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

Agenda - Final

Wednesday, November 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
Holly J. Mitchell
Rex Richardson
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 not withstanding 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 call (213) 922-4600 between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. For riders with hearing or speech impairments, please use the California Relay Service 711.
Requests can also be sent to 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) 922-4600. Live Public Comment Instructions can also be translated if requested 72 hours in advance.

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://boardagendas.metro.net
For riders with hearing or speech impairments - Please use the California Relay Service 711
Board Clerk Email - 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 November 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 de Noviembre de 2026. Puedes unirte a la llamada 5 minutos antes del comienso 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

5. SUBJECT: LA RIVER PATH – LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (LPA) 2026-0638

RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the LA River Path project as Modified Option 2, an 8-mile path between Riverside Drive and Atlantic Boulevard evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR);

B. APPROVING an approximately 5.5-mile gap closure through two simultaneous Initial Operating Segments (IOS) - the IOS-north between Riverside Drive and Spring Street; and the IOS-South, between Sixth Street and Atlantic Boulevard; and

C. AUTHORIZING staff to work with the City of Los Angeles to bridge the 2.5 mile gap between IOS-north and IOS-south, to prioritize planned Class IV cycle tracks, in combination with the existing on-street bike lanes, which can serve as an interim connection until funding for the off-street river channel paths between Broadway/Spring Street and Sixth Street is secured.

Attachments:
Attachment A - June 2021 Metro Board Amendment
Attachment B - May 2026 Board Motion 46
Attachment C - DEIR Alternatives-Path Types
Attachment D - Draft EIR Executive Summary
Attachment E - Draft EIR Outreach Summary
Attachment F - LPA & IOS
Attachment G - LA River Path Project Cost-Benefit Analysis

(ALSO ON EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE)

6. SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM ANNUAL UPDATE - GATEWAY CITIES SUBREGION 2026-0726

RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING programming an additional $222,633,182 in Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 61), as shown in Attachment A; and

B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and/or amendments for approved projects.

Attachments: Attachment A - I-605 'Hot Spot' Interchange Imp. Prgm (Exp. Line 61) Proj. List
Attachment B - SB I-605 Beverly Interchange Improvements Project Map
Attachment C - WB SR-91- Alondra Blvd to Shoemaker Ave Imp. Proj. Map
Attachment D - SR-91 Central Ave to Acacia Ct Improvement Project Map
Presentation

7. SUBJECT: MEASURE M 10-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, METRICS, AND WEIGHTING 2026-0786

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE the project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics and weighting, for the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment (Attachment A).

Attachments: Attachment A - Project Evaluation Framework
Attachment B - Projects/Programs assessed and not assessed
Attachment C - SGV Forward
Presentation

(ALSO ON EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE)

8. SUBJECT: IMPROVING CONNECTIVITY AND RELIABILITY FOR THE EAST VALLEY METROLINK SYSTEM MOTION 2026-0872

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE Motion by Padilla and Bass that the Board direct the Chief Executive Officer to:

A. Prepare a First/Last Mile plan for the Sun Valley Metrolink Station with a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Vision study focused on the redevelopment potential of underutilized industrial parcels in Sun Valley and along the San Fernando Road industrial corridor, coordinated with the Brighton to Roxford Double Track Project;

B. Evaluate whether improvements identified for the former Sylmar Light Rail Transit station in the 2020 ESFV Light Rail Transit Project's First/Last Mile plan are applicable to the Sylmar Metrolink Station; based on the results of the Shared Right-of Way Study; and

C. Establish early coordination on the design and construction schedule of the Brighton to Roxford Double Track Project with the California High-Speed Rail Authority's Palmdale to Burbank selected alignment through Sun Valley. Develop recommendations that preserve design flexibility and experience for riders.

9. SUBJECT: COUNTYWIDE PLANNING MAJOR PROJECT STATUS REPORT 2026-0799

RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE status report on the Countywide Planning Major Project Status Report.

Attachments: Attachment A - Project Status Report

(CARRIED OVER FROM OCTOBER'S COMMITTEE CYCLE)

SUBJECT: GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT 2026-0826

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

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

File #: 2026-0638, **File Type:** Project **Agenda Number:** 5.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 18, 2026
EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 19, 2026

SUBJECT: LA RIVER PATH - LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (LPA)

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the LA River Path project as Modified Option 2, an 8-mile path between Riverside Drive and Atlantic Boulevard evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR);

B. APPROVING an approximately 5.5-mile gap closure through two simultaneous Initial Operating Segments (IOS) - the IOS-north between Riverside Drive and Spring Street; and the IOS-South, between Sixth Street and Atlantic Boulevard; and

C. AUTHORIZING staff to work with the City of Los Angeles to bridge the 2.5 mile gap between IOS-north and IOS-south, to prioritize planned Class IV cycle tracks, in combination with the existing on-street bike lanes, which can serve as an interim connection until funding for the off-street river channel paths between Broadway/Spring Street and Sixth Street is secured.

ISSUE

Metro published a Draft EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the LA River Path Project on December 18, 2025. The Board's action to approve the LPA and the two simultaneous IOSs is necessary to continue advancing the Project design for state and federal environmental clearance, which is required for obtaining the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) permit to build and operate the Project, and to allow Metro to support the LA River Governance Model Study (Governance Study). Selecting an LPA does not constitute approval of the project.

BACKGROUND

The Project is included in the 2016 Measure M Expenditure Plan as the LA River Waterway & System

Bike path, and in the Metro 2020 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) as the LA River Path - Central LA. At its May 2018 meeting, the Board authorized staff to advance the Project through design, environmental clearance, and construction, based on the findings from the prior 2016 Feasibility Study. Metro published a Draft EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the LA River Path Project on December 18, 2025.

The Project would close the longest remaining gap of the active transportation network along the LA River. This 8-mile segment between Elysian Valley in the City of Los Angeles and the City of Maywood poses an increased safety risk, as cyclists and pedestrians must use surface streets and busy intersections to traverse the existing network. By closing this gap through downtown Los Angeles and the City of Vernon, the Project would serve communities between the San Fernando Valley and the City of Long Beach, transforming how people travel across LA County. When complete, the Project would add to the existing 24-miles of active transportation network along the LA River, providing a seamless 32-mile traffic-separated active transportation facility.

Project History

Currently, 24 miles of non-continuous pedestrian and bicycle paths exist along the LA River. South of the Project, Los Angeles County opened the LA River Bicycle Path in 1983, a 17-mile route stretching from Maywood to Long Beach. Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LADPW) published the first LA River Master Plan in 1996, which was subsequently updated in 2022 to include the Project. North of the Project, the City of Los Angeles opened the Los Angeles River Greenway Trail in 1997 from Elysian Valley to Burbank.

In 2016, Measure M identified the LA River Waterway & System Bike Path in its expenditure plan, allocating $365 million (2015$) for its design, environmental clearance, and construction. Later rebranded as the LA River Path, the Project aims to create a safe, accessible pathway for pedestrians and cyclists and provide an alternative mode of transportation suitable for users of all ages and abilities, particularly for residents living within a 3-mile radius of the corridor.

At its September 2016 meeting, the Metro Board approved the LA River Bike Path Gap Closure Feasibility Study, which concluded that gap closure was viable.

Subsequently, at its September 2019 meeting, the Board received the LA River Path Conceptual Design Report (CDR), which incorporated significant public outreach findings and identified the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. The CDR studied a bottom-of-channel (BOC) alignment that was not recommended for advancement in the environmental studies. This path type would incur significant risk from seasonal flooding, would require the longest access ramps to get on and off the path, and would not be able to provide many of the amenities and features, such as direct path lighting, rest stations, landscaping, and security features, as the path would be underwater during rain events and for a period of time during and after flooding events. In typical rain events, water can surge to 3-6 feet deep at 24 mph within 24 hours. Based on the last 25 years of rain events and USACE’s recommendation of a 72-hour post-storm stand-down, a BOC alignment could be closed between 1.9 months during dry years and 5.6 months during wet years. Aside from the flood risk, a BOC path's visibility is greatly impaired when it is placed at the bottom of the river with banks at least 25 feet high and flanked by active railroads. Women weigh visibility heavily when choosing trails.

Studies of women trail users find that the feeling of being trapped or unable to exit quickly leads them to avoid routes they perceive as unsafe.

For these reasons, this alignment was not among the top three best-performing alternatives. The Board authorized the CEO to initiate the Draft EIR with the three best-performing alternatives: A, B, and C (Proposed Project, Option 1, and Option 2 in the Draft EIR). It also highlighted the design constraints to be further addressed in the Project area, including active freight and passenger rail abutting the river channel, utility towers, and bridges, some of which are designated as historic.

On November 18, 2021 <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2021-0556/>, in response to a June 2021 Metro Board Motion (Attachment A), the Board authorized staff to coordinate with the City and County of Los Angeles for ownership, operations, and maintenance of the Project, noting that Metro will not assume any financial responsibility for operating and maintaining the completed project. One of the biggest limitation cited in the response was Metro's insignificant share of right-of-way (ROW) ownership along the corridor. While the City of Los Angeles (including Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), and the County of Los Angeles (including the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD)) in total own approximately 80% of the ROW along the corridor, Metro ownership is less than 1% with the remaining 19% privately owned.

At its May 2026 meeting, the Board approved Motion 46 (Attachment B) by Directors Bass, Solis, Horvath, Hahn, and Padilla, which identified LACFCD to lead a LA River Governance Model Study, and directed the CEO or her designee to enter into all necessary agreements with the County of Los Angeles, LACFCD, and/or City of Los Angeles to carry out and finance the Governance Study, and directed Metro staff to collaborate with all relative stakeholders throughout the development and implementation of recommendations from the Governance study.

DISCUSSION

Decades before Measure M, the 1996 Los Angeles River Master Plan envisioned the five-mile Downtown corridor-stretching from the Arroyo Seco to Washington Boulevard-as a vital canvas for integrating urban flood control with community connections, aesthetic, and recreational revitalization.

The LA River Path advances that vision well beyond simple recreation. Entirely grade-separated from vehicular traffic, the path would offer a safe, multi-use transit corridor connecting commuters and visitors alike to key destinations throughout the urban core. Crucially, it would establish equitable mobility for historically underserved, transit-dependent communities along the river's east bank. By fusing safe recreational space for all ages and abilities with functional infrastructure, the project fundamentally reimagines mobility in Los Angeles.

The transformative impact of urban infrastructure is well illustrated by benchmark developments like the San Antonio River Walk and New York City's High Line. By surrounding its downtown waterway with a seamless network of winding pathways and bridges, San Antonio converted an urban river into a world-class destination that draws millions of visitors annually and drives significant economic growth. Similarly, New York's High Line reimagined a disused elevated rail line into a thriving linear park that empowers local communities through public programming while generating over $1.4 billion in tax revenue.

Environmental Review Process

On October 23, 2019, pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15082, Metro filed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Project Draft EIR, with the State of California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) State Clearinghouse (SCH) and the Los Angeles County Clerk. Metro staff initiated public scoping for the Draft EIR, with a 45-day scoping period ending on December 6, 2019, and holding four in-person scoping meetings. Multiple commenters expressed preference for a BOC alternative, claiming lower construction costs, minimal rain-related closures in LA, and enhanced safety due to clearances from railroad tracks and overhead power lines near Union Station.

Following public scoping, Metro prepared conceptual engineering (CE) drawings for project alignments and design options, including environmental analysis and technical studies on 18 environmental resources. On December 18, 2025, Metro released the Draft EIR for public review during a 47-day comment period that concluded on February 2, 2026. In addition to the Draft EIR, Metro published the Preliminary Capital Cost Estimate Summary, Conceptual Engineering Plan Set, and Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, available on the Project website at <https://www.metro.net/projects/lariverpath/>

Alternatives and Options Evaluated in the Draft EIR

The Draft EIR evaluated seven alternatives with design options. Five alternatives close the entire 8-mile gap from Riverside Drive to Atlantic Boulevard, with each beginning and ending on the west bank of the LA River (maps in Attachment C, Figures C-1 thru C-7). The remaining two alternatives would serve as partial gap closures. Additionally, as required by CEQA, a “No Project” alternative was also considered. Draft EIR Executive Summary (Attachment D) is included for reference. A BOC alternative was considered but not carried forward into the Draft EIR (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c)) due to significant concerns regarding safety, constructability, accessibility, and maintenance during periods of seasonal rains and flooding, as well as not meeting most of the project objectives.

All alternatives have two key design features:

- Path Types: elevated (path on structures where either an incised or top-of-bank (TOB) right of way is unavailable), incised (path is cut into the trapezoidal embankment), and TOB (path on the riverbank) (Attachment C, Figure C-8). However, each alternative varies in alignment, path length, number and locations of river crossings, number and locations of access points, and distribution of path types
- River Crossings: pedestrian/bike crossings between each bank of the river to provide equitable access to communities on both banks of the river.

The core path alignment of each alternative generally follows the LA River channel. All alternatives connect to communities on both banks and to major destinations directly or indirectly, such as LA State Historic Park (LASHP), Albion Park, Union Station, Sixth Street PARC, and Bandini-Soto Triangle. The shorter alternatives, while connecting to communities on both banks, do not connect to all destinations.

Attachment C, Table C-1, summarizes project elements and capital cost for each alternative.

Community and Stakeholder Engagement and Comments

Public notification for the release of the Draft EIR was conducted in accordance with CEQA requirements and included direct mail (approximately 15,000 bilingual postcards), flyer door-to-door distribution (approximately 48,000 flyers), transit rider intercepts (390 transit riders), three legal advertisement publications (Los Angeles Times, La Opinión, and Daily News), e-blasts (approximately 6,700 contacts via email), media advertisements, earned media, press releases, and advertisement on the project website. The Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR was filed with both the Los Angeles County Clerk and the California State Clearinghouse, including a Notice of Completion with the State Clearinghouse. The NOA was mailed to potentially affected government agencies, residents, tribal groups, and businesses at the start of the comment period to announce the availability of the Draft EIR and to invite participation in the four public hearings in January/February 2026.

During the 47-day public review period, Metro hosted three in-person and one virtual public hearings, during which the public could provide comments. Of the four public hearings, three were held on weekday evenings, and one on a weekend morning. The Draft EIR public review period included consultation with resource agencies, local, state, and federal agencies, cooperating and responsible agencies, including the USACE. In total, approximately 440 comment submissions (encompassing approximately 880 individual, delimited comments) were received through various methods, including oral and written comments at the Public Hearings, project email submissions, phone submissions, and online submissions. A high-level summary of the community engagement conducted and the Draft EIR comments received are provided in Attachment E.

Overall, about 315 of the 440 comment submissions (over 70%) expressed support for the Project, regardless of any alternative. This included support for a BOC alternative, which some favored, claiming that it could be faster and cheaper to build.
As stated earlier, Metro has considered the BOC alternative but did not advance it for study in the Draft EIR due to its failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, safety concerns from permitting agencies, hydrological functions, and maintenance. Additionally, about 90 comment submittals (about 21%) expressed explicit preference for a specific alternative in the Draft EIR, including Option 2, often citing direct access to LASHP and Downtown Los Angeles.

The remaining comments received addressed several non-environmental topics, including requests for additional design details, concerns about path safety, cost estimates, and the funding gap.

Metro received comment letters from six Responsible Agencies identified in the Draft EIR, as well as from 14 other agencies and stakeholders. Some specific comments received from these Responsible Agencies could further inform LPA selection, design refinement and/or additional study. These include:

- *City of Los Angeles:* Expressed support for an alternative that closes the existing 8-mile gap and provides access points to the EFCs. Expressed preference for TOB and incised path types over the elevated path type to minimize capital, operations, and maintenance costs.

Apprehensive of the BOC designs due to flood vulnerability and lighting/access constraints.

- *US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)*: Expressed concerns about a BOC proposal because it raises life safety concerns and may require additional access ramps. Noted that USACE will not assume additional Operations and Maintenance (O&M) responsibilities associated with the Project.
- *Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP):* Noted that the project owner is to be clearly identified and held solely responsible for all liability, operation, and maintenance. Noted that no access point on Main Street on the west bank through LADWP property will be allowed and emphasized minimum clearances to LADWP facilities and over existing access roads.

Staff Recommendation for LPA

Based on environmental findings from the Draft EIR and comments received from individuals and key agency stakeholders during the Draft EIR review period, staff recommends **Modified Option 2** as the LPA (Attachment F, Figure F-1), as it meets Project objectives most cost-effectively, accommodates community input on access locations along the corridor, and introduces no new environmental impacts.

- Project Objective - provides an alternative that caters to people of all ages and ability, provides direct access to major destinations, promotes equity by providing access on both banks, with more access to the EFCs on the east bank,
- Cost Effective - leverages an existing on-street Class IV segment, prioritizes top-of-bank (TOB) and incised paths over elevated structures where possible, and reduces river crossings
- Community Input - value engineered to respond to communities' concern for cost, provides two additional accesses to be cleared environmentally for implementation later, subject to future funding.

For details on Modified Option 2, see Attachment F.

