnel Safety Community Meeting #1 – October 1, 2025

Metro held the first Tunnel Safety Meeting virtually on Zoom with 53 participants, including staff from the offices of Supervisor Holly Mitchell, Supervisor Lindsey Horvath, Los Angeles City Council District 5: Office of Councilwoman Katy Yaroslavsky, Los Angeles City Council District 10: Office of Councilwoman Heather Hutt, and Mayor Chelsea Byers of the City of West Hollywood. The roughly 90-minute session included a 30-minute presentation followed by about 60 minutes of open discussion.

The presentation shared key findings from the Tunnel Safety Report and explained how tunnels are designed, built, and monitored to keep nearby structures safe. Metro staff also showed a short testimonial video featuring representatives from the Petersen Museum, Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza, and the Higgins Building, who described their experiences with Metro tunneling beneath their properties and the agency’s communication throughout construction. The presentation highlighted examples from Los Angeles and other cities and explained how pressurized Tunnel Boring Machines (TBMs) and continuous monitoring help prevent vibration or settlement issues. During the Q&A, participants asked questions about vibrations, soil conditions, seismic safety, and how tunneling compares to cut-and-cover construction. A total of 19 comments were received.

## Mid-City Tunnel Safety Community Meeting #2 and Tour – October 4, 2025

The second community meeting on tunnel safety was held on Saturday, October 4, 2025, in person at the Petersen Museum from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m., drawing approximately 38 participants, including Supervisor Holly Mitchell, Director Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, and staff from the offices of Supervisor Holly Mitchell, Supervisor Lindsey Horvath, and Los Angeles City Council District 8: Office of Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson. The event featured an open house, presentation, Q&A session, and screening of the project’s testimonial video. The presentation outlined Metro’s tunneling experience, described the operation of TBMs, and highlighted findings from the Tunnel Safety Report on vibration, settlement, groundwater, and seismic safety. Case studies from both Metro projects and other major transit systems were shared to illustrate successful tunneling beneath historic structures without damage. Attendees raised questions about seismic safety, accessibility, station spacing, and construction methods, and offered feedback on public communication, video content, and first/last mile connections. A total of 21 comments were received.

Key Themes from October<sup>2</sup> Community Meetings




Chart 2. The chart reflects comments from both October meetings.

(2) Some comments addressed multiple themes and were counted under more than one category.

Following the meeting, Metro hosted an optional Tunnel Safety Tour from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. for 34 participants, including Supervisor Holly Mitchell, Director Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, and staff from the offices of Supervisor Holly Mitchell, Supervisor Lindsey Horvath, Los Angeles City Council District 8: Office of Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson, and Director Dupont-Walker (also representing City of Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass). Due to the significant number of RSVPs received in the week leading up to the meeting, Metro staff secured an additional bus to accommodate all participants who had been placed on a waiting list. The tour was organized to address community concerns about tunneling under historic homes by showcasing existing conditions along the D Line. Stops included the Wilshire/Fairfax Station and the Westwood and Westholme area, where attendees viewed single-family homes and apartments with subsurface tunnel easements. The final stop was the Westwood/UCLA Station site, where Metro engineers explained tunneling instrumentation, safety monitoring, and coordination with nearby stakeholders. Several attendees requested additional tours once the D Line Westwood/Wilshire Station is complete.



## Notification Efforts

Metro used direct and digital notifications to inform Mid-City residents about upcoming meetings and new material releases.

### Direct Notifications:

> **Flyers #1:** On August 2, 2025, Metro distributed more than 4,000 flyers across the Mid-City area, targeting residences in Lafayette Square, Wellington Square, and nearby neighborhoods to promote the upcoming August community meetings on the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis and Property Considerations.



## Community Open Houses – You’re Invited!

*We’re planning rail to bridge divides.*

The Metro K Line Northern Extension (KNE) would link to the Metro C, E, D, and B Lines, connecting four major rail lines and six of the highest ridership bus lines in LA County. This project creates a vital north-south link by extending the K Line underground from the Metro E Line to West Adams, Mid-City, Miracle Mile, West Hollywood, and Hollywood.