Preliminary Cost Estimates and Funding

The preliminary capital cost estimate for Modified Option 2 is approximately $872 million (2025$) based on 15 percent design. The cost estimates are based on early engineering and are consistent with those developed and published during the circulation of the Draft EIR. It includes baseline construction costs in 2025$, including labor, materials, and professional services, a right-of-way administration cost at 4% of the baseline construction costs, and a contingency 40% to account for known and unknown project risks.

The cost estimate for Modified Option 2 is lower than the cost estimates for all five 8-mile alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR, which range between approximately $1.08 billion and $1.27 billion, depending on the alternative. Escalation to year of expenditure (YOE) was not included in the capital cost estimates and would be determined by a future funding plan and construction schedule.

The preliminary capital cost estimate for the LPA is $872 million, which exceeds approximately $433 million (escalated to 2025$ from 2015$) identified for the Project in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.

Preliminary estimates of annual O&M cost are between $1.3 million and $1.4 million. However, the O&M cost would have to be vetted and approved by the project's committed O&M entity(ies). As mentioned earlier in this report, the Board noted in 2021 that Metro will partner with the City, County, and Federal agencies with ownership and responsibility in the LA River corridor in regard to the overall management structure of the completed project, but will not assume any financial responsibility for operating and maintaining the completed project. This is based upon one of the biggest limitations for Metro - the insignificant share of right-of-way along the 8-mile corridor. While the City of Los Angeles (including Los Angeles Department of Water & Power) and the County of Los Angeles (including LA Flood Control) in total own approximately 80% of the right-of-way along the corridor, Metro ownership is less than 1%. Of the remaining 20%, most is held as private ownership. Hence, the permitting agencies other than USACE which has flood control jurisdiction over the river, will be the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles.

Further rationale for Metro not assuming responsibility for O&M is that at both its January 2026 and March 2026 meetings, the Board reviewed Metro's current financial position, including an overview of the near-term budget outlook, which identified that starting in FY28, the operational fiscal cliff forecasts a deficit from $0.9 billion to as much as $2.0 billion. Looking ahead, Metro projects a cumulative financial gap in the range of $3.6 to $5.2 billion by FY30. The gap is comprised of $4.3 billion for Metro Transit Operations & Maintenance (O&M) and $0.9 billion for Metro Transit Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Of the more than 130 different sources of funds available to Metro, less than 15 sources of funds are dedicated for mass transit operations. Consequentially, any O&M funding set aside for an active transportation project takes away from available funding for transit operations. As a result, the Board has adopted a foundational guiding principle to preserve essential services for addressing Metro's fiscal cliff.

Project Phasing and IOS

Based on available funding, Metro staff recommend advancing two simultaneous Initial Operating Segments (IOSs), each providing independent utility. The combined cost of these IOS segments is approximately $436 million, slightly exceeding the currently available Measure M funding of $433 million. As the project advances and reaches key milestones, such as certification of the Final EIR, staff will need to have commitments from County and/or City agencies to support in the development and lead the operations and maintenance of the project. Upon confirmation of these commitments, refinements to the scope including pursuing value engineering opportunities will require review and concurrence by the agencies assuming operations and maintenance of the project. These approvals are necessary while Metro is pursuing competitive Active Transportation Program grants at the state level and, if applicable, federal active transportation funding to close the remaining gap.

Attachment F, Table F-1, presents the cost and funding breakdown.

Project phasing enables incremental investment, allowing benefits to be realized with identified funds and enabling some of the Project's mobility benefits to be realized sooner. Metro staff recommends two simultaneous IOS segments, each with independent utility, extending the existing active

transportation network along the LA River and providing initial access to the many EFCs and key trip generators, including population centers, employment centers, and key destinations. These segments are:

- IOS-north: extend from the northern terminus of the Modified Option 2 at Riverside Drive to Spring Street and
- IOS-south: Modified Option 2 between Sixth Street and Atlantic Boulevard.

The IOS segments, shown in Attachment F, Figure F-2, collectively would include 7 access points, with 5 on the east bank, and 2 on the west bank. Combined, the IOSs would close approximately 5.5 miles of the 8-mile gap. The IOS segments are not expected to impact the USACE's LA River Ecosystem Restoration Project during its implementation. To bridge the gap between IOS-north and IOS-south, staff identified planned Class IV cycle tracks in the City of Los Angeles' 2035 Mobility Plan. Metro will work with the City of Los Angeles to prioritize, these planned Class IV cycle tracks, in combination with the existing on-street bike lanes, which can serve as an interim connection until funding for the off-street river channel paths (between Broadway/Spring Street and Sixth Street) is secured. This interim route will improve access to EFCs directly adjacent to the LPA, particularly in Lincoln Heights, Chinatown, and Boyle Heights.

Some of the potential interim corridors identified are:

1) Spring/Alameda Safety & Mobility Project - anticipated completion 2026-2027
2) Alameda Corridor (Spring to Sixth)
3) Cesar Chavez Corridor (Alameda to Mission)
4) First Corridor (Alameda to Boyle)
5) Main Corridor (LA River to Mission)
6) Mission Corridor (Cesar Chavez to Main)
7) Whittier Corridor (Sixth to Soto)
8) Soto Corridor (Whittier to First)

Metro Cost-Benefit Analysis

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 (WBA) and Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR).

The Project CBA, conducted in August 2026, evaluated six alternatives: Modified Option 2 (the staff-recommended LPA) and the five 8-mile alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. The WBA component of the CBA found that the Project provides significant benefits locally and regionally for all alternatives. Based on several qualitative and quantitative evaluation metrics, Modified Option 2 received a WBA score of 5.8 out of 7.0, which is comparable to the five 8-mile alternatives, which range from 5.8 to 6.0. All alternatives scored comparably with respect to path user demand, and connectivity to jobs, housing, amenities, public transit, and the existing and planned bicycle network. Under the WBA theme of Operational Sustainability & Delivery, Modified Option 2 scored the highest due to its greater cost-effectiveness and lower complexity in permitting and coordination with adjacent projects.

The BCR analysis found that Modified Option 2 performed best, with a BCR of 0.23. The BCR compares a project's total monetized costs against a set of calculated monetizable benefits. BCRs below 1 indicate that a project will cost more than the monetizable benefits it creates. It is important to note that not all benefits or costs are quantifiable or easily monetized, especially at a larger regional scale such as this case. Specifically, the BCR does not capture all social, safety, and network benefits. Hence, the BCR is presented alongside the WBA to provide more robust analysis of costs relative to benefits.

Modified Option 2 delivers comparable benefits at significantly lower construction costs (at least 20% lower) than the other five 8-mile alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. The recommended LPA has a BCR (0.23) nearly double that of the lowest-performing alternative (0.13). Modified Option 2 achieves these cost savings by minimizing expensive elevated structures and river crossings, and prioritizing the cost-effective incised, TOB, and on-street path types.

Additional details on the Project CBA are presented in Attachment G.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

By separating cyclists and pedestrians from vehicle traffic in a high-collision corridor, the Project will improve safety for active transportation users.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The Fiscal Year 2026-2027 budget assigned about $4.4 million in funding to the project (No. 474303) for professional services within Countywide Planning and Development, including support for technical analysis and community engagement in response to the Draft EIR. Since this is a multi-year project, Cost Center Managers, Chief Planning Officer, and Chief Program Management Officer will be responsible for budgeting in future years.

Impact to Budget
Funding for this project comes from Measure M Capital Subfund for Highway, Active Transportation and Complete Streets - both from the 17% Highway Construction and the 2% Metro Active Transportation Program. These funds are not eligible for bus or rail operating expenses.

EQUITY PLATFORM

Socioeconomic data reveals that approximately 23% of the population within this 3-mile radius live in poverty, and 17% of working-age individuals either walk, bike, or use public transit to commute. Within the Project area, the proportion of older adults is relatively low (8.09%), while Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) individuals constitute a substantial 92%, with Latinos comprising 77%. The Project promises mobility choices and regional access to employment, education, and recreational opportunities for populations both in the Project vicinity and along the wider LA River active transportation network. The Project would be directly accessible to EFCs in Elysian Valley, Lincoln Heights, Chinatown, and Boyle Heights in the City of Los Angeles, as well as the City of Maywood.

To engage hard-to-reach populations who do not typically participate in community meetings, Metro circulated materials and notices, including the Draft EIR Executive Summary in both English and Spanish, held pop-up events at community events, and performed transit rider intercepts at rail stations and bus stops in the Project area. Metro released the Draft EIR on the online digital platform, improving accessibility and navigability of the environmental document. The online platform is also compatible with common Internet browsers and smartphones, with translation functions, allowing community members to translate the document from English to a language of their choice. During the public review and comment period, all in-person public hearings were held at EFCs in Lincoln Heights, Boyle Heights, and the City of Maywood to better engage hard-to-reach communities. All public hearings, including the virtual public hearing, included live Spanish translation services.

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 the Project advances. 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

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and VMT per capita in Los Angeles County are lower than national averages, the lowest in the Southern California Association of Governments (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 that 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 active transportation, transit ridership, and ridesharing. When complete, this project will provide a seamless, 32-mile active transportation network, offering car-free mobility options for users. 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 will decrease VMT. The Draft EIR estimated that by 2031, the project would reduce average daily VMT by approximately 0.2% to 2% (translating to 20 to 1,410 vehicles per day in 2031, depending on roadway characteristics) due to trip reduction. This would also 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 strategic plan goals identified in Vision 2028:

- Goal 3: Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity;
- Goal 4: Transform LA County through regional collaboration and national leadership; and

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board may choose to defer selection of an LPA and IOS segments given the low benefit cost-ratio. This is not recommended because it would delay project delivery thereby continuing to drive costs higher and moving it further from its Measure M schedule. Deferring selection may also delay development of the LA River Governance Model Study as approved in the May 2026 Metro Board Motion (Attachment B).

The Board could select other alignments evaluated in the 2025 Draft EIR, or the No Project Alternative. However, Modified Option 2 delivers comparable benefits at the lowest cost per unit of benefit. It offers the lowest construction cost while maximizing ridership and equity, and provides a realistic opportunity to close the entire 8-mile gap: with the two IOSs, almost entirely within the remaining Measure M budget; the remaining gap of 2.5 miles closed in the interim, via non-Metro projects (City of Los Angeles on-street connections, which are existing, in construction or planned). The No Project alternative is not recommended as it does not meet the Project needs and objectives.

NEXT STEPS

Upon Board approval of an LPA, staff will coordinate on directions and findings that emerge from the LA River Governance Model Study. As directed by the Board in November 2021, Metro will partner with these agencies but will not assume any financial responsibility for operating and maintain the completed project considering Metro owns about 1% of the ROW along the corridor. Staff will collaborate with the County of Los Angeles, LACFCD, and/or City of Los Angeles, as well as all relevant stakeholders, including the USACE, by providing all requested Project-related information, technical expertise, right-of-way data, and review support for the Study. Staff collaboration also includes identifying the agency/agencies to assume ownership, delivery, and maintenance of the final Project.

Once the Governance Study identifies the agency/agencies for ownership, delivery, and maintenance of the final Project, and their commitments formalized, staff will advance the CEQA environmental clearance process and further design will be coordinated with the agency/agencies identified to assume ownership, delivery, and maintenance of the project, including development of the Final EIR for only IOS-north and IOS-south (total of 5.5 miles of the 8-mile gap), and proceed with a federal Environmental Assessment (EA), under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which is necessary for the USACE permit process.

As the project progresses, staff will continue coordinating with the Early Intervention Team to identify project risks and track mitigation opportunities. Once design and environmental re-initiate, staff will pursue activities to control costs for the IOS-north and IOS-South, including value engineering, collaborating with responsible jurisdictions exercising cooperative agreements, and pursuing streamlining the permitting process. Concurrently, staff will support the agreed upon governance structure to continue to support the exploration of grant funding opportunities for active transportation


projects at the local, state, and federal levels to help minimize the funding gap.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - June 2021 Metro Board Amendment
Attachment B - May 2026 Metro Board Motion 46
Attachment C - Draft EIR Alternatives - Path Types
Attachment D - Draft EIR Executive Summary
Attachment E - Draft EIR Outreach Summary
Attachment F - LPA & IOS
Attachment G - LA River Path Project Cost-Benefit Analysis

Prepared by: E. Cadena, Transportation Planner
K. Decastro, Manager Transportation Planning
M.Gupta, Senior Manager, Transportation Planning
J. Liu, Senior Director, Countywide Planning & Development
D. Roybal, Deputy Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development
A. Yoh, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development
D. Mieger, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development
M. Dierking, Director, Community Relations
J. Wei, Executive Director, Project Engineering/Delivery
C. Hoshijima, Executive Officer, Strategic Financial Planning

Reviewed by: R. Sosa, Chief Planning Officer



Stephanie Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer

Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

Board Report

File #: 2021-0556, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response **Agenda Number:** 35.

REVISED
EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 18, 2021

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO JUNE 2021 BOARD MOTION 49: LA RIVER BIKE PATH PROJECT DELIVERY

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to:

A. NEGOTIATE and enter into a funding agreement between Metro and the City of Los Angeles in the amount not to exceed $60 million for design and construction of the LA Riverway in the San Fernando Valley.

B. NEGOTIATE and conditionally enter into a Cooperative Agreement with Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW), City of Los Angeles and City of Vernon for Metro to manage and coordinate on final design and construction of the LA River Path through downtown Los Angeles. The conditions to be negotiated include:

1. Accessibility to right of way owned by each entity for construction permits
2. Commitment from each entity on cooperative engagement on securing additional funding when needed;
3. Metro will partner with the City, County, and Federal agencies with ownership and responsibility in the LA River corridor in regards to the overall management structure of the completed project, but will not assume any financial responsibility for operating and maintaining the completed project. ~~Cities and County with ownership in the LA River corridor to partner and assume responsibility for operating and maintaining the completed project~~

C. ENTER into a Funding Agreement with LACDPW in the amount not to exceed $773,870 to support LACDPW to perform and lead the environmental clearance for the Lower LA River Bike Path.

ISSUE

In June 2021, the Board approved Motion 49 (Attachment A), directing staff to report the status of

each of the following three projects (Attachment B) regarding funding plans, sustainability, equity assessments, milestone schedules, and execution of agreements with partner agencies.

A. LA Riverway in the San Fernando Valley: Within the jurisdictions of the City of Los Angeles and led by the City, this project known as Complete LA River Bike Path in the Measure M Expenditure Plan will close a series of gaps in active transportation on a 12-mile stretch along the LA River from Canoga Park to Studio City.

B. LA River Path through downtown Los Angeles: A Metro-led project known as the LA River Waterway & System Bike Path in the Measure M Expenditure Plan will close an eight-mile continuous gap between Elysian Valley and Vernon, through downtown Los Angeles.

C. Lower LA River Bike Path in the Gateway Sub-region: Consisting of one or more elements defined by Motion 22.1 (Attachment C) authored by Supervisor Solis in October 2015.This project is within the jurisdiction of LACDPW.

BACKGROUND

Bicycle and pedestrian paths already exist along much of the LA River, but large gaps in the LA River bicycle corridor make it impossible to travel along the entire length of the river. To close these gaps and provide additional bicycle facilities along the river, at least three distinct bike projects are planned, which are at different stages of development. When complete, these Active Transportation infrastructure along the LA River can act as a spine for Class I bicycle infrastructure throughout the river's 51-mile length across the county, thus providing a low-cost alternative mode of transportation to Angelenos and in turn creating a transportation system that reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. In addition to these benefits, active transportation infrastructure provides low-cost transportation that supports public health while protected and separated infrastructure improves traffic safety for all users and provides a safe space for all ages and the ability to exercise more.

Because the LA River passes through many of the historically underserved and marginalized communities that Metro has defined as Equity Focused Communities (EFC), completing a contiguous bike path along the river's 51 miles is a goal of both the County and the City of Los Angeles. This effort is supported through several planning documents, including the 2020 LA River Master Plan, City of Los Angeles General Plan Mobility Element (Mobility 2035), Metro's 2020 Long Range Transportation Plan, and 2016 Active Transportation Strategic Plan (ATSP).

DISCUSSION

A. LA Riverway in the San Fernando Valley

The LA Riverway project in San Fernando Valley encompasses a 12-mile series of gap closure projects along this portion of the LA River Bike Path. The City of Los Angeles Public Works' Bureau of Engineering (LABOE) is the Lead Agency for these projects which are in various stages of project development. The project between Vanalden Avenue and Balboa Boulevard is the furthest along and nearing completion of the design phase, while the remaining projects are ready to begin the design phase.

The City of Los Angeles currently estimates the total project cost at $154 million. The City has contributed $5.5 million in local funds to date and Metro has programmed the $60 million of Measure M funds in Fiscal Years (FY) 2022-2026. Attachment D shows the proposed distribution of Measure M funds for each fiscal year (FY22 through FY26). Per Measure M, the project is expected to be completed by FY27. The pursuit of additional funding will be led by the City of Los Angeles with support by Metro.

The design of these segments will be consistent with the LA River Master Plan and will employ sustainability strategies such as native landscaping elements to treat stormwater runoff, pervious hardscape to facilitate water conservation, and a bike-with-greenway approach to help lessen the urban heat island effect and serve as a greenhouse gas "sink." The project will help to mitigate the elevated temperatures found in the San Fernando Valley by using vegetation and green infrastructure to increase permeability and greenhouse gas absorption and provide shade to cool temperatures. Furthermore, this project will support more sustainable travel mode choices than single-occupancy car driving by improving the viability and safety of active transportation and increasing connectivity to other public transit systems.

B. LA River Path through downtown Los Angeles

In September 2019, the Metro Board approved the Conceptual Design Report and authorized the project to enter into environmental clearance. In October 2019, the Notice of Preparation was published, and subsequently, four scoping meetings were held in November 2019. Staff is now preparing various environmental technical studies to support the evaluation of three alternatives as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and advancing the design development to 15%.

On the administrative side, Metro has entered into Memorandum of Agreements (MOAs) with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for issuance of Section 408 and Section 404 permits. Since the USACE currently operates and maintains the river as a flood control channel, both Section 408 and 404 permits are needed to deliver the project. In addition, staff is preparing draft Cooperative Agreements that will be vetted by County Counsel and partner agencies, including the City of Los Angeles, LACDPW to define roles and responsibilities of each partnering agency to facilitate efficient project delivery.

Metro anticipates releasing its Draft EIR in late 2022. Final EIR and selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) are anticipated in late 2023. After the selection of the LPA, the project team will advance the LPA to at least 60% design for a NEPA Environmental Assessment (EA) to support the permitting process from USACE. Metro anticipates project completion in 2028 (following final design and construction).

One of the biggest limitations for Metro to construct this project is Metro's insignificant share of right-of-way (ROW) along the 8-mile corridor. While the City of Los Angeles (including Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)) and the County of Los Angeles (including LA Flood Control) in total own approximately 80% of the ROW along the corridor, Metro ownership is less than 1%. Of the remaining 20%, most is held as private ownership. Hence, the permitting agencies other than USACE which has flood control jurisdiction over the river,

will be the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles. As a result, Metro would require firm commitments from both entities on their active role in facilitating an efficient process and cooperation during permitting and construction of the project.

Upon completion of construction, Metro will partner with City, County, and Federal agencies with ownership and responsibility in the LA River corridor in regards to the overall management structure of the completed project. ~~transfer the project to the City and County of Los Angeles and the City of Vernon, and the projects's operational governance post-construction must be negotiated between these three entities.~~ However, ~~G~~given that Metro owns less than 1% of the project ROW, Metro will not be responsible for future operation and maintenance of the project, including both funding and labor. ~~a partner, administrative, financially, or otherwise, in the future operation and maintenance of the project.~~ In addition, as the designs and cost estimates progress, Metro ~~will~~ may evaluate other cost reduction strategies such as shorter segmentation.

The project is currently funded through Measure M ($365 million in 2015$). Based on in-progress 15% engineering and cost estimate efforts, the cost range for constructing this project, depending on the alternative, varies between $392 million and $486 million (2021$). This early estimate points to a substantial funding shortfall of at least $142 million (2021$). Cost estimates will be further refined as design progresses. As the project moves forward through the environmental and early design process, Metro anticipates seeking partnership with the City and County of Los Angeles, as well as with City of Vernon and other potential funding partners to pursue additional funding, as needed.

Metro's 10-year Strategic Plan - Moving Beyond Sustainability (MBS) created the Sustainability Engagement Team to facilitate project specific sustainability assessments for major capital projects to help realize Metro's MBS goals. The LA River Path project will work with the Sustainability Engagement Team to identify opportunities to integrate sustainability elements into the project where feasible and cost effective.

C. Lower LA River Bike Path in the Gateway Sub-region

In October 2015, Motion 22.1 directed Metro staff to study three new Class I bike paths noted as items G, H, and I. In April 2017, Motion 5.1 (Attachment F) directed staff to advance Item J from Motion 22.1 into environmental review based on preliminary designs. From these motions, four items are listed below:

Motion 22.1 Item G: Construction of a new, 8-foot, Class I bike path and access points within the Los Angeles Flood Control District right-of-way on the western levee of the LA River Channel from the Pacific Coast Highway [Long Beach] to Imperial Highway [South Gate] *(approximately 10 miles)* to connect with the existing Los Angeles River Bike Path;

Motion 22.1 Item H: Construction of a new 8-foot, Class I bike path and access points within Southern California Edison (SCE) right-of-way, roughly parallel to Greenleaf Blvd. (*approximately 8 miles)* between the Los Angeles Blue Line and Sportsman Drive;

Motion 22.1 Item I: Construction of a new 8-foot, Class I bike path and access points within

SCE and LADWP right-of-way from Willow/TI Freeway [Long Beach] to connect with the Rio Hondo Bike Trail at Garfield Avenue [South Gate] (*approximately 7 miles)*;

Motion 22.1 Item J: Upgrades to the existing Los Angeles River Bike Path consisting of safety, landscaping, hardscape, lighting, access enhancements, and fix-it stations between Ocean Boulevard [Long Beach] and its northern terminus at Slauson Avenue [Vernon] *(approximately 15.5 miles).*

Metro staff completed the I-710 Bike Path Project Definition Study in 2017 as an initial step in responding to Motion 22.1. Aside from proposed improvements to the existing facility (Item J), the study proposed three new bike path projects identified as Western Levee (Item G), Compton Boulevard (Item H), and Terminal Island Freeway to Rio Hondo (Items I). The Compton Boulevard bike path, due to higher benefits and opportunities, was proposed in place of the SCE right-of-way paralleling Greenleaf Boulevard that was initially identified in Item H. Metro staff met with the City of Compton Public Works staff in July 2018 and were informed of a Complete Streets Plan in place for Compton Boulevard, which included bike path upgrades. As such, the need to pursue a bike path on Compton Boulevard in the City of Compton was obviated, leaving Items G and I as two new bike path options for further consideration. Therefore, Items G, I, and J, remain three options from Motion 22.1 to consider for the Lower LA River Path.

Furthermore, Metro intended to lead and perform the environmental clearance for Items G, I, and J for LACDPW. Coordination and discussion between Metro and LACDPW took place on several occasions during spring/summer of 2018 to determine a workplan involving staff support and oversight from Los Angeles County. Agreement on the amount to reimburse LACDPW for their support during the Metro-led environmental clearance was not reached, and efforts stalled.

As the Lower LA River Path is within the jurisdiction of LACDPW and LACDPW is the agency of record for environmental clearance and will construct, own, and maintain the project, staff recommends LACDPW to perform the environmental clearance for one or more Items (G, I and J) from Motion 22.1. In addition, the County of Los Angeles, through LACDPW, is the Lead Agency for the Programmatic EIR for the 2020 LA River Master Plan. LACDPW could also consider improvements recommended in the 2020 Plan.

The cost to develop the three independent bikeway projects initiated by Motion 22.1 was approved for $1,196,596 as part of a contract modification for the I-710 South Corridor Project (Attachment G). Measure R Administrative Funds were budgeted for this effort under Cost Center 4730 (Highway Programs B). The completion of the I-710 Bike Path Project Definition Study drew down $422,726 from the approved $1,196,596, and $773,870 remains under that contract. Staff recommends the reimbursement of $773,870 to LACDPW. Discussions with LA County are ongoing, and should this initial amount be under their needs, staff will return to the Board to request additional funds. Should this amount be over their needs, remaining funds will stay with Metro.

To advance subsequent design and construction phases, LACDPW's identified project(s) for the Lower LA River Bike Path will be considered in the discussion and collaboration with corridor jurisdictions, stakeholders and the Gateway Cities Council of Governments on the I-710 Early Action Program and future Measure M funding allocations.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

A. LA Riverway in the San Fernando Valley
The implementation of this project will improve safety for active transportation users and the general public by providing a new shared-use path separated from vehicle traffic along High-Injury Network corridors, including Ventura Boulevard and Victory Boulevard. Staff will continue to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles on the development and eventual construction of the project to ensure that it does not adversely impact the continued safety of staff, contractors, and the public.

B. LA River Path through downtown Los Angeles
Currently, the action will have no impact on the safety of Metro's customers and/or employees since the project is in early stages of design and in the environmental phase. Subsequently, when the project advances into the construction phase, staff will continue to oversee construction activity to ensure the safety of staff, contractors and the public and ensure that steps are in place to mitigate any adverse effects during construction.

C. Lower LA River Bike Path in the Gateway Sub-region
The action will have no impact on the safety of Metro customers and/or employees as the project is still in the early planning phase.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

A. LA Riverway in the San Fernando Valley
The LA River Bike Path in the San Fernando Valley subregion is a Measure M funded project funded yearly through the annual budget up to the approved programming amount. This is a multi-year contract/project, and the Project Manager, the Cost Center Manager, and the Chief Program Management Officer are responsible for budgeting in future fiscal years.

B. LA River Path through downtown Los Angeles
The FY 2022 proposed budget includes $7 million in Cost Center 4310 (Mobility Corridor 1), Project 474303 (LARVR WaterWay Sys Bike Path). Since this is a multi-year effort, the Cost Center Manager and Chief Planning Officer (CPO) will be responsible for budgeting funds in future years. The recommended action, however, will have no impact on the overall project cost. The project is identified as one of Mayor Garcetti's "Twenty-Eight by '28 Initiative" and is considered a regionally-significant infrastructure project funded through Measure M ($365M in 2018$).

C. Lower LA River Bike Path in the Gateway Sub-region
Funding for completing the environmental clearance work by LACDPW will be programmed

under the appropriate Cost Center as a subsidy using the Measure R Administrative funds consistent with the #2015-1656 action. Project 462316 subsequently budgeted funds for the I710 Bike Path Study. However, a new project number will be established for the Lower LA River Bike Path. Further coordination with LACDPW is needed to identify which one or more elements from Motion 22.1 (Items G, I, J) would be pursued and what associated costs would be funded. In addition, LA County could consider improvements recommended in the 2020 LA River Master Plan.

Impact to Budget

A. LA Riverway in the San Fernando Valley
There are no impacts to the FY22 budget. Staff will fund the project on an annual basis up to the approved programming amount.

B. LA River Path through Downtown Los Angeles
The Board's decision will have no impact on the FY22 budget.

C. Lower LA River Bike Path in the Gateway Sub-region
There are no impacts to the FY22 budget. Staff will need to identify budget and future programming years.

EQUITY PLATFORM

A. LA Riverway in the San Fernando Valley
The project will benefit disadvantaged communities by providing increased mobility/connectivity, safety, access to opportunities, improved sustainability, and public health. The project will add new separated biking and walking facilities that will provide a safer alternative route to nearby High Injury Network streets including Ventura Boulevard and Victory Boulevard where active transportation users experience disproportionate traffic injuries. The new path will connect Equity Focus Communities in Reseda, Canoga Park, and Burbank to many jobs and services in areas such as Ventura Boulevard and Universal City. The project will also improve access to recreational facilities along the river via sustainable modes for improved public health in communities including Lake Balboa and Reseda, which already have higher transit and bike mode share, but experience disparities in environmental quality with CalEnviroScreen scores above the 80th percentile. The project may potentially cause a burden through temporary construction impacts and potential gentrification and displacement pressures. However, these will be mitigated by construction management plans and continued community engagement throughout the project development process.

The City of Los Angeles conducted community engagement for this project through the City's LA River Revitalization Master Plan, the Bicycle Plan, and Feasibility Study Report; and included numerous public workshops, multilingual and accessible communications. These engagement efforts informed the plans. Metro will continue to support the City in ongoing efforts to ensure vulnerable communities are engaged as the project implementation advances.

B. LA River Path through downtown Los Angeles
This project will provide benefits including enhanced mobility and regional access to jobs, education, and other recreational opportunities for underserved populations within the Project area. A recent study for Parks Needs Assessment showed that Boyle Heights has the highest need for parks and open spaces in the areas directly adjacent to the river, followed by downtown Los Angeles.

For context, approximately 29% of the population within 3-miles of the project lives in poverty, with 92% of the population being people of color (BIPOC) with limited English proficiency. Moreover, 79% of the population is Latino and more than 22% of the population relies on multi-modal transportation options for getting to work, including walking, bicycling, and taking public transit.

The benefits, however, without proper protections, may increase the risk of displacement for existing residents and small businesses during construction and due to potential gentrification. To mitigate these impacts and ensure Metro can advance transit equity, the Project engaged the community early on during Conceptual Design phase and will continue to involve the community and other stakeholder groups in the decision-making process during environmental and final design phase. The Project team will further partner with Community Based Organizations (CBO) to support this work, and advance equity - the exact nature of engagement is yet to be defined. Finally, during construction, the team will work with Metro's Homeless Task Force and existing Metro programs and policies that address temporary interruptions to affected small businesses due to Metro project construction.

C. Lower LA River Bike Path in the Gateway Sub-region
The Lower LA River Path aims to increase safe active transportation facilities, enhance connections to transit, increase transportation choices for people with limited mobility options, encourage fewer car trips, promote active, healthy living, and connect to major activity centers and destinations. Analyzing Metro EFC data found that of the 24-mile cumulative project distance, nearly 14 miles intersect or touch EFC areas.

High-Injury network locations exist within one-mile of the study area for bicycle-auto collisions, particularly in Long Beach's Downtown, Eastside communities and the City of South Gate. Pedestrian collisions in the 2-mile study area notably occurred in Downtown, East and North Long Beach, and in the Cities of Huntington Park and South Gate. The study area's approximate 122 square miles are also major employment destinations for industrial facilities and shipping warehouses, generating close to 500,000 jobs. Additionally, 11 Metro A Line stations are within 1-2 miles of the Lower LA River from Compton to Long Beach. This information can help LACDPW further evaluate potential benefits through an equity lens and consider what projects will be environmentally cleared.

Metro staff will work with LACDPW to address equity concerns and potential burdens or negative impacts through the environmental work and specific project location(s) led and identified by LACDPW. Staff will coordinate and recommend incorporating equity focused terms and conditions in the funding agreement and provide support through administrative oversight and project monitoring.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The three bike paths along the LA River discussed in this board report contribute to implementing multiple goals of Metro's Vision 2028 Strategic Plan. In particular:

- Goal 1: Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling;
- Goal 3: Transform LA County through regional collaboration and national leadership; and
- Goal 4: Provide responsive, accountable, and trustworthy governance within the Metro organization.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

A. LA Riverway in the San Fernando Valley
The Board may choose not to approve the recommended action. This option is not recommended as it may hinder Metro's ability to deliver the Measure M Expenditure Plan on schedule. The recommended action will enable Metro to expend Measure M funds during the programmed year of FY22-23 for segments of the San Fernando Valley portion that have the most project-readiness.

B. LA River Path through downtown Los Angeles
The Board may choose not to approve the recommendations, however, doing so may delay the delivery of this Measure M project by 2028. In addition, it will also be an impedance in fulfilling the City and County of Los Angeles' common goal of providing low cost and low impact alternative transportation options to marginalized communities.

C. Lower LA River Bike Path in the Gateway Sub-region
The Board may choose not to approve the recommended action. This option is not recommended as it further hinders the ability to meet common goals, projects and programs identified by various plans including the LA River Master Plan led the County of LA and Metro's Long-Range Transportation Plan and Active Transportation Strategic Plan.

NEXT STEPS

A. LA Riverway in the San Fernando Valley:
Staff will finalize and execute the Funding Agreement between Metro and the City of Los Angeles to establish the scope, expenditure plan, and schedule. Staff will continue to administer the executed Funding Agreement to ensure project delivery.

B. LA River Path through downtown Los Angeles:
Staff will finalize Cooperative Agreements delineating roles and responsibilities of LACDWP, cities of Los Angeles and Vernon and execute the same to facilitate collaboration through all phases of this project, especially during permitting and construction.

C. Lower LA River Bike Path in the Gateway Sub-region:
Staff will coordinate with LACDPW to identify updated costs for completing environmental clearance and budget needed for programming.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Legistar File #: 2021-0436
Attachment B - LA River Bike Path Projects
Attachment C - Legistar File #: 2015-1595
Attachment D - Proposed Measure M Expenditure
Attachment E - Legistar File #: 2019-0443
Attachment F - Legistar File #: 2017-0270
Attachment G - Legistar File #: 2015-1656

Prepared by: Maressa Sah, Principal Transportation Planner, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-2462
Mitali Gupta, Manager, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-5283
Anthony Jusay, Manager, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-7675
Carolyn Mamaradlo, Manager, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-5529
Dolores Roybal-Saltarelli, DEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3024
Cory Zelmer, DEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-1079
William Rider, EO, Countywide Planning & Development, Federal/State Policy & Programming, (213) 922-2887
David Mieger, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3040
Timothy Lindholm, SEO, Program Management, (213) 922-7297

Reviewed by: James de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-2920

Stephanie N. Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer

Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

Board Report

File #: 2026-0416, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response **Agenda Number:** 46.