Metro is evaluating additional potential alignment options in Mid-City based on concerns raised during the Draft EIR public comment period from residents of historic Mid-City communities about the proposed tunnel alignment, tunnel safety, and property impacts. In response, Metro is developing three technical reports: a Tunnel Safety Report, a Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis Report, and a Property Values and Rights Summary to address these issues and help guide next steps.

To share these findings and continue the conversation, Metro is hosting two open houses. These meetings are an opportunity for community members to learn more, ask questions, and provide feedback that will help shape the project’s next steps.

### The meeting will include:

- > A presentation on the latest findings
- > Opportunities to ask questions
- > Direct engagement with Metro staff

### In-Person Open House

**Saturday, August 23, 2025 | 10:00am-12:00pm**

Johnnie L. Cochran Jr. Middle School

4066 Johnnie Cochran Vista, Los Angeles, CA 90019

**Registration for in-person meeting is optional:** [bit.ly/KNEo823](http://bit.ly/KNEo823)

To submit questions in advance, email [klinienorth@metro.net](mailto:klinenorth@metro.net)

### Virtual Open House

**Tuesday, August 26, 2025 | 12:00pm-1:30pm**

**Webinar Link:** Please register at [bit.ly/KNEo826](http://bit.ly/KNEo826)

**Webinar ID:** 823 0085 0001

**Call-in:** 669 900 6833

### Or Register Here

for the Virtual Open House by scanning the QR code:



Translation and other ADA accommodations available by calling 213.418.3093 at least 72 hours in advance.



### CONTACT US

213.418.3093

[klinienorth@metro.net](mailto:klinienorth@metro.net)

[metro.net/KNE](http://metro.net/KNE)

PHOTOS COURTESY OF METRO

> **Mailers:** On August 6, 2025, Seda’s Printing mailed notices to 4,732 residences and businesses within the notification area, focusing on Lafayette Square, Wellington Square, and surrounding neighborhoods to raise awareness of the August community meetings focused on the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis and Property Considerations Reports.



> **Social Media Toolkit #1:** On August 8, 2025, Metro shared a Social Media Toolkit with Mid-City leaders, neighborhood associations, and community partners. The toolkit included ready-to-post graphics and sample language to help amplify information about the August community meetings on the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis and Property Considerations.

- > **Social Media Toolkit #2:** On September 9, 2025, Metro shared an updated Social Media Toolkit with Mid-City leaders, neighborhood associations, and community partners. The toolkit included ready-to-post graphics and sample messages to help amplify information about the October community meetings on Tunnel Safety.
- > **Flyers #2:** On September 19, 2025, Walking Man distributed 4,750 flyers across the Mid-City area, targeting households and businesses in Lafayette Square, Wellington Square, and surrounding neighborhoods to promote the October Tunnel Safety Meetings.



The e-blasts announced the Mid-City community meetings, linked to new technical materials including the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis, Tunnel Safety, and Property Considerations, highlighted the updated Story Map and FAQs, and later reminded stakeholders about the October Tunnel Safety meetings (October 1 virtual and October 4 in person with an optional tour). They encouraged the public to submit comments by October 31 and shared findings on the West Boulevard option, which evaluated design refinements to reduce subsurface easements. Each message emphasized transparency, accessibility, and continued opportunities for public participation to inform Metro staff’s recommendation to the Board on the Locally Preferred Alternative.

## Direct Outreach with Mid-City Leaders

In addition to the above, Metro Community Relations staff corresponded regularly with Mid-City leaders on email and by phone to ensure receipt of any new information.

## Tunnel Safety Meetings – You’re Invited!

The Metro K Line Northern Extension (KNE) will create a much-needed rail connection, connecting to Metro’s C, E, D, and B rail lines and six of the highest ridership bus lines in LA County. This project creates a vital north-south link by extending the K Line underground from the Metro E Line to West Adams, Mid-City, Miracle Mile, West Hollywood, and Hollywood.