REVISED
REGULAR BOARD MEETING
MAY 28, 2026

Motion by:

DIRECTORS BASS, SOLIS, HORVATH, HAHN, AND PADILLA

Governance, Delivery, and Operation Options for the LA River Path Project Motion

The LA River Path project is a critical regional investment that will close the longest remaining gap in the 51-mile LA River Path, creating a continuous active mobility corridor that connects communities, enhances access to transit, and advances regional climate, health, and equity goals. Metro is the current lead agency for the Downtown LA River Path project and owns ~~significant~~ small, insignificant portions of right-of-way within the project limits. ~~This Metro-owned~~ Right-of-way is essential to advancing design, permitting, and construction, and underscores the need for a coordinated governance and delivery structure to efficiently steward the project through completion and into long-term operations.

Given the project's complexity-multiple jurisdictions, varied right-of-way ownership, environmental permitting, and long-term operations and maintenance needs-identifying the most effective governance, delivery, and stewardship model is necessary to ensure timely and cost-effective implementation. A governance structure that is clear, empowered, and aligned across Metro, the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD), the City of Los Angeles, and other regional partners may accelerate project delivery, improve operational outcomes, and support sustainable long-term maintenance of both the Downtown LA River Path and the full 51-mile LA RiverWay system.

Metro is the current lead agency for the project; however, a different "Project Client" may offer faster design, construction, and cohesive operational benefits to the communities along the LA River path and to the users of the LA River path. Alternative models include: a new or existing Joint Powers Authority, an existing governmental agency, or a new purpose-built governmental authority. Confirming a Project Client, ~~whether Metro or an alternative~~, and a responsible party for long-term operations and maintenance, is a key step to facilitating project development. It may also ease the process of securing the right-of-way, which is vital for effective and cost-efficient project delivery.

Metro has the funding but not staff capacity to engage a consultant to research and report on governance models, project delivery and contracting options, operations and maintenance models, and processes under the laws of the State of California to establish authorities and identify funding

flows. Because multiple Cities, Los Angeles County, the LACFCD, Metro, and other State and local agencies and Conservancies are stakeholders in the project's long-term success, ~~inform this effort.~~, a formal study is needed to inform the appropriate Governance Structure.

While Metro currently has limited staff resources to undertake a comprehensive governance and delivery study, the LAFCFD, with its long standing expertise on the LA River and its established working relationships with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, is better suited to lead this effort, in partnership with the City of Los Angeles, the County of Los Angeles, and LA Metro. The LACFCD's technical, regulatory, and interagency experience positions it to effectively coordinate the study and evaluate governance models, delivery pathways, and long-term operations and maintenance structures.

Metro will provide all necessary funding, project documents, technical information, and review support, and will continue to play an active and engaged role throughout the study's development. Metro will collaborate fully with the LACFCD, County, and City and will support the recommendations and implementation steps that emerge from this work, ensuring long-term participation and funding commitments consistent with Metro's role as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

SUBJECT: GOVERNANCE, DELIVERY, AND OPERATION OPTIONS FOR THE LA RIVER PATH PROJECT MOTION

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE Motion by Bass, Solis, Horvath, Hahn, and Padilla that the Board directs the Chief Executive Officer or her designee to:

Enter into all necessary agreements and subsequent amendments with the County of Los Angeles, the LACFCD, and/or the City of Los Angeles to carry out the LA River Path Governance Model Study, and to fully reimburse the County of Los Angeles, the LACFCD, and/or the City of Los Angeles for the full cost of the study.

WE FURTHER MOVE that the Board directs the CEO to have the Metro staff collaborate with the County of Los Angeles, the LACFCD, the City of Los Angeles, and all relative stakeholders including the United States Army Corps of Engineers, on the LA River Path Governance Model Study by providing all requested project-related information, technical expertise, right-of-way data, and review support, and by serving as a committed partner throughout the development and implementation of the study's recommendations. The study shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements:

A. Governance: Review best practices from other regions and report with recommendations on suitable models, options, and processes, including:

1. Identifying a Project Client for development, delivery, and operation;

2. Using an existing agency or authority as the Project Client;

3. Creating a new Joint Powers Authority (JPA), including recommendations for optimal

membership and roles;

4. Establishing a new authority or agency through existing or new State legislation, including the creation of a Climate Resilience District, to serve as the Project Client, operator or both; and

5. Retaining Metro's current role as the Project's developer, builder, and partner in operation;

B. Project Delivery: Study alternative delivery models to benefit the project, such as Design-Build -Finance-Operate-Maintain (DBFOM) and other innovative procurement approaches.

C. Operations and Maintenance: Research and report on operations and maintenance models, including:

1. An initial model for meeting operations and maintenance needs of the Downtown LA River Path project, including security, public safety, graffiti abatement, routine maintenance, and long -term structural inspection and repair; and

2. A model for a unified operations and maintenance program for the entire 51-mile LA River Path (the "LARiverWay"), and how it may relate to delivery of the Downtown LA River Path project;

D. Sustainable Funding: Develop recommendations for existing and potential new funding sources for the sustainable long-term stewardship of the Downtown LA River Path project and/or the entire 51-mile LARiverWay, including:

1. Realigning funding formulas for existing active transportation funding sources, such as TDA Article 3;

2. Opportunities to address active transportation operations and maintenance funding in the Measure M decennial review process;

3. New local or regional levies based on funding models for similar active transportation infrastructure in other jurisdictions; and

4. Potential operational revenue, such as filming, special events, sponsorship, and advertising;

E. Stakeholder Engagement: Engage with various agencies and project stakeholders to inform the research described above and the collaborative roles for delivery and operation.

Attachment C

Figure C-1: Proposed Project




Figure C-2: Option 1



Figure C-3: Option 2



Figure C-4: Mostly East-Bank



Figure C-5: Mostly West-Bank



Figure C-6: Shortened North



Figure C-7: Shortened South



Figure C-8: LA River Path Project Path Types




ELEVATED PATH TYPE Proposed in locations with no top-of-bank right-of-way (ROW) availability and/or to maneuver over existing bridges or rail tracks	
INCISED PATH TYPE Proposed in locations with no top-of-bank ROW availability and/or to maneuver under existing bridges	
TOP-OF-BANK PATH TYPE Proposed where ROW is available on the bank of the river, mostly in the southern portion of the project	

Table C-1: Summary of Project Alternatives

	Proposed Project	Option 1	Option 2	Mostly-East Bank	Mostly-West Bank	Shortened North*	Shortened South*
Capital Cost (in millions, 2025$)	$1,082	$1,266	$1,102	$1,220	$1,170	$595	$688
Path Length (in miles) **	9.6	10.1	9.1	9.9	9.9	3.2	5.0
New Access Points (on East or West Bank)	9 (5 East, 4 West)	11 (5 East, 6 West)	9 (5 East, 4 West)	9 (6 East, 3 West)	10 (4 East, 6 West)	5 (3 East, 2 West)	6 (3 East, 3 West)
New River Crossings	7	6	7	5	6	4	4
Path Type Distribution							
Elevated	46%	56%	47%	47%	35%	16%	29%
Incised	26%	35%	34%	28%	48%	28%	20%
Top of Bank	28%	9%	19%	24%	17%	2%	24%

**For Shortened Northern Path and Shortened Southern Path, the percentage of Path Type is expressed as a percentage of the entire length of the project to provide consistency between Alternatives.*

*** Path length includes core path and connectors*

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Attachment C

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Executive Summary

LA RIVER PATH



December 2025

Metro

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES-1 Introduction

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (*Public Resources Code* Section 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 *California Code of Regulations* [CCR] Section 15000, et seq.), this Executive Summary provides a synopsis of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (Metro's) LA River Path Project (Project) and its potential effect on the environment. This Executive Summary is an overview of the main Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and includes the following information:

- EIR purpose and process
- Project history and objectives
- Public review process
- Alternatives considered
- Environmental analysis summary
- Areas of controversy and issues to be resolved

A detailed discussion and a full analysis of these topics is in this Draft EIR and its appendices.

ES-2 Project Description

ES-2.1 Overview and History

The Project would create a pedestrian and bicycling path regionally located in the center of Los Angeles County, California, and would close the longest remaining 8-mile gap between the existing Los Angeles River Greenway Trail and the existing LA River Trail along the LA River, allowing for a continuous 32-mile path extending from Griffith Park through Downtown Los Angeles to the City of Vernon and connecting to Long Beach along the LA River. Land uses within the Project study area and surrounding area are predominantly industrial or contain infrastructure such as utility and flood-control facilities, with some residential, commercial, religious, and open space land uses near the Project. The Project would improve health, economic, environmental, transportation, and equity conditions throughout and beyond the Project study area.

In June 2014, the Metro Board of Directors authorized the *Los Angeles River Bike Path Gap Closure Feasibility Study* (Feasibility Study) (Metro 2016) to evaluate possibilities for closing the 8-mile gap along the LA River between Elysian Valley and the City of Vernon. The Feasibility Study included a preliminary assessment of the engineering feasibility, neighborhood connectivity, safety, environmental and permitting requirements, hydraulic impacts, real estate, maintenance and operations, and preliminary cost estimates of a gap closure project. The Feasibility Study found that a gap closure project was feasible and would help serve the active transportation needs of communities neighboring the Project study area and the region. In October 2019, the *LA River Path Conceptual*

Design Report (Conceptual Design Report) (Metro 2019) incorporated significant public outreach findings and resulted in the identification of Project objectives and path alternatives. Metro sought to capture community feedback on topics such as Project goals and objectives, path types, and preferred access points to guide the evaluation of different path alignments, and ultimately identified three top-performing path alternatives. Overall, more than 4,600 in-person comments and 3,800 survey responses were received throughout the conceptual design process. In addition, several completed, ongoing, and future projects or plans along the LA River or near the Project may influence it. These projects or plans include:

- City of Los Angeles' *Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan* (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works 2007)
- US Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE's) *Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report* (USACE 2015)
- River LA's *Greenway 2020* advocacy campaign (River LA 2013)
- Los Angeles County's *LA River Master Plan* (LARMP) (Los Angeles County Department of Public Works [LACDPW] 2022)
- City of Los Angeles' *Draft Cornfield Arroyo Seco Specific Plan Update* (CASP Update) (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2022)

Five potential alternatives reflecting various preliminary, yet feasible alignments were initially considered (Alignments A, B, C, D, and E). Each alternative had a unique combination of path types, crossings, and access points. Feasible alignment options evaluated include the West Bank Alignment, Bottom-of-channel Alignment, East Bank Alignment, and East Side Alignment. The five potential alternatives were refined once more based on community input regarding access points and path types. Following the final screenings, three path alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) responded best to both the evaluation criteria and the community feedback; they were ultimately presented to the community for their feedback in May 2019. Alternatives A, B, and C were identified to provide the greatest community benefits and best meet the Project goals. From these three scoping alternatives, Metro identified the Project and two options to the Project, Option 1 and Option 2, for evaluation in this Draft EIR.

Figure ES-1 shows the Project's regional location and Figure ES-2 shows the Project study area. The Project study area shows the area in which reasonably foreseeable direct or indirect impacts of the Project may occur. Individual resource areas addressed in this Draft EIR may have unique study areas based on the potential for specific direct and indirect impacts associated with those resources; this is described fully in each resource's environmental setting section in Chapter 3, *Environmental Settings, Impacts, and Mitigation*.

Metro has prepared this Draft EIR to inform public agency decision-makers and the general public about potential significant environmental impacts of the Project, as well as possible ways to minimize potential impacts, and reasonable alternatives to the Project.

Figure ES-1. Project Regional Context




Figure ES-2. Project Study Area



ES-2.2 Environmental Review Process

In 2014, the Los Angeles City Council and Metro's Board of Directors authorized two motions to pursue closing the gap between the two existing paths along the LA River (City of Los Angeles 2014, Metro 2014). In 2016, Metro identified the LA River Path as one of the first projects to receive funding from Measure M. Metro conducted two significant efforts assessing the viability of the Project. The first was the Feasibility Study, which found that a gap closure project was feasible. The second was the Conceptual Design Report, which incorporated significant public outreach findings and resulted in the identification of Project objectives and path alternatives.

Metro filed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Project's Draft EIR on October 23, 2019, and accepted comments on the NOP for a 45-day period from October 23 through December 6, 2019. Metro used a variety of methods to communicate with the public and public agencies to notify them of the NOP and invite public agencies, Native American tribes, and interested individuals and organizations to comment on the scope of this Draft EIR. Throughout the scoping comment period, interested parties were able to provide their input via mail, email, voicemail, and through an online comment form. Metro conducted four public scoping meetings to solicit input on the Draft EIR scope from interested organizations, interested parties, and members of the public.

This Draft EIR is being distributed to interested agencies, organizations, parties, and individuals to ensure they have an opportunity to express their views regarding the potential environmental impacts of the Project. This distribution also ensures that information relevant to permits, authorizations, and discretionary approvals is provided to decision-makers, lead agencies, and CEQA-responsible and trustee agencies. During the public review and comment period, Metro will conduct public hearings to take testimony on the Draft EIR. Public agencies, organizations, and individuals may submit written comments concerning the adequacy of the document during the public comment period, as detailed in Chapter 1, *Introduction*.

After circulation of the Draft EIR and review of public and agency comments, the Metro Board can consider and select a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Public and agency comments received on the Draft EIR will be considered as part of the LPA selection process. If an LPA is selected by the Metro Board, Metro will then prepare a Final EIR including written responses to public and agency comments. The Metro Board may then adopt the findings of the Project's environmental effects after implementation of mitigation measures and statement of overriding considerations, certify the Final EIR, and approve the Project.

ES-2.3 Project Objectives

Project objectives were shaped by input from stakeholders and communities throughout the conceptual design public engagement process from late 2018 through 2019.

The primary objective of the Project is to create a safe and world-class active transportation path along the LA River between Elysian Valley in the City of Los Angeles and the Cities of Vernon and Maywood that would enhance and provide recreational opportunities, livability, regional and local connectivity and provide an outstanding user experience, access to economic opportunity, and separation from vehicular traffic for people of all ages and abilities. This new transportation facility would contribute to improved health, economic, environmental, transportation, and equity issues throughout and beyond the study area.

The Project objectives include:

- Providing, to the extent feasible, a seamless pedestrian and bicycling path between the San Fernando Valley in Los Angeles and the LA River Bicycle Path in Long Beach
- Improving safety for pedestrians and bicyclists from existing conditions
- Increasing access from local neighborhoods to employment centers, regional destinations, resources, and amenities, including healthcare services
- Reducing vehicle miles traveled by allowing people to walk and bicycle on a dedicated, vehicle-separated path through and within Los Angeles County, thereby reducing trip lengths and expanding travel choices
- Improving access to opportunity for historically under-invested communities, especially for low-income households earning less than $60,000 per year and in marginalized communities
- Creating a path that feels safe, comfortable, and is a world-class transportation facility open to people of all ages and abilities
- Creating a path that meets the needs of both recreational and utilitarian users

ES-2.4 Proposed Project and Options Considered in the EIR

Metro has identified an alignment as the Proposed Project; there are two alignment options for the Proposed Project (Option 1 and Option 2) that are considered and included in this Draft EIR, and are summarized here.


The inclusion of an option or alternative in the Draft EIR does not imply that any stakeholder agencies have approved or authorized the design, including project components that interact with the agencies' projects (e.g., Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's Main Street Center - General Construction Headquarters and USACE's LA River Ecosystem Restoration project). Therefore, their presence in the Draft EIR does not signal approval of either the alternatives or the Proposed Project design.

ES-2.4.1 Proposed Project

Spanning approximately 9.6 miles, the Proposed Project includes seven river crossings and nine access points: four on the west bank and five on the east bank on the river, as shown in Figure ES-3. Additionally, the Proposed Project includes improvements to the existing access point on the west bank of the river at Atlantic Boulevard in the City of Vernon. The Proposed Project would serve four Metro stations: Union Station, Chinatown Station, Pico/Aliso Station, and Washington Station. Detailed discussions of the Proposed Project's components are described in this section.

Starting north on the west bank of the LA River where the LA River Greenway Trail ends, the Proposed Project would run atop the bank and pass beneath the existing Interstate (I-)5 Viaduct and Riverside Drive Viaduct. Then, the Proposed Project would transition to an elevated configuration, crossing over the Metrolink LA River–Downey Bridge and moving under the State Route (SR)-110 Bridge. After passing under SR-110, the Proposed Project would transition to an incised configuration along the west bank, allowing it to go under the Metro A Line LA River Bridge. The path would mainly remain in an incised configuration from the North Spring Street Viaduct to the Mission Junction where it would cross both Metrolink railroad bridges with a new elevated crossing from the west bank, connecting to Albion Park on the east bank, between North Spring

Figure ES-3. Proposed Project Alignment



Street and North Main Street. South of Mission Junction, the Proposed Project would again transition to an elevated configuration to cross the LA River from the west bank to the east bank between the Metrolink Mission Junction Railroad Bridge South and Cesar E Chavez Avenue Viaduct.

Approximately 800 feet north of the Cesar E Chavez Avenue Viaduct, the Proposed Project would cross to the east bank of the river, where it would run in an incised configuration, allowing it to pass under the Cesar E Chavez Avenue Viaduct, El Monte Busway Bridge, and US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge. The Proposed Project would then transition to an elevated configuration to avoid a transmission tower and provide an opportunity to connect to Union Station across the river on the west bank.

The Proposed Project's connector to the Union Station access point would be implemented only if the separate Link Union Station (LinkUS) project proceeds with its proposed demolition of the Kahn-Beck Co./Friedman Bag Co. Building (located at 801 E Commercial Street/600 Center Street).[1]

South of the Union Station connector and transmission tower along the west bank, the path would transition back to an incised configuration, traveling under the First Street Viaduct and Fourth Street Viaduct. The Proposed Project would then transition to an elevated configuration to cross the LA River from the east bank to the west bank between the Fourth Street Viaduct and the Sixth Street Viaduct.

The Proposed Project would remain elevated to travel under the Sixth Street Viaduct and then transition to an incised configuration to go under the Seventh Street Viaduct. The path would transition to an elevated configuration to go under the I-10 Santa Monica Viaduct and Olympic Boulevard Viaduct. Continuing in an elevated configuration, the path would then go over the Union Pacific (UP) LA River Bridge and the Washington Boulevard Bridge. The path would then immediately travel beneath the Redondo Junction Grade Separation and begin to cross from the west bank of the LA River to the east bank.

After the Proposed Project crosses over the river, the path would continue south in an elevated configuration on the east bank, crossing over the BNSF Railway LA River Bridge, 26th Street Bridge, and Soto Street Bridge. Continuing south, the Proposed Project would remain in an elevated configuration until reaching Bandini Boulevard Bridge. The path between Bandini Boulevard and Atlantic Boulevard would use a combination of incised and top-of-bank path types to go under the Bandini Boulevard Bridge, the Downey Road Bridge, and two BNSF Railway bridges, one at Downey Road and the other at District Boulevard. Just north of Atlantic Boulevard, the Proposed Project would cross over the LA River from the east bank to the west bank.

The alignment would then turn south to go under the Atlantic Boulevard Bridge in an incised configuration on the west bank and tie into the existing LA River Trail in the City of Vernon. Figure ES-3 shows the Proposed Project alignment, path types and access points.

Proposed Project Access Points

The configuration and location of each access point for the Proposed Project are listed in Table ES-1 from north to south.

[1] The demolition occurred in 2025, after this Draft EIR was substantially complete.

Table ES-1. Proposed Project Access Points

Access Point	Bank	Connector Description
Albion Park	East	Single elevated bridge over the LA River to elevated bridge over railroad tracks with ramp connecting to Albion Park
Mission Road/Cesar E Chavez Avenue	East	Single elevated ramp crossing over railroad tracks to connect to the northwest corner of Mission Road and Cesar E Chavez Avenue intersection at the back of sidewalk
Union Station	West	Single elevated bridge over the LA River and railroad tracks and landing at the northeast corner of Center Street and Commercial Street underneath the future Link US viaduct
First Street	East	Single elevated ramp that parallels the path and then travels over the railroad tracks and Myers Street to connect at-grade to the back of sidewalk at the northwest corner of Mission Road and First Street intersection
Sixth Street	West	Single incised ramp connecting down to the south side of the Sixth Street Tunnel with future access to the Sixth Street PARC Project
Washington Boulevard	West	Single hook ramp connecting down to the south side of Washington Boulevard
Bandini-Soto Triangle	West	Single elevated bridge over the LA River connecting at-grade to Bandini Boulevard Bridge at the back of sidewalk adjacent to the commercial plaza known as the "Bandini-Soto Triangle"
Downey Road	East	Single at-grade connection to the back of sidewalk on the northwest side of Downey Road
Atlantic Boulevard	East	Single at-grade connection to the northwest side of Atlantic Boulevard at the back of sidewalk
Atlantic Boulevard (Existing)	West	Improvements to an existing access point in the City of Vernon

Proposed Project Design Variations

In addition to the Proposed Project, multiple design variations have been identified to offer site-specific engineering variations to navigate the constraints of the Proposed Project. Design variations include path connections to rail service at Union Station. Table ES-2 is a summary of design variations for the Proposed Project.

Table ES-2. Proposed Project Design Variations

Design Variation	Bank	Configuration
Riverside Drive	West	Cantilever along the west bank from the existing path to under the Riverside Drive Bridge.
Arroyo Seco Parkway (SR-110)	West	Single elevated top-of-bank path starting north under SR-110 to just south of the freeway.
East Cesar E Chavez Avenue	West	Elevated path ramps up before crossing westward over railroad right-of-way (ROW) at grade and continuing south again parallel to the railroad ROW. Path crosses underneath the East Cesar E Chavez Avenue Bridge and continues south to the optional access point at Union Station via Keller Street.
Union Station	West	Connection to Union Station is provided from the optional access point at Union Station via Keller Street through an on-street alignment along Keller Street, then connection with Ramirez Street to Union Station.
US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge	East	Continues in an incised configuration underneath US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge.
Kearney Street	East	Optional access point at Kearney Street is added via path traveling north up the east bank and crossing over to North Myers Street before turning left and continuing to optional access point at Kearney Street.
East Fourth Street	West	Elevated river crossing passes underneath the East Fourth Street Bridge before continuing south along the west bank in an elevated configuration.
East Washington Boulevard (In-Channel)	West	Path becomes elevated in-channel and continues south underneath the East Washington Boulevard Bridge, East 26th Street Bridge, and South Soto Street Bridge before crossing to the east bank and continuing south underneath Bandini Boulevard.
East Washington Boulevard (Triangular Helix)	West	Elevated path crosses westward under the Redondo Junction Grade Separation, ascends in a triangular helix configuration, and continues south, crossing over East Washington Boulevard and LA River from the west bank to the east bank.
South of Downey Road	East	Path continues south in an incised configuration.
South Atlantic Boulevard	North	Path continues splits north of the Atlantic Boulevard East access point, continuing south before becoming elevated to cross to the southern bank to end at the Atlantic Boulevard Existing Path access point.

ES-2.4.2 Option 1

As discussed in Section ES-2.1, Metro identified two options for the Proposed Project. Option 1 would retain most components of the Proposed Project, with some modifications. These modifications would result in a slightly longer route for Option 1, which would span approximately 10.1 miles. Option 1 would have the same path types as the Proposed Project though with some changes in locations and compositions, with 56% elevated, 9% top-of-bank, and 35% incised path types. Option 1 would cross the river six times and would have 11 access points: six on the west bank and five on the east bank, including improvements to the existing Atlantic Boulevard access point in the City of Vernon. Option 1 would provide connections to the same three Metro stations, Union Station, Chinatown Station, and Washington Boulevard Station, with the addition of two Metro stations, Lincoln/Cypress Station and Little Tokyo/Arts District Station. This section details the modifications to Project elements associated with Option 1.

Starting north on the west bank where the LA River Greenway Trail ends, Option 1 would run atop the riverbank to traverse under the I-5 Viaduct and Riverside Drive Viaduct. Option 1 would then traverse

over the Metrolink LA River–Downey Bridge and under the SR-110 Bridge in an elevated configuration. After passing under SR-110, Option 1 would transition to an elevated configuration along the west bank then cross over the river to the east bank just north of the Metro A Line LA River Bridge. Compared to the Proposed Project, Option 1would have a path alignment and design variations that include river crossings, path along the east bank, and access points to Ed P. Reyes Greenway on the east bank and Los Angeles State Historic Park on the west bank.

After crossing the river to land on the east bank, Option 1 would mainly be elevated as it passes the Metro A Line and continues south. North of Broadway, the alignment would include an access point at the Ed P. Reyes Greenway and a river crossing to the west bank leading to the Los Angeles State Historic Park access point. Option 1 continues south along the east bank to cross under the North Broadway Viaduct and North Spring Street Viaduct. Continuing in an elevated configuration, Option 1 would cross over the North Main Street Bridge and both Metrolink railroad bridges at Mission Junction. Option 1 would remain in an elevated configuration to diagonally cross under the Cesar E Chavez Avenue Viaduct and cross over the river from the east bank to the west bank.

After landing on the west bank, Option 1 would continue south in a mostly elevated configuration to traverse under the US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge and First Street Viaduct. Compared to the Proposed Project, Option 1 includes an elevated in-channel alignment along the west bank north of First Street, and two access points that connect to the First Street Bridge. South of the First Street Viaduct, Option 1 would descend into an incised configuration to travel under the Fourth Street Viaduct, then transition into elevated to travel under the Sixth Street Viaduct. The path would then transition to incised to go under the Seventh Street Bridge, I-10 Santa Monica Viaduct, and Olympic Boulevard Viaduct. Moving from incised to elevated as the path approaches Redondo Junction Grade Separation, Option 1 would cross over the UP LA River Bridge and Washington Boulevard Bridge. The elevated configuration would then travel beneath the Redondo Junction Grade Separation and begin to cross the LA River to the east bank.

Once Option 1 crosses over the river to the east bank, the path would continue in an elevated configuration to cross over the existing BNSF Railway LA River Bridge, 26th Street Bridge, and Soto Street Bridge. Just southeast of the Soto Street Bridge, an elevated river crossing would connect to the Bandini-Soto Triangle access point on the west bank. South of the river crossing, Option 1would continue south on the east bank, transitioning to an incised configuration to cross under Bandini Boulevard. South of Bandini Boulevard Bridge, Option 1 would transition to a top-of-bank configuration as the path travels south. Option 1 would then change to an incised configuration between Downey Road and Atlantic Boulevard, allowing it to pass under the Downey Road Bridge and the two BNSF Railway bridges at the Downey Road Bridge and at District Boulevard. By comparison, the Proposed Project in this area would run predominantly atop the bank, descending into an incised alignment to cross under the BNSF Railway Bridge at District Boulevard. Just north of Atlantic Boulevard, Option 1 would cross over the LA River from the east bank to the west bank and then tie into the existing LA River Trail in the City of Vernon. Figure ES-4 shows the Option 1 alignment, path types, and access points.

Figure ES-4. Option 1 Alignment



Option 1 Access Points

Table ES-3 lists the configuration and location of each potential access point for Option 1, from north to south. Option 1 would include the same access points as the Proposed Project, with modifications to two of them (Union Station and First Street) and would have two additional access points: Ed P. Reyes River Greenway and LA State Historic Park.

Table ES-3. Option 1 Access Points

Access Point	Bank	Connector Description	Common to Proposed Project
Ed P. Reyes River Greenway	East	Single elevated ramp over railroad tracks that parallels the path to the east and connects to the Ed P. Reyes River Greenway	No
LA State Historic Park	West	Single elevated bridge over the LA River and railroad tracks, and then ramps down under the North Broadway Viaduct and lands on the north side of the Baker Street south of the intersection of Aurora Street at northern driveway access to LA State Historic Park parking lot	No
Albion Park	East	Single elevated ramp over railroad tracks that would loop around the southern edge of Albion Park to land at the back of sidewalk at Albion Street	Yes
Mission Road/Cesar E Chavez Avenue	East	Single elevated ramp that parallels the path and crosses over railroad tracks to connect to the northwest corner of Mission Road and Cesar E Chavez Avenue intersection at the back of sidewalk	Yes
Union Station via Center Street	West	Single elevated ramp that parallels the path before traveling over the railroad tracks south of the US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge to land near the northeast corner of the Commercial Street and Center Street intersection at the back of sidewalk	Yes, with some differences
First Street North/First Street South	West	Dual elevated ramps that connect to the north and south sides of the First Street Viaduct	Yes, with some differences
Sixth Street	West	Single elevated ramp that parallels the path to the west and connects into the Sixth Street Tunnel from the south side with access to the future Sixth Street PARC Project	Yes
Washington Boulevard	West	Single hook ramp that connects down to the south side of Washington Boulevard at the back of sidewalk	Yes
Bandini-Soto Triangle	West	Single elevated bridge over the LA River that connects at-grade to Bandini Boulevard at the back of sidewalk adjacent to the commercial plaza known as the “Bandini-Soto Triangle”	Yes
Downey Road	East	Single at-grade connection to the back of sidewalk on the west side of Downey Road	Yes
Atlantic Boulevard	East	Single at-grade connection to the northwest side of Atlantic Boulevard at the back of sidewalk	Yes
Atlantic Boulevard (Existing)	West	Improvements to an existing access point in the City of Vernon	Yes

Option 1 Design Variations

Similar to the Proposed Project, design variations have been identified to offer site-specific engineering variations to address the constraints of the Project study area. Design variations at various locations of the alignment and access points for Option 1 are included in the footprint. Option 1 includes all of the Proposed Project's design variations except Kearney Street and includes four additional design variations: Egret Park to Ed P. Reyes Greenway, Naud Street, Albion Street, and East Seventh Street/Jesse Street. Table ES-4 summarizes design variations for Option 1.

Table ES-4. Option 1 Design Variations

Design Variation	Bank	Configuration	Common to Proposed Project
Egret Park to Ed P. Reyes Greenway	East	Single at-grade connection from Egret Park to Riverside Drive bridge onto Avenue 19 southerly to Ed P. Reyes River Greenway. A spur route would branch off Avenue 19, south of the Arroyo Seco confluence, and traverse at-grade southerly along the backside of the Lincoln Heights Jail building. This spur route would continue under the Metro A Line Bridge and connect to Ed P. Reyes River Greenway.	No
Riverside Drive	West	Cantilever along the west bank from the existing path to under the Riverside Drive Bridge.	Yes
Arroyo Seco Parkway (SR-110)	West	Single elevated top-of-path connection from path starting north under SR-110 to just south of the freeway.	Yes
Naud Street	West	Elevated path would cross westward, remaining in an elevated configuration, to the west bank where the path would reach the optional Naud Street access point.	No
Albion Street	East	Elevated path would split from westbound path to cross eastward over Metro ROW, before traveling south to reach the Albion Park access point.	No
East Cesar E Chavez Avenue	West	Elevated path crosses from the east bank to the west bank before continuing westward over railroad ROW at grade and then south parallel to the railroad ROW. Path crosses underneath the East Cesar E Chavez Avenue Bridge and continues south to the optional access point at Union Station via Keller Street.	Yes
Union Station	West	Connection to Union Station is provided from the optional access point at Union Station via Keller Street through an on-street alignment along Keller Street, then connection with Ramirez Street to Union Station.	Yes
US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge	East	Elevated path would continue south along the east bank underneath the East Cesar E Chavez Bridge before crossing diagonally underneath the US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge to the west bank.	Yes
East Fourth Street	West	Path continues south underneath East Fourth Street Bridge.	Yes
East Seventh Street/Jesse Street	East	Elevated river crossing to east bank provides access to optional East Seventh Street/Jesse Street access point.	No
East Washington Boulevard (In-Channel)	West	Path becomes elevated in-channel and continues south underneath the East Washington Boulevard Bridge, East 26th Street Bridge, and South Soto Street Bridge before crossing to the east bank and continuing south underneath Bandini Boulevard.	Yes

Table ES-4. Option 1 Design Variations

Design Variation	Bank	Configuration	Common to Proposed Project
East Washington Boulevard (Triangular Helix)	West	Elevated path crosses westward under the Redondo Junction Grade Separation, ascends in a triangular helix configuration, and continues south, crossing over East Washington Boulevard and LA River from the west bank to the east bank.	Yes
South of Downey Road	East	Path continues south at top-of-bank.	No
South Atlantic Boulevard	North	Path continues splits north of the Atlantic Boulevard East access point, continuing south before becoming elevated to cross to the southern bank to end at the Atlantic Boulevard Existing Path access point.	Yes

ES-2.4.3 Option 2

As discussed in Section ES-2.1, Metro identified two options for the Proposed Project. Option 2 would retain most components of the Proposed Project, with some changes. These modifications would result in a slightly shorter alignment for Option 2, which would span approximately 9.1 miles. Option 2 would have the same path types as the Proposed Project though with some changes in locations and compositions, with 47% elevated, 19% top-of-bank, and 34% incised path types. Option 2 would cross the river seven times and would have nine access points: four on the west bank and five on the east bank of the river, including improvements to the existing Atlantic Boulevard access point in the City of Vernon. Option 2 would provide connections to four Metro stations: Union Station, Chinatown Station, Pico/Aliso Station, and Washington Station, with the addition of the Lincoln/Cypress Station. This section details the modifications to Project elements associated with Option 2.

Starting north on the west bank where the LA River Greenway Trail ends, Option 2 would be in a top-of-bank configuration to travel under the I-5 Viaduct and Riverside Drive Viaduct. Option 2 would then traverse over the Metrolink LA River–Downey Bridge and under the SR-110 Bridge in an elevated configuration to then cross over the river from the west bank to the east bank. Compared to the Proposed Project, Option 2 would include river crossings, a path along the east bank and an access point at Ed P. Reyes Greenway.

After crossing the river to land on the east side of the railroad tracks in an elevated configuration, Option 2 would transition to grade to go under the Metro A Line LA River Bridge and would no longer be adjacent to the channel, but instead on the outside edge of the railroad tracks. Option 2 would be at-grade adjacent to the outside edge of the railroad track between the Ed P. Reyes River Greenway and Spring Street. Compared to the Proposed Project, Option 2 includes a top-of-bank alignment along the east bank from SR-110 to just south of Spring Street. As Option 2 passes under the North Spring Street Viaduct and approaches Albion Park, the path would begin to incline to an elevated configuration to cross the LA River from the east bank to the west bank.