Metro evaluated potential alignment options in Mid-City based on concerns raised during the Draft EIR (DEIR) public comment period from residents of historic Mid-City communities about the proposed tunnel alignment, tunnel safety, and property impacts. In response, Metro has released three technical reports: a Tunnel Safety Report, a Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis Report, and a Property Considerations Summary to address these issues and help guide next steps.

To continue the conversation, Metro will host two community meetings focused on the historic Mid-City area. At these meetings, Metro staff will share the findings of the Tunnel Safety Report and respond to questions raised during the DEIR process. Topics will include various tunnel safety concerns during construction and operations, including case studies for older homes and historic properties. The presentation will cover community concerns on ground settlement, groundwater levels, earthquake safety, oil wells, noise, and vibration. These meetings are intended to allow residents to hear directly from Metro, ask questions, and stay informed as the project progresses.

### The meeting will include:

- > A presentation on findings from the Tunnel Safety Report
- > Optional Tunnel Safety tour\* on October 4th with Metro experts on hand to answer questions

### Virtual Tunnel Safety Meeting

**Wednesday, October 1, 2025**  
 Presentation | 12:00-1:30pm  
**Webinar Link:** Register at [bit.ly/KNE1001](https://bit.ly/KNE1001)  
**Webinar ID:** 867 1116 1922  
**Call-in:** 669.444.9171



### In-Person Tunnel Safety Meeting and Tunnel Safety Tour (Registration for Tour Required)

**Saturday, October 4, 2025**  
 Presentation | 9:00-11:00am  
 Tour\* | 11:00am-1:00pm  
**Petersen Automotive Museum**  
 6060 Wilshire Bl Los Angeles, CA 90036  
 Please register at [bit.ly/KNE1004](https://bit.ly/KNE1004)  
 \*Tour limited to first 35 registrants.



Translation and other ADA accommodations available by calling 213.418.3093 at least 72 hours in advance.



### CONTACT US

213.418.3093  
[Klinenorth@metro.net](mailto:Klinenorth@metro.net)  
[metro.net/KNE](https://metro.net/KNE)

© 2025 METRO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## Digital Notifications (E-Blasts):

To support targeted outreach, Metro developed a stakeholder list focused specifically on Mid-City residents. The list was initially built using sign-ins from the Nate Holden meeting held in Fall 2024, following the Draft EIR public hearings. Each time outreach was conducted in the Mid-City area, additional contacts were added to this list. Between July 9 and October 30, Metro distributed 16 e-blasts to provide updates on meeting logistics and share access to technical materials, including the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis, Property Considerations, and Tunnel Safety Reports and FAQs.

**K LINE NORTHERN EXTENSION (KNE)**

**Metro Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)**

In July 2025, the Board adopted a CBA framework for evaluating project alternatives, including assessing the regional economic impacts of investment and identifying benefits relative to the costs of investment. The CBA includes two components – Weighted Benefits Analysis and Benefit-Cost Ratio – as described below. The CBA was used to evaluate the three full alignments studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the K Line Northern Extension (Project) prepared by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) – the San Vicente-Fairfax, Fairfax and La Brea alignments, excluding the Hollywood Bowl extension (Figure 1). The evaluation is based on data collected during the environmental review process, including capital cost estimates and ridership data.

*Figure 1. Map of Alignments Studied in the Draft EIR*



**Weighted Benefits Analysis:** A points-based evaluation comparing the alignments across five goals that are weighted per Metro-adopted CBA methodology. This considers relevant quantitative and qualitative performance indicators (KPIs) within each of the five goals that are scored relative to each other on a 7-point scale with seven being the highest/best performing.

The Weighted Benefits Analysis component of the CBA finds that the Project provides significant benefits locally and regionally for all alignment options. San Vicente-Fairfax performs best, followed by Fairfax, and then La Brea (Table 1). However, the spread between the highest and lowest total weighted score is small – only 0.5 points. This implies that the benefits across alternatives are relatively similar. This is because while San Vicente-Fairfax scored highest in some goal categories, La Brea scored highest in others. Meanwhile, Fairfax scored in the middle. Even after weighting, this led to a balancing out of cumulative scores and a relatively small difference in in how each alignment performed.