Once on the west bank, Option 2 would remain elevated to cross over the North Main Street Bridge and both Metrolink railroad bridges at Mission Junction, in contrast to the Proposed Project's incised alignment. Option 2 would then move to the middle of the channel, remaining elevated, to cross under the Cesar E Chavez Avenue Viaduct and US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge. After passing under the First Street Viaduct, Option 2 would descend to an incised configuration. Three connectors would branch from the elevated pathway in the channel's center, leading to three different access

points. To the north of Cesar E Chavez Avenue Viaduct, one connector would extend to the Mission Road/Cesar E Chavez access point on the east bank. To the south of US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge, another connector would lead to the Union Station access point on the west bank and another connector would lead to the First Street access point on the east bank. Option 2 would travel in a mostly incised configuration between the First Street Viaduct and Olympic Boulevard Viaduct compared to the Proposed Project. Like the Proposed Project, as it approaches Redondo Junction Grade Separation, Option 2 would transition from an incised to an elevated configuration, crossing over the UP LA River and Washington Boulevard bridges. The path would then continue in an elevated configuration, traveling beneath the Redondo Junction Grade Separation and then crossing the LA River over the BNSF Railway LA River Bridge to the east bank.

Once on the east bank in an elevated configuration, the path would remain elevated as it crosses over the 26th Street Bridge and Soto Street Bridge. Between Soto Street and Bandini Boulevard, Option 2 would transition to an incised configuration to cross under Bandini Boulevard Bridge. An elevated crossing between Soto Street and Bandini Boulevard would connect to the Bandini-Soto Triangle access point. Continuing south on the east bank, Option 2 would use the top-of-bank to circumvent two transmission towers north of Downey Road, before transitioning to either the Downey Road access point or going under the Downey Road Bridge and BNSF Railway Bridge at Downey Road. South of Downey Road Bridge, Option 2 would use a combination of incised and top-of-bank configuration and then pass under the BNSF Railway Bridge at District Boulevard. Just north of Atlantic Boulevard, Option 2 would cross over the LA River from the east bank to the west bank.

After crossing the river to the west bank, Option 2 would continue south in an incised configuration. After passing under the Atlantic Boulevard Bridge, Option 2 would tie into the existing LA River Trail on the west bank in the City of Vernon. Compared to the Proposed Project and Option 1, Option 2 would not include the Atlantic Boulevard East access point. Figure ES-5 shows the Option 2 alignment, path types, and access points.

Figure ES-5. Option 2 Alignment



Option 2 Access Points

The configuration and location of each access point for Option 2 are listed in Table ES-5 from north to south. Option 2 would include eight of the same access points as the Proposed Project, with modifications to one of them (Union Station) and would have two additional access points: Ed P. Reyes River Greenway and Spring Street/Broadway/Albion Park.

Table ES-5. Option 2 Access Points

Access Point	Bank	Configuration	Common to Proposed Project
Ed P. Reyes River Greenway	East	At-grade connection directly adjacent to path at Ed P. Reyes River Greenway	No
Spring Street/Broadway/ Albion Park	East	Single at-grade connection from path under Spring Street to the Albion Park and access to Broadway and Spring Street	No
Mission Road/Cesar E Chavez Avenue	East	Single elevated ramp crossing over railroad tracks to connect to the northwest corner of the Mission Road and Cesar E Chavez Avenue intersection at the back of sidewalk	Yes
Union Station via Center Street	West	Single elevated ramp that crosses over the railroad tracks south of the US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge to land near the northeast corner of the Commercial Street and Center Street intersection at the back of sidewalk	Yes, with some differences
First Street	East	Single elevated ramp that travels over the railroad tracks and Myers Street to connect at-grade to the back of sidewalk at the northwest corner of Mission Road and First Street intersection	Yes
Sixth Street	West	Direct connection between the Option 2 path and the existing Sixth Street Tunnel with access to the future Sixth Street PARC Project	Yes
Washington Boulevard	West	Single hook ramp that connects down to the south side of Washington Boulevard at the back of sidewalk	Yes
Bandini-Soto Triangle	West	Single elevated bridge over the LA River that connects at-grade to Bandini Boulevard at the back of sidewalk adjacent to the commercial plaza known as the “Bandini-Soto Triangle”	Yes
Downey Road	East	Single at-grade connection to the back of sidewalk on the west side of Downey Road	Yes
Atlantic Boulevard (Existing)	West	Improvements to an existing access point in the City of Vernon	Yes

Option 2 Design Variations

Design variations have been identified to offer site-specific engineering variations to navigate challenges and constraints in the Project study area. Design variations at various locations of the alignment and at access points for Option 2 are included in the footprint. Option 2 would include all of the Proposed Project’s design variations except US Highway Route 101 LA River Bridge and includes four additional design variations design variations: Egret Park to Ed P. Reyes Greenway, North Avenue 19, and North Broadway/Spring Street. Table ES-6 summarizes design variations for Option 2.

Table ES-6. Option 2 Design Variations

Design Variation	Bank	Configuration	Common to Proposed Project
Egret Park to Ed P. Reyes Greenway	East	Single at-grade connection from Egret Park to Riverside Drive bridge onto Avenue 19 southerly to Ed P. Reyes River Greenway.	No
Riverside Drive	West	Cantilever along the west bank from the existing path to under the Riverside Drive Bridge.	Yes
Arroyo Seco Parkway (SR-110)	West	Single elevated top-of-bank connection from path starting north under SR-110 to just south of the freeway.	Yes
North Avenue 19	West	Elevated path continues south before crossing the river channel diagonally to the east bank near the Ed Reye Greenway access point.	No
North Broadway/ Spring Street	East	Path branches east to optional access point at Broadway and Spring Street.	No
East Cesar E Chavez Avenue	West	Elevated in-channel path splits westward before crossing over railroad ROW at grade and then continuing south parallel to the railroad ROW. Path crosses underneath the East Cesar E Chavez Avenue Bridge and continues south to the optional access point at Union Station via Keller Street.	Yes
Union Station	West	Connection to Union Station is provided from the optional access point at Union Station via Keller Street through an on-street alignment along Keller Street, then connection with Ramirez Street to Union Station.	Yes
Kearney Street	East	Elevated in-channel path splits eastward to reach east bank before continuing south and then east to reach optional access point at Kearney Street.	Yes
East Fourth Street	West	Path continues south underneath East Fourth Street Bridge.	Yes
East Washington Boulevard (In-Channel)	West	Path becomes elevated in-channel and continues south underneath the East Washington Boulevard Bridge, East 26th Street Bridge, and South Soto Street Bridge before crossing to the east bank and continuing south underneath Bandini Boulevard.	Yes
East Washington Boulevard (Triangular Helix)	West	Elevated path crosses westward under the Redondo Junction Grade Separation, ascends in a triangular helix configuration, and continues south, crossing over East Washington Boulevard and LA River from the west bank to the east bank.	Yes
South of Downey Road	East	Path continues south in an incised condition.	Yes
South Atlantic Boulevard	North	Path continues south before becoming elevated to cross to the southern bank to end at the Atlantic Boulevard Existing Path access point.	Yes

ES-2.4.4 Comparison of Proposed Project and Options

As stated, this Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project and two options, Option 1 and Option 2, each having a different combination of Project elements to navigate site conditions in different ways. The Proposed Project and its options each includes a combination of path types, river crossing locations, access points, and design variations aimed at accomplishing the Proposed Project objectives. Table ES-7 is a summary comparison of the Proposed Project, Option 1, and Option 2.

Table ES-7. Summary Comparison of Proposed Project and Options

Proposed Alignments	Approximate Path Length	Access Points	River Crossings	Elevated Path Type	Top-of-Bank Path Type	Incised Path Type
Proposed Project	9.6 miles	9	7	46%	28%	26%
Option 1	10.1 miles	11	6	56%	9%	35%
Option 2	9.1 miles	9	7	47%	19%	34%

Note: This count of access points does not include the existing westbound access point at Atlantic Boulevard.

Figures ES-3, ES-4, and ES-5 above show proposed alignments for the Proposed Project, Option 1, and Option 2.

ES-2.5 Project Schedule

Construction activities for the portion of the path for which funding is currently available are estimated to last approximately 3 years (Figure ES-6). Preconstruction activities are anticipated to start in 2028. The anticipated construction start is in 2028, with phased completion anticipated in 2031.

Figure ES-6. Project Timeline



ES-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts Analysis

This Draft EIR identifies potential environmental impacts of the Project and its options and analyzes any significant impacts and implementation of feasible mitigation measures. Project features are design features, best management practices, or other measures required by law or permit approvals and are incorporated as part of the Project. Mitigation measures are additional actions designed to avoid, minimize, or compensate for significant impacts and are required where significant impacts have been identified. Mitigation measures would be proposed as conditions of Project approval and would be monitored to ensure compliance and implementation. Table ES-8 summarizes the environmental impacts, required mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation (as applicable). A detailed analysis for each environmental resource area is provided in Chapter 3, *Environmental Settings, Impacts, and Mitigation*.

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
Aesthetics and Visual Resources					
AES-1: Have a substantially adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Proposed Project	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
AES-2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historical buildings within a state scenic highway?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
AES-3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, and conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.).	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
AES-4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day- or nighttime views in the area?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
Air Quality					
AQ-1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
AQ-2: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
AQ-3: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
AQ-4: Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
Biological Resources					
BIO-1: Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-BIO-01, *Worker Environmental Awareness Program* ▪ MM-BIO-02a, *Preconstruction Identification of Active Bat Roost Sites* ▪ MM-BIO-02b, *Avoid Disturbing Active Bat Roosts* ▪ MM-BIO-03, *Nesting Bird Surveys*	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-BIO-01 ▪ MM-BIO-02a ▪ MM-BIO-02b ▪ MM-BIO-03	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-BIO-01 ▪ MM-BIO-02a ▪ MM-BIO-02b ▪ MM-BIO-03	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
BIO-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	Proposed Project	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
BIO-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Proposed Project	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
BIO-4: Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-BIO-02a ▪ MM-BIO-02b	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-BIO-02a ▪ MM-BIO-02b	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-BIO-02a ▪ MM-BIO-02b	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
BIO-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
BIO-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-04, *Fully Incised Path* ▪ MM-HWQ-05, *Incised/Elevated Transition Widening* ▪ MM-HWQ-06, *Elevated-in-Channel Incised Path* ▪ MM-HWQ-07, *Channel Daylight Crossing Structure*	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-05 ▪ MM-HWQ-06 ▪ MM-HWQ-07	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-05 ▪ MM-HWQ-06 ▪ MM-HWQ-07	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
Cultural Resources					
CUL-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a built-environment historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-CUL-01, *Conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* ▪ MM-CUL-02, *Recordation of Existing Conditions* ▪ MM-NOI-02, *Drill Piles Where Feasible* ▪ MM-VIB-01, *Vibration Control Plan* ▪ MM-VIB-02, *Vibration Monitoring Plan*	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-CUL-01 ▪ MM-CUL-02 ▪ MM-NOI-02 ▪ MM-VIB-01 ▪ MM-VIB-02	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-CUL-01 ▪ MM-CUL-02 ▪ MM-NOI-02 ▪ MM-VIB-01 ▪ MM-VIB-02	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique or historical archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-CUL-03, *Qualified Archaeologist* ▪ MM-CUL-04, *Cultural Resources Mitigation and Management Plan*	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-CUL-03 ▪ MM-CUL-04	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-CUL-03 ▪ MM-CUL-04	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
CUL-3: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-CUL-04	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-CUL-04	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-CUL-04	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
Energy					
ENE-1: Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
ENE-2: Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
Geology and Paleontological Resources					
GEO-1(i): Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	Proposed Project	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
GEO-1(ii): Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
GEO-1(iii): Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
GEO-1(iv): Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
GEO-2: Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
GEO-3: Located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
GEO-4: Located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
GEO-5: Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	Proposed Project	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
GEO-6: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-PAL-01, *Prepare a Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan* ▪ MM-PAL-02, *Worker Environmental Awareness Program Training* ▪ MM-PAL-03, *Curation*	Significant and Unavoidable
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-PAL-01 ▪ MM-PAL-02 ▪ MM-PAL-03	Significant and Unavoidable
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-PAL-01 ▪ MM-PAL-02 ▪ MM-PAL-03	Significant and Unavoidable
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions					
GHG-1: Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
GHG-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
HAZ-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
HAZ-2: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HAZ-01, *Project-wide Phase II Environmental Site Assessment* ▪ MM-HAZ-02, *Soil Management Plan Surveys* ▪ MM-HAZ-03, *Preconstruction Asbestos, Lead-Based Paint, and Universal Waste Surveys*	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HAZ-01 ▪ MM-HAZ-02 ▪ MM-HAZ-03	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HAZ-01 ▪ MM-HAZ-02 ▪ MM-HAZ-03	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
HAZ-3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HAZ-03	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HAZ-03	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HAZ-03	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
HAZ-4: Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HAZ-01 ▪ MM-HAZ-02	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HAZ-01 ▪ MM-HAZ-02	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HAZ-01 ▪ MM-HAZ-02	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
HAZ-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	Proposed Project	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
HAZ-6: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
HAZ-7: Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
Hydrology and Water Quality					
HWQ-1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01, *Temporary Water Diversion Plan*	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
HWQ-2: Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
HWQ-3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
HWQ-4: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious area in a manner that would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff resulting in flooding onsite or offsite?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
HWQ-5: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
HWQ-6: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would impede or redirect flood flows?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01 ▪ MM-HWQ-02, *Construction Scheduling*	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-03, *Advanced Hydraulic Analysis* ▪ MM-HWQ-04, *Fully Incised Path* ▪ MM-HWQ-05, *Incised/Elevated Transition Widening* ▪ MM-HWQ-06, *Elevated-in-Channel Incised Path* ▪ MM-HWQ-08, *Streamlined Bridge Piers*	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01 ▪ MM-HWQ-02	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-03 ▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-05 ▪ MM-HWQ-06 ▪ MM-HWQ-08	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01 ▪ MM-HWQ-02	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-03 ▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-05 ▪ MM-HWQ-06 ▪ MM-HWQ-08	Less than Significant Impact
HWQ-7: Result in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
HWQ-8: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
HWQ-9: Cause changes to flood risk in sensitive reaches of the LA River or conflict with USACE's obligations under Section 408?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01 ▪ MM-HWQ-02	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-03 ▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-05 ▪ MM-HWQ-06 ▪ MM-HWQ-08 ▪ MM-HWQ-09, *Compliance with Section 408 Permit*	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01 ▪ MM-HWQ-02	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-03 ▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-05 ▪ MM-HWQ-06 ▪ MM-HWQ-08 ▪ MM-HWQ-09	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-01 ▪ MM-HWQ-02	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-03 ▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-05 ▪ MM-HWQ-06 ▪ MM-HWQ-08 ▪ MM-HWQ-09	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
HWQ-10: Cause water quality or hydraulic conflicts with the ultimate implementation of the LARER project?	Proposed Project	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-05 ▪ MM-HWQ-06 ▪ MM-HWQ-07, *Channel Daylight Crossing Structure* ▪ MM-HWQ-09	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-06 ▪ MM-HWQ-07 ▪ MM-HWQ-09	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-HWQ-04 ▪ MM-HWQ-05 ▪ MM-HWQ-06 ▪ MM-HWQ-07 ▪ MM-HWQ-09	Less than Significant Impact
Land Use					
LU-1: Physically divide an established community?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
LU-2: Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
Noise and Vibration					
NOI-1: Generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels near the project in excess of standards established by the FTA, in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable agency standards?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-NOI-01, *Noise Control and Monitoring Plan*	Significant and Unavoidable
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-NOI-01	Significant and Unavoidable
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-NOI-01	Significant and Unavoidable
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
NOI-2: Generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant (for damage) Potentially Significant (for annoyance)	▪ MM-NOI-02, *Drill Piles Where Feasible* ▪ MM-VIB-01, *Vibration Control Plan* ▪ MM-VIB-02, *Vibration Monitoring Plan*	Less than Significant Impact (for damage) Significant and Unavoidable (for annoyance)
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant (for damage) Potentially Significant (for annoyance)	▪ MM-NOI-02 ▪ MM-VIB-01 ▪ MM-VIB-02	Less than Significant Impact (for damage) Significant and Unavoidable (for annoyance)
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant (for damage) Potentially Significant (for annoyance)	▪ MM-NOI-02 ▪ MM-VIB-01 ▪ MM-VIB-02	Less than Significant Impact (for damage) Significant and Unavoidable (for annoyance)
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
NOI-3: Expose people residing or working in the RSA to excessive noise levels if the project is located near a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport?	Proposed Project	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
Population and Housing					
PH-1: Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
PH-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
Public Services/Safety and Security					
PS-1: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable services ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection and emergency services?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
PS-2: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable services ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
PS-3: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable services ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?	Proposed Project	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
PS-4: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable services ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public libraries?	Proposed Project	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	No Impact	None	No Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
Recreation					
REC-1: Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
REC-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
REC-3: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for parks?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
Transportation					
TR-1: Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
TR-2: Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
TR-3: Substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
TR-4: Result in inadequate emergency access?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
Tribal Cultural Resources					
TCR-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR, defined in PRC Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k), or is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision I of PRC Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	Proposed Project	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-TCR-01, *Tribal Monitoring* ▪ MM-CUL-03 ▪ MM-CUL-04	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-TCR-01 ▪ MM-CUL-03 ▪ MM-CUL-04	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Potentially Significant	▪ MM-TCR-01 ▪ MM-CUL-03 ▪ MM-CUL-04	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
Utilities and System Services					
UTL-1: Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, or other utility or public services facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental impacts?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
UTL-2: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
UTL-3: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
UTL-4: Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid-waste reduction goals?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
UTL-5: Conflict with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	No Impact	None	No Impact

Table ES-8. Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project/ Option	Phase	Impact Before Mitigation	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Impact After Mitigation
Wildfire					
WF-1: Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
WF-2: Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
WF-3: Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
WF-4: Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	Proposed Project	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 1	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
	Option 2	Construction	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact
		Operation	Less than Significant Impact	None	Less than Significant Impact

ES-4 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

CEQA Guidelines Section 15216.2(b) requires EIRs to include a discussion of significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided if a project is implemented. In Chapter 3, *Environmental Settings, Impacts, and Mitigation*, Sections 3.2 through 3.19 analyze significant environmental impacts related to the Proposed Project and its options; identify feasible mitigation measures that could avoid or reduce these significant impacts, where available; and present a determination stating whether these mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. If a specific impact discussed in any of these sections cannot be fully reduced to a less than significant level, it is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. As concluded in the Draft EIR and shown in Table ES-8, the following impacts would be significant and unavoidable for the Proposed Project and its options, even after implementation of mitigation measures:

- Geology, soils, and paleontological resources (paleontological resources during construction)
- Noise and vibration (increase in ambient noise during construction; vibration annoyance during construction)

ES-5 Project Alternatives

CEQA requires that a range of reasonable project alternatives to the Proposed Project is considered that could meet most of the basic project objectives and substantially reduce or eliminate significant impacts associated with the project. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a):

> "An EIR shall describe the range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation."

Project Alternatives are summarized below, and are described in more detail in Chapter 5, *Alternatives*.

ES-5.1 No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative is required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) and assumes that the Proposed Project would not be implemented. The Proposed Project is identified in the LARMP as the "Metro LA River Path." Under the No Project Alternative, the approximately 8-mile stretch of the LA River from Elysian Valley in the City of Los Angeles to the Cities of Vernon and Maywood would not be developed with an active transportation path. The 8-mile gap between the existing Los Angeles River Greenway Trail and the existing LA River Trail along the LA River would remain and connectivity between the existing pedestrian and bicycle paths would not occur. The Project footprint along the LA River would remain a flood channel and remain closed to the public. No new access points to the surrounding parks and recreational facilities would be developed and path elements such as lighting, landscaping, and signage would not exist. In addition, no new bridges and piers would be constructed in the LA River and no new river crossings related to the Project would occur.

The No Project Alternative assumes that projects in the regional area would continue to progress as identified in local general plans, capital improvement programs, and regional plans, including the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG's) *Connect SoCal—The 2024–2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* (Connect SoCal) (SCAG 2020) and other proposed projects identified in the LARMP, including the Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration (LARER) project. Under the No Project Alternative, the LARMP would continue to serve as the existing planning framework for enhancing the LA River, including the Project area.

ES-5.2 Mostly-East Bank Alternative

The Mostly-East Bank Alternative, known as Alignment D in the Conceptual Design Report, proposes a pedestrian and bicycling path alignment running predominantly along the east bank of the LA River from the northern terminus of the existing LA River Greenway Trail at Riverside Drive in the City of Los Angeles to the southern terminus of the existing path at Atlantic Boulevard. Starting at the north end on the western bank where the LA River Greenway Trail ends, this alternative would cross over the LA River to operate on the east bank north of Mission Road/Cesar E. Chavez to just north of Washington Boulevard/Redondo Junction. Due to physical and hydrological constraints, only a west bank option is possible at the Redondo Junction and the Mostly-East Bank Alternative would require a gap in the alignment path starting at the Redondo Junction before continuing along the east bank and connecting with the existing bike path at Atlantic Boulevard. The alternative would be directly adjacent to the river's east bank between the channel and at-grade active rail facilities. The Mostly-East Bank Alternative would include 10 access points: Figueroa Street (Existing), Los Angeles State Historic Park/Main Street, Mission Road/Cesar E Chavez, Union Station, First Street, Seventh Street, Washington Boulevard, Bandini Boulevard, Downey Road, and Atlantic Boulevard.

ES-5.3 Mostly-West Bank Alternative

The Mostly-West Bank Alternative, known as Alignment E in the Conceptual Design Report, proposes a pedestrian and bicycling path predominantly along the west bank of the LA River from the northern terminus of the existing path at Elysian Park to the southern terminus of the existing path at Atlantic Boulevard. The Mostly-West Bank Alternative would follow the western bank of the LA River in the area between the channel and at-grade active rail facilities. Starting at the north end on the western bank where the LA River Greenway Trail ends, the Mostly-West Bank Alternative would cross over the LA River to operate on the eastern bank between Ed. P. Reyes Greenway and Albion Park, then cross back to the west bank at the LA State Historic Park access point and stays on the west bank until Washington Boulevard. This alternative would then operate on the east bank until just north of Atlantic Boulevard where the alignment would cross back to the west bank and connect with the existing access point at Atlantic Boulevard. The Mostly-West Bank Alternative would include 10 access points: Ed P. Reyes Greenway, Albion Park/Main Street, Los Angeles State Historic Park/Main Street, Mission Road/Cesar E Chavez Avenue, Union Station, First Street, Sixth Street Tunnel, Washington Boulevard, Bandini-Soto Triangle, and Downey Road.

ES-5.4 Shortened Northern Path Alternative

The Shortened Northern Path Alternative would not meet the Project's primary objective. The Shortened Northern Path Alternative would have a northern terminus of the existing LA River Greenway Trail in the City of Los Angeles and a southern terminus at Sixth Street and would not close the entire 8-mile gap along the LA River between Elysian Valley and the City of Vernon. This alternative would result in limited or no access to the local neighborhoods south of Sixth Street.

ES-5.5 Shortened Southern Path Alternative

The Shortened Southern Path Alternative would not meet the Project's primary objective. The Shortened Southern Path Alternative would have a northern terminus at First Street in the City of Los Angeles and a southern terminus at Atlantic Boulevard in the City of Vernon and would not close the entire 8-mile gap along the LA River between Elysian Valley and the City of Vernon. This alternative would result in limited or no access to the local neighborhoods north of First Street.

ES-5.6 Comparison of Alternatives

Table ES-9 summarizes the environmental impacts of the alternatives compared to the Proposed Project and identifies if the alternatives would have greater, lesser, or similar impacts compared to the Proposed Project. Additional detail is described in Chapter 5, *Alternatives*.

Table ES-9. Alternatives Comparison of Environmental Impacts Relative to the Proposed Project

Environmental Topics	Construction/ Operation	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Mostly-East Bank Alternative	Mostly-West Bank Alternative	Shortened Northern Path Alternative	Shortened Southern Path Alternative
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
Air Quality	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↑	=	=	↑	↑
Biological Resources	Construction	LTSM	↓	↓	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
Cultural Resources	Construction	LTSM	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	NI	=	=	=	=	=
Energy	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↑	=	=	↑	↑
Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources	Construction	SU	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↑	=	=	↑	↑
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Construction	LTSM	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
Hydrology and Water Quality	Construction	LTSM	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTSM	↑	=	=	↓	↓
Land Use and Planning	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	=	=
	Operation	LTS	↑	=	=	=	=

Table ES-9. Alternatives Comparison of Environmental Impacts Relative to the Proposed Project

Environmental Topics	Construction/ Operation	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Mostly-East Bank Alternative	Mostly-West Bank Alternative	Shortened Northern Path Alternative	Shortened Southern Path Alternative
Noise and Vibration	Construction	SU	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
Population and Housing	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	=	=
	Operation	LTS	↓	=	=	=	=
Public Services/ Safety and Security	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↑	=	=	↓	↓
Recreation	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	=	=
	Operation	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
Transportation	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↑	=	=	↑	↑
Tribal Cultural Resources	Construction	LTSM	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	NI	=	=	=	=	=
Utilities and Service Systems	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
	Operation	LTS	↓	=	=	↓	↓
Wildfire	Construction	LTS	↓	=	=	=	↓
	Operation	LTS	↓	=	=	=	↓

Notes:

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTSM = Less Than Significant with Measures Incorporated

NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

↑: Greater Impacts compared to the Proposed Project

↓: Lesser Impacts compared to the Proposed Project

=: Similar Impacts compared to the Proposed Project

ES-5.6.1 No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would have similar impacts compared to the Proposed Project for cultural resources (operation), tribal cultural resources (TCRs) (operation), and noise and vibration (operation). The No Project Alternative would not include operation and maintenance (O&M) activities that would disturb cultural resources and TCRs and would result in no impacts. Under the No Project Alternative, impacts for noise and vibration (operation) would be less than significant and have similar impacts to the Proposed Project. The reduction in vehicular traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not occur as a result of the No Project Alternative and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would not be reduced. Traffic noise could be greater than Proposed Project, but the No Project Alternative would avoid minor O&M noises associated with the Proposed Project. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in less than significant impact related to both noise and vibration, similar to the Proposed Project during operation.

The No Project Alternative would not result in Project-related construction and O&M activities and would have fewer impacts compared to the Proposed Project for the following environmental resources: aesthetics/visual resources; air quality (construction); biological resources; cultural resources (construction); energy (construction); geology, soils, and paleontological resources; GHG (construction); hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning (construction); noise and vibration (construction); population and housing; public services/safety and security (construction); recreation (construction); transportation (construction); TCRs (construction); utilities and service systems; and wildfire.

The No Project Alternative would have greater impacts compared to the Proposed Project for the following environmental resources: air quality (operation), energy (operation), GHG (operation), land use (operation), public services/safety and security (operation), recreation (operation), and transportation (operation). Air quality (operation), energy (operation), GHG (operation), and transportation (operation) impacts would be greater than the Proposed Project as a result having lower VMT reductions compared to the Proposed Project. Land use (operation) impacts would be greater than the Proposed Project because the No Project Alternative would not meet the objectives of the LA River Revitalization Master Plan and other applicable regional and local plans to provide linkages and connections to nearby communities, encourage alternative modes of transportation, and provide safe bicycle facilities for people of all types and abilities. Public services/safety and security (operation) and recreation (operation) impacts would be greater than the Proposed Project because the No Project Alternative would not construct additional access points to the LA River, nor incorporate additional safety features along the LA River associated with the Proposed Project.

ES-5.6.2 Mostly-East Bank Alternative

The Mostly-East Bank Alternative would have similar impacts for almost all environmental resources compared to the Proposed Project. Impacts to cultural resources (construction) would be less than significant with mitigation and similar to the Proposed Project during construction. Excluding historic bridges, nine identified historical resources are situated along the west bank and two identified historical resources are situated along the east bank through this area. Compared to the Proposed Project, this alternative would avoid potential less than significant impacts to the property and historic setting of HR-44. However, compared to the Proposed Project one additional historic property (HR-38) may be impacted by construction vibration due to the closer proximity of construction activity on the east bank and one historic property (HR-33) may no longer be impacted as a result of pile driving no longer occurring in its vicinity. As a result, similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would result in construction-related vibration impacts to historic resources located in close proximity to construction activities, which would generally involve those historical resources located along the east bank of the LA River Channel. This alternative would implement the same mitigation measures as the Proposed Project to avoid construction impacts on built-environment historical resources.

This alternative would have fewer impacts related to biological resources (construction) and noise and vibration (construction annoyance). This alternative would have fewer impacts related to biological resources (construction) because it may not require the removal of the southern California black walnut trees located along the western riverbank between the Riverside Drive Viaduct and the SR-110 Bridge and would therefore result in fewer impacts related to the removal of protected trees, migratory birds, and loss of nesting habitats than the Proposed Project.

Impacts related to noise and vibration (construction annoyance) would be significant and unavoidable and less than the Proposed Project during construction. The path type near Receptors 17, 18, and 19 would no longer require pile driving and the severity of noise and vibration impacts may be reduced. General construction activity may still result in noise and vibration impacts at these receptors. One

additional historic property (HR-38) may be impacted by construction vibration due to the closer proximity of construction activity on the east bank and one historic property (HR-33) may not be impacted as a result of pile driving no longer occurring in its vicinity, compared to the Proposed Project. This alternative would implement the same mitigation measures as the Proposed Project to reduce noise and vibration impacts during construction. It is anticipated that potential significant vibration damage impacts would be reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures similar to the Proposed Project. However, like the Proposed Project, construction of the Mostly-East Bank Alternative may still result in noise and vibration annoyance impacts due to the proximity of adjacent sensitive receptors and the potential use of pile drivers.

This alternative would not have greater impacts compared to the Proposed Project.

ES-5.6.3 Mostly-West Bank Alternative

The Mostly-West Bank Alternative would have similar impacts for almost all environmental resources compared to the Proposed Project. Impacts to cultural resources (construction) would be less than significant with mitigation and similar to the Proposed Project during construction. This alternative would have potential less than significant impacts to the historic setting of HR-47 because the path alignment would be situated along the opposite side of the LA River; however, new potential impacts to HR-26 may occur. Such impacts to HR-26 would be similar to those described for Option 2 and would be less than significant. A reduction in vibration impacts at one historic property (HR-33) would also occur due to increased distance from construction activity. As a result, similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would result in construction-related vibration impacts to historic resources located in close proximity to construction activities which would generally involve those historical resources located along the west bank of the LA River Channel. This alternative would implement the same mitigation measures as the Proposed Project to avoid construction impacts on built-environment historical resources.

Impacts related to noise and vibration (construction annoyance) would be significant and unavoidable and less than the Proposed Project during construction. This path alignment would be predominantly on the west bank where sensitive receptors are sporadically located within primarily industrials uses. As the construction activity would primarily occur on the west bank, sensitive receptors on the east bank would be less impacted by construction noise and vibration. Specifically, residences located between the US-101 freeway and Second Street (Receptors 17, 18, and 19) on the east bank would receive a reduction in noise and vibration impacts as a result of the increased distance and path type no longer requiring pile driving. The One Santa Fe Apartments (Receptor 20) may experience increased construction noise and vibration due to construction activity occurring at a closer distance than under the Proposed Project. A reduction in vibration impacts at HR-33 would also occur due to increased distance from construction activity, compared to the Proposed Project. Potential significant vibration damage impacts would be reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures similar to the Proposed Project. However, like the Proposed Project, construction of the Mostly-West Bank Alternative may still result in noise and vibration annoyance impacts due to the proximity of adjacent sensitive receptors and the potential use of pile drivers.

This alternative would not have greater impacts compared to the Proposed Project.

ES-5.6.4 Shortened Northern Path Alternative

The Shortened Northern Path Alternative would have similar impact compared to the Proposed Project for cultural resources (operation), land use planning, population and housing, recreation, TCRs (operation), and wildlife.

As a result of a shortened alignment, this alternative would have fewer impacts compared to the Proposed Project for the following environmental resources: aesthetic/visual resources, air quality (construction), biological resources, cultural resources (construction), energy (construction), geology, soils, and paleontological resources, GHG (construction), hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise and vibration, public services/safety and security, transportation (construction), TCRs (construction) and utilities and service systems. In particular, cultural resources (construction) would have reduced impacts because this alignment would avoid potentially significant impacts to the Washington Boulevard Bridge and Atlantic Boulevard Bridge associated with the path alignment of the Proposed Project. The number of historic properties that would be potentially exposed to excessive vibration would be reduced by six properties compared to the Proposed Project. This alternative would implement the same mitigation measures as the Proposed Project to avoid construction impacts on built-environment historical resources and impacts. Therefore, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant with mitigation and less than the Proposed Project during construction.

Significant and unavoidable impacts related to paleontological resources (construction) and noise and vibration impacts (construction) would be reduced under this alternative, compared to the Proposed Project, due to the shorter alignment and reduced construction activities. However, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable even after implementation of mitigation measures, though to a lesser extent compared to the Proposed Project. In particular, noise and vibration (construction) would have reduced impacts due to its shorter alignment. The number of noise and vibration sensitive receptors affected would be reduced by three sensitive receptors compared to the Proposed Project and the number of historic properties that would be potentially exposed to excessive vibration would be reduced by six properties. This alternative would implement the same mitigation measures as the Proposed Project to reduce noise and vibration impacts during construction. It is anticipated that potential vibration damage impacts would also be able to be mitigated. However, like the Proposed Project, this alternative may still result in noise and vibration annoyance impacts due to the proximity of adjacent sensitive receptors and the potential use of pile drivers. Impacts to noise and vibration annoyance (construction) would be significant and unavoidable but less than the Proposed Project during construction.