Table 1. Weighted Benefits Analysis Scores

Goals	San Vicente-Fairfax	Fairfax	La Brea	Key Performance Indicators Evaluated
	Average Score by Goal (Unweighted)			
<b>Mobility &amp; Accessibility</b> (Weight: 40%)	6.7 / 7	6.1 / 7	5.5 / 7	Daily trips, new trips, trips per new station, number of residents near proposed stations, travel time savings, direct connections to transit, change in transit mode share, Equity Focused Communities (EFC) population near proposed stations, daily project trips made by low-income individuals, travel time, EFC travel time savings, number of nearby educational facilities
<b>Safety &amp; Health</b> (Weight: 15%)	7 / 7	6.1 / 7	5.3 / 7	Number of nearby parks and recreational facilities, improved transit access to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, improved transit access to Pan Pacific Park, number of grocery stores nearby, average walk score of new stations, existing bike infrastructure near proposed stations, proximity to Healthy Places Index (HPI) less healthy conditions
<b>Environmental Sustainability</b> (Weight: 15%)	5.2 / 7	5.8 / 7	6 / 7	Number of significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources, VMT reduction, changes in emissions due to Project, construction-related energy consumption, number of Recognized Environmental Concern sites nearby, proximity to CalEnviroScreen 4.0 communities
<b>Operational Sustainability &amp; Delivery</b> (Weight: 15%)	3.1 / 7	4.1 / 7	4.8 / 7	Estimated project costs, potential to obtain Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) funding from City of West Hollywood, geotechnical considerations (fault crossings, liquefaction zones), oil and gas well encounters, anticipated utility conflicts, construction approach, construction duration, transfer station feasibility and design complexity, number of subsurface easements, potential full and partial acquisitions required, West Hollywood Sheriff site relocation need, anticipated construction disruption to traffic and parking, need for NEPA
<b>Economic Impact</b> (Weight: 15%)	6.6 / 7	5.8 / 7	5.2 / 7	Number of jobs near proposed stations, number of affordable housing near proposed stations, construction jobs generated, planned developments near proposed stations, number of businesses permanently affected, Transit Oriented Community capacity score, estimated regional jobs created, estimated regional economic output
<b>Total Weighted Score*</b>	<b>5.9 / 7</b>	<b>5.7 / 7</b>	<b>5.4 / 7</b>	<b>All alternatives offer significant benefits. San-Vicente Fairfax performs best.</b>

\*7-point scale with 7 as the highest/best performing

**Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR):** Compares monetized costs of the Project, including capital and operating costs, to the monetized benefits of the Project, including travel time savings, traffic safety, active transportation health benefits, and regional economic benefits over a 20-year operating period. A higher ratio of benefits to costs means that there are more monetized benefits for every dollar spent. However, it is important to note that many costs and benefits cannot be monetized. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 2.

*Table 2. Benefit-Cost Ratio Findings*

Alignment	Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)*
San Vicente-Fairfax	3.4
Fairfax	3.7
La Brea	3.7

*\* BCRs are unique to each project and not to be compared across projects, due to specific construction and operation years being considered, travel demand modeling years, and other factors.*

The BCR analysis assumes a 30-year construction period for San Vicente-Fairfax and 20 years for Fairfax and La Brea, with all alternatives starting construction in 2041 (Measure M schedule). Standard BCR methodology calculates benefits and costs in terms of today's purchasing power (present value). Although some alternatives generate higher total benefits in future years (measured in constant dollars), benefits that occur later are worth less in present value terms. As a result, the alternative with the largest future benefits is not always the alternative with the highest present value of benefits.

When calculating total benefits for each alignment, San Vicente-Fairfax presents the highest constant dollar value due to better-performing indicators like travel time savings, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) savings, new transit trips and project boardings when compared to Fairfax and La Brea. However, once total benefits are converted to present dollar value, Fairfax presents the highest total benefits, followed by San Vicente-Fairfax, then La Brea.

The Fairfax and La Brea alignments present the highest BCRs (both 3.7). In terms of present value, Fairfax has the highest monetized benefits, while La Brea has the lowest costs. Because these differences are proportional, the benefit-over-cost ratios end up being nearly identical. San Vicente-Fairfax has the lowest BCR (3.4) due to presenting less monetized benefits than Fairfax in present value terms, and the highest life cycle cost among all three alternatives.

Overall, the BCR analysis finds that all three alternatives offer significant benefits compared to costs. When all monetized benefits, including GDP benefits, are evaluated relative to costs, the Project is expected to produce between \$3.40 and \$3.70 in monetized benefits per dollar invested over a 20-year operating period.

Map of Staff Recommendation for LPA for K Line Northern Extension (KNE) Project



IOS = Initial Operating Segment



HOLLYWOOD

# Next stop: key rail connections.

K LINE NORTHERN EXTENSION

Metro Planning &  
Programming  
Committee  
March 18, 2026  
File ID: 2025-0846

# Recommendation

## CONSIDER:

APPROVING the San Vicente-Fairfax alignment evaluated in the 2024 Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the K Line Northern Extension (KNE) Project contingent upon the formation of an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) by the City of West Hollywood in coordination with Los Angeles County to provide additional local sources of funding (at least 25% of the capital cost estimate) per the Early Project Delivery Strategy with:

- an initial operating segment (IOS) from the Expo/Crenshaw Station at the E/K Line to Wilshire/Fairfax at the D Line,
- an adjusted tunnel alignment in Mid-City to continue to maximize use of public rights-of-way (ROW), to reduce subsurface easements, described as Crenshaw ROW: Option 2 in the Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis Report (2025),
- a commitment to work with the owner of the Midtown Crossing Shopping Center to preserve the opportunity to relocate the supermarket at an alternate location on acquired property adjacent to the construction site, prior to the start of construction, and
- a terminus station at the Hollywood Bowl.



# Draft EIR Alignment Options

Draft EIR evaluated the following:


- Light rail alignments to connect E Line to B Line
  - San Vicente-Fairfax – 9.7 miles with 9 stations
  - Fairfax – 7.9 miles with 7 stations
  - La Brea – 6.2 miles with 6 stations
  - Hollywood Bowl Optional Terminus
- Expansion of Division 16 Maintenance Yard to support light rail extension
- High Frequency Bus Alternative
- No Build Alternative



# Project Implementation Approach


Project would be constructed using Tunnel Boring Machines (TBMs) and implemented in sections.

- Initial section would connect to D Line at Wilshire Blvd
- 8-12 years estimated to construct each section
- Number of sections would vary based on alignment



# Comparison of Draft EIR Alignments


Comparison of Alignment Options	San Vicente Fairfax	Fairfax	La Brea
Tunnel Alignment Length	9.7 miles	7.9 miles	6.2 miles
Proposed Stations	9	7	6
Travel time E Line to B Line (Hollywood/Highland)	19 mins	15 mins	12 mins
Daily Project Trips	59,700	52,900	47,200
Daily Project Trips by Low-Income Riders	39,200	35,200	31,000
Daily Trips by New Riders	15,100	12,800	11,400
Daily Hours of User Benefits (Travel Savings)	18,800	15,700	13,800
Daily Reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	135,000	127,400	135,500
Daily Trips to D Line Station (at Fairfax or La Brea)	33,000	33,000	33,000
Daily Trips on Entire K Line (Torrance to Hollywood)	98,000	91,200	85,200
Projected residents w/in half-mile of stations 2045	131,500	106,800	94,200
Projected jobs w/in half-mile of stations 2045	125,700	75,200	56,200
Capital Cost Estimate 2023\$ (includes contingency)	\$14.85B	\$12.47B	\$10.99 B
Capital Cost Estimate in 2023\$ for IOS to D Line	\$4.67 B	\$4.67 B	\$4.45 B
Construction Implementation (# of sections)	3	2	2
Construction Duration (assumes 10 yrs per section)	30 year	20 years	20 years
Cost Benefit Analysis – Weighted Benefits (7-scale)	5.9/7	5.7/7	5.4/7
Cost Benefit Analysis – Benefit/Cost Ratio	3.4	3.7	3.7



# Alignments & Tunnel Route Concerns on Draft EIR

Project includes several segments where tunnels travel below homes and private properties to connect stations for fast, reliable service.

- Metro received concerns from Mid-City historic residential communities re lack of engagement, proposed tunnel route, safety of tunnels below older homes, and impacts to property values and businesses.
- Metro conducted survey of age of homes in Mid-City: oldest homes constructed between 1900-1910 and majority of homes constructed in the 1920s.





# Additional Technical Studies in Response to Concerns

In response to public comments and concerns on Draft EIR, Metro conducted additional research and analysis summarized in three reports published in August 2025:

- Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis
- Property Considerations
- Tunnel Safety Report

To help distill and share findings, Metro also prepared:

- Website Story Map
- Project FAQ
- Project Fact Sheet
- Technical Reports & FAQs



# Mid-City Alignment Options with Highest Support

## Draft EIR (Option 1)



## Crenshaw ROW (Option 2)




## West Blvd (Option 4, 4A, 4B)




Maps are not to scale

# Midtown Crossing Station Area Analysis



## Option 2, Staff Recommendation




- Maximizes access for riders and connections to street and bus transit centers
- Minimizes long-term impacts to property by locating station box along San Vicente Blvd
- Allows for greatest flexibility to relocate neighborhood supermarket



Underground (Permanent)	
	Station Platform
	Passageway Connection
	Station Box, Crossover, and Station Program
	Knock-Out Panel
Surface (Permanent)	
	Entrance at Street Level
Surface (Temporary)	
	Construction Staging Area
Subsurface	
	Subsurface Easement

# Additional Analysis on Tunnel Safety & Property Concerns

- Modern tunneling construction techniques are safe with pre-construction studies, use of advanced tunnel boring machines, mitigations and monitoring.
- Tunnels are proposed at depths of 40 to 120 feet below the surface in project area, and ~80 to 120 feet below Mid-City.
- At these depths, noise and vibration are estimated to be below threshold of damage to structures and human perception.
- Metro has successfully tunneled in similar ground conditions (e.g. gases, high groundwater) and depths with settlement below thresholds for damage to buildings above tunnels.
- Tunnel easements would not affect:
  - Property and structures above
  - Ability to remodel/develop property
  - Historic designation or zoning
  - Underground oil and mineral rights
  - Property values




# Additional Engagement Since January 2025

- 4 Coffee Conversation with Mid-City Leaders (March 2025-February 2026)
- 4 community meetings (August & October) with 234 Attendees
- 1 Tunnel Safety Tour with Community including Directors Mitchell and Dupont-Walker
- 13,000+ Notices
- [Tunnel Safety Testimonials Video](#)
- Stakeholder Briefings (e.g. TAC, Westside COG, LA County Sheriff, Cedars-Sinai)
- Briefings with Councilmember Heather Hutt's Office (CD10)
- Participation in 11 Pop-up Events
- Monthly briefings with Board staff representing project area
- Updates via Project Webpage, Mid-City Stakeholder Database, Social Media Toolkits




# Staff Recommendation



- **Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA):** San Vicente Fairfax Alignment contingent upon the formation of an EIFD by the City of West Hollywood in coordination with Los Angeles County to provide additional local source(s) of funding at least 25% of capital cost per Early Project Delivery Strategy
- **Initial Operating Segment (IOS)** to Wilshire/Fairfax at D Line
- **Crenshaw ROW in Mid-City** to reduce tunnel easements below historic residential neighborhoods (Option 2 in Mid-City Additional Alignment Analysis) with commitment to work with property owner at Midtown Shopping Center to preserve neighborhood grocery store in advance of construction at Midtown Crossing
- **Terminus at Hollywood Bowl** to connect people to regional cultural center and provide optimal TBM construction site

## Next Steps



- LPA selection is a necessary step in the planning process initiated under the Early Project Delivery framework for future planning, funding, and coordination purposes.
- LPA selection is not project approval.
- Further planning and construction remain subject to Board approval related to acceleration.