In addition, this alternative would result in fewer impacts for hydrological impacts compared to the Proposed Project. However, this alternative would still be located within LA River Reaches 7 and 8 in conjunction with the LARER project and within a 100-year flood zone, thus requiring mitigation measure specific to Reaches 7 and 8, similar to the Proposed Project. This alternative would not avoid hydrological impacts at Reaches 7 and 8. Nonetheless, this alternative would result in lesser impacts to hydrological resources compared to the Proposed Project because of the shorter alignment and avoidance of hydrological impacts associated with the construction of piers and elevated crossings related to the Proposed Project south of Sixth Street and near the Washington Boulevard (Redondo Junction), Bandini-Soto Triangle, and Atlantic Boulevard access points. Similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would be an active transportation path that would result in a reduction of passenger vehicle trips to the region and in a reduction in VMT. However, as a result of the shortened alignment from the northern terminus of the existing LA River Greenway Trail to Sixth Street, this alternative would not reduce VMTs to the same level as the Proposed Project. As a result, the

alternative would have greater levels of impact compared to the Proposed Project for air quality (operation), energy (operation), GHG (operation), and transportation (operation).

This alternative would not have greater impacts compared to the Proposed Project.

ES-5.6.5 Shortened Southern Path Alternative

The Shortened Southern Path Alternative would have similar impacts compared to the Proposed Project for cultural resources (operation), land use planning, population and housing, recreation, and TCRs (operation).

As a result of a shortened alignment from the First Street to southern terminus at Atlantic Boulevard, this alternative would have fewer impacts compared to the Proposed Project for the following environmental resources: aesthetic/visual resources, air quality (construction), biological resources, cultural resources (construction), energy (construction), geology, soils, and paleontological resources, GHG (construction), hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise and vibration, public services/safety and security, transportation (construction), TCRs (construction), utilities and service systems, and wildfire. In particular, cultural resources (construction) would have reduced impacts because potentially significant impacts to the North Main Street Bridge and Cesar E Chavez Viaduct associated with the path alignment of the Proposed Project would be avoided by this alternative. The number of historic properties potentially exposed to excessive vibration would be reduced by 15 properties. This alternative would implement the same mitigation measures as the Proposed Project to avoid construction impacts on built-environment historical resources and impacts. Therefore, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant with mitigation and less than the Proposed Project during construction.

Significant and unavoidable impacts related to paleontological resources (construction) and noise and vibration impacts (construction) would be reduced under this alternative due to the shorter alignment and reduced construction activities compared to the Proposed Project. However, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable even after implementation of mitigation measures, though to a lesser extent compared to the Proposed Project. In particular, noise and vibration (construction) would have reduced impacts due to its shorter alignment, reduction in construction activities, and no construction north of First Street. The number of noise and vibration sensitive receptors affected would be reduced by 19 sensitive receptors compared to the Proposed Project and the number of historic properties that would be potentially exposed to excessive vibration would be reduced by 15 properties. This alternative would implement the same mitigation measures as the Proposed Project to reduce noise and vibration impacts during construction. It is anticipated that potential vibration damage impacts would also be able to be mitigated. However, like the Proposed Project, this alternative may still result in noise and vibration annoyance impacts due to the proximity of adjacent sensitive receptors and the potential use of pile drivers. Impacts to noise and vibration annoyance (construction) would be significant and unavoidable but less than the Proposed Project during construction.

This alternative would result in lesser impacts for hydrological impacts compared to the Proposed Project. This alternative would not be located within LA River Reaches 7 and 8 in conjunction with the LARER project and would not be within a 100-year flood zone. Thus, the Proposed Project's mitigation measure specific to Reaches 7 and 8 and the LARER project would not be required, and fewer hydrology mitigation measures are needed compared to the Proposed Project. This alternative would still have hydrological impacts associated with the construction of piers and elevated crossings related to the Proposed Project south of Sixth Street and near the Washington Boulevard (Redondo Junction), Bandini-Soto Triangle, and Atlantic Boulevard access points. However, hydrological impacts are

reduced because of the shorter alignment and would result in lesser impacts to hydrological resources compared to the Proposed Project. In addition, this alternative would be substantially within the same footprint as the Proposed Project south of First Street and would not be located within a designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ), resulting in no wildfire impacts compared to the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would be an active transportation path that would result in a reduction of passenger vehicle trips to the region and in a reduction in VMT. However, as a result of the shortened alignment from the First Street to the southern terminus at Atlantic Boulevard, this alternative would not reduce VMTs to the same level as the Proposed Project. As a result, the alternative would have greater levels of impact compared to the Proposed Project for air quality (operation), energy (operation), GHG (operation), and transportation (operation).

This alternative would not have greater impacts compared to the Proposed Project.

ES-6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), a Draft EIR must identify an "environmentally superior alternative" to determine which alternative possesses an overall environmental advantage when compared to all other alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, CEQA requires the identification of an environmentally superior other than the No Project Alternative. The environmentally superior alternative can inform decision-makers as part of the project approval process; however, Metro is not required by CEQA to select the environmentally superior alternative as the locally approved project.

As shown in Table ES-9, the No Project Alternative would avoid, have similar, or have reduced significant impacts for almost all environmental resources associated with the Proposed Project, but may have a slightly greater impact related to air quality (operation), energy (operation), GHG (operation), land use and planning (operation), noise and vibration (operation), public services/safety and security (operations), and transportation (operation).

The Shortened Southern Alignment would have the greatest reductions in impacts to environmental resources compared to the other alternatives aside from the No Project Alternative. Therefore, the Shortened Southern Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative as it would further reduce impacts to aesthetic/visual resources, air quality (construction), biological resources, cultural resources (construction), energy (construction), geology, soils, and paleontological resources, GHG (construction), hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise and vibration, public services/safety and security, transportation (construction), TCRs (construction), utilities and service systems, and wildfire compared to the Proposed Project.

ES-7 Public Outreach

Metro has implemented a comprehensive outreach program for the Project in an effort to better understand the communities that live in and near the Project area, their priorities, and how the Project can best meet their needs. During the conceptual design phase, the Project team held nine community meetings and 23 pop-up events and administered two online survey tools to gather community input. More than 300 people participated in the nine community meetings, more than 4,600 comments were received through all in-person events, and more than 3,800 responses were received for the two online and in-person surveys. Outreach during the conceptual design phase helped inform the Project's mission statement, goals, path types, and access point opportunities.

Metro's scoping outreach program for the Project worked to increase awareness and disseminate information, gather public input, and support the technical and legal environmental process. In alignment with Metro's Public Participation Plan, in Title IV, *Environmental Justice and Limited English Proficiency*, accommodations were made to expand participation during the public scoping process. Notification of public scoping meetings were published in eight newspapers highly circulated in areas potentially affected by the Project. A variety of other noticing methods were also implemented in advance of the public scoping meetings, including mailed notices, email notice distributions, information posted to the Metro website, hand-distributed flyers, geo-targeted Facebook advertisements, and Metro Marketing efforts. Metro conducted four public scoping meetings in Boyle Heights, Little Tokyo/Arts District, City of Maywood, and Cypress Park during the 45-day scoping period. Metro received a total of 148 written and oral comments during the public scoping period.

Metro filed an NOP for the Project Draft EIR on October 23, 2019, with the State of California Office of Planning and Research's State Clearinghouse and the Los Angeles County Clerk. The NOP provided notice for responsible agencies to transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 45 days of receiving the NOP from the Lead Agency (Metro). The NOP also invited public participation in the EIR scoping process and announced scheduled scoping meetings.

ES-8 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

ES-8.1 Areas of Controversy

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(2) requires that an EIR identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

During the public comment period for the NOP, various comment letters were received regarding the Project. The comments submitted on the NOP during the public review and comment period are in Appendix A, *Public Participation and Outreach*. Areas of potential controversy known to Metro are discussed in the *Scoping Summary Report* (also in Appendix A, *Public Participation and Outreach*). Areas of known controversy are briefly summarized as follows:

- Project construction costs
- Safety and security for path users
- Air quality and odor along the path
- Equity concerns for disadvantaged communities
- Connectivity to recreation and key destinations
- Impacts related to hazardous materials

ES-8.2 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(3) requires a discussion of issues to be resolved, including a choice of alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. The Metro Board will decide if the significant impacts associated with biological resources, cultural resources hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and TCRs have been fully mitigated to below a level of significance. Impacts related to geology, soils, and paleontological resources (during construction)

and noise and vibration (during construction) would remain significant and unavoidable. The Metro Board will also decide if any Proposed Project alternatives substantially reduce significant impacts while still meeting the key Project objectives, and if one of the alternatives could be approved. Upon the completion of the Final EIR and other required documentation, if warranted, the Metro Board will adopt findings relative to the Project's environmental effects, and prepare a statement of overriding considerations, in conjunction with the certification of the Final EIR and approval of the Project.

The following issues are to be resolved as the Project proceeds through the environmental process and interested-party coordination:

- Selection of alignment
- Selection of access points
- Selection of design variations
- Selection of the Final EIR Project (Metro Board will select a Final EIR Project after circulation of the Draft EIR)
- Funding shortfall
- Phasing of the Project based on available funding

ES-9 References

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. 2022. *Draft Cornfield Arroyo Seco Specific Plan Update*. November. https://planning.lacity.gov/plans-policies/casp-update.

City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. 2007. *Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan*. April. https://apps.engineering.lacity.gov/lariverrmp/CommunityOutreach/masterplan_download.htm.

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW). 2022. *LA River Master Plan*. June. Prepared by Geosyntec, Olin and Gehry Partners, LLP. https://pw.lacounty.gov/uploads/swp/LARiverMasterPlan-FINAL-DIGITAL-COMPRESSED.pdf.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). 2016. *Los Angeles River Bike Path Gap Closure Feasibility Study*. May 31. libraryarchives.metro.net/dpgtl/lariver/20170712-la-river-bike-path-gap-closure-feasibility-study-updated.pdf.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). 2019. *Conceptual Design Report: LA River Path*. October. https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/78uqw9ywqe8ecz3hiu6tb/190912_LAR_Concept_Design_Report_Final.pdf?rlkey=f3k1it8ddnmi1to45ypab0u60&dl=0.

River LA. 2013. Website: *Greenway 2020*. https://www.riverla.org/pastprojects/greenway2020-sz8wl-pkz6s.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2020. *Connect SoCal 2024—The 2024–2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy*. March. https://scag.ca.gov/connect-socal.

US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2015. *Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report*. October. Prepared by USACE Los Angeles District. Record RN 735-17c https://usace.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p16021coll7/id/2339.

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

DRAFT EIR OUTREACH SUMMARY

LA River Path



Metro

Contents

1.0 Introduction 3

1.1 Project Overview 3

1.1.1 Project Area 3

1.2 Project Description and Objectives 4

2.0 Draft EIR Review Period Process 5

2.1 Draft EIR Review Period Notification 6

2.2 Legal Ads – Newspapers 6

2.3 Agency Notification 6

2.4 Mailings and Other Notification Methods 7

2.5 Title VI, Environmental Justice, Limited English Proficiency, and Metro's Public Participation Plan 9

2.6 Tribal Consultation 9

2.7 Transit Rider Intercepts 9

3.0 Public Hearing Activities and Outcomes 10

3.1 Public Hearings 10

3.2 Public Participation 12

4.0 Summary Draft EIR Review Period Comments 13

4.1 Summary of Comments from Agencies 13

4.2 Summary of Comments from Stakeholder Groups 18

4.3 Summary of Comments from Community Members 21

4.3.1 Categories of Comments 21

5.0 Next Steps 24

Tables and Figures

Figure 1 Project Map and Project Area 4

Table 1 Legal Ads 6

Table 2 Display Ads 7

Figure 2A Postcard Notification Map 7

Figure 2B Flyer Notification Map 8

Figure 3 Draft EIR Postcard Notification 8

Table 3 Transit Rider Intercepts 9

Figure 4 Online StoryMap Presentation 11

Table 4 Government Agencies, Elected Officials, and Special Districts Represented at the Public Hearings 12

Table 5 Public Participation by Public Hearing 12

Figure 5 Comments by Source 13

Table 6 Agency Comments 13

Table 7 Stakeholder Comments 18

1.0 Introduction

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has initiated a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Los Angeles River Path Project (Project) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Metro is the lead agency for the Project. The Project is a proposed an 8-mile pedestrian and bike path to create a continuous 32-mile path extending from Griffith Park through Downtown Los Angeles to the City of Vernon and connecting to Long Beach along the LA River.

In December 2025, Metro issued a Notice of Availability (NOA) initiating the Draft EIR public comment Review Period under the CEQA. The Draft EIR Review Period commenced on December 18, 2025, and ended on February 2, 2025, for a 47-day comment period to allow the public sufficient opportunity to comment on the Project. In January 2026, Metro held four public hearings to provide information on the Draft EIR and receive public comments. Three of these public hearings were held in-person, while one was held virtually.

In addition to a recording of the virtual public hearing, Project information, Draft EIR chapters, non-CEQA reports (i.e., technical reports on topics not evaluated in CEQA such as capital costs and conceptual engineering), and interactive maps were made available online throughout the Review Period via the **Project website**, **ArcGIS StoryMap**, and the interactive **PlanEngage** site that hosted the complete Draft EIR.

The outreach report summarizes both the Draft EIR efforts and comments received during the 47-day Review Period. It includes five main sections and appendices, as described below:

> Section 1: Introduces the report, describes the purpose of the Draft EIR and an overview of the Project, and includes information on the Notice of Availability (NOA).

> Section 2: Provides information on the Draft EIR process, agency roles, cooperating agencies, tribal consultation, legally required notification methods, and public agency participation.

> Section 3: Provides an overview of the public comment themes received and comments from agencies during the 47-day Review Period. Full comments received during the Review Period will be responded to in the Final EIR.

> Section 4: Provides an overview of participation at the public hearings.

> Section 5: Provides an overview of the next steps in the environmental process.

> Appendices: Provide all the supporting materials used during the public hearings as well as copies of comments received. The appendices also include copies of the NOA, meeting materials provided at the public hearings, newspaper ads and other supporting materials

1.1 Project Overview

1.1.1 Project Area

The main purpose of the Project is to provide a safe and world-class active transportation path along the LA River between Elysian Valley in the City of Los Angeles and the Cities of Vernon and Maywood. The Project would enhance recreational opportunities, livability, regional and local connectivity, access to economic opportunity, and separation from vehicular traffic for people of all ages and abilities, while providing an outstanding user experience. This new transportation facility would contribute to improved health, economic, environmental, transportation, and equity issues throughout and beyond the study area.


Metro is evaluating a Proposed Project and its two options, Option 1 and Option 2, which vary in their path types, access points, river crossings, connectors, ancillary path elements, and design variations. The Proposed Project spans approximately 9.6 miles in length and includes seven river crossings and nine access points: four on the west bank and five on the east bank on the river, as shown in Figure ES-3 of the Draft EIR. Additionally, the Proposed Project includes improvements to the existing access point on the west bank of the river at Atlantic Boulevard in the City of Vernon. The Proposed Project would be in close proximity (0.5 to 1 mile) to the Union Station, Chinatown Station, Pico/Aliso Station, Washington Station, Little Tokyo/Arts District Station, and Lincoln/Cypress Station.

Option 1 retains most components of the Proposed Project, with some modifications. These modifications result in a slightly longer route for Option 1, which would span approximately 10.1 miles. Option 1 would have the same path types as the Proposed Project (refer to Section 2.5.1.4 of the Draft EIR) though with some changes in locations and compositions, with 56% elevated, 9% top-of-bank, and 35% incised path types. Option 1 would cross the river six times and would have 11 access points: six on the west bank and five on the east bank, including improvements to the existing Atlantic Boulevard access point in the City of Vernon. Like the Proposed Project, Option 1 would be in close proximity to 6 Metro stations.

Option 2 would retain most components of the Proposed Project, with some changes. These modifications would result in a slightly shorter alignment for Option 2, which would span approximately 9.1 miles. Option 2 would have the same path types as the Proposed Project though with some changes in locations and compositions, with 47% elevated, 19% top-of-bank, and 34% incised path types. Option 2 would cross the river seven times and would have nine access points: four on the west bank and five on the east bank of the river, including improvements to the existing Atlantic Boulevard access point in the City of Vernon. Like the Proposed Project and Option 1, Option 2 would be in close proximity to 6 Metro stations.

The Draft EIR outlines the Project objectives, describes the Project design, operations, and maintenance. It discloses potential environmental impacts in the short-term (construction) and long-term (operations) and mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate potential environmental impacts from the Project. The Draft EIR also considers a range of reasonable project alternatives that could meet most of the basic project objectives and to substantially reduce or eliminate significant impacts associated with the Project. This includes a No Project Alternative option, Mostly-East Bank, Mostly-West Bank, Shortened Northern Path, and a Shortened Southern Path Alternative.

Figure 1 Project Map and Project Area



1.2 Project Description and Objectives

The Project would create a pedestrian and bicycling path regionally located in the center of Los Angeles County, California, and would close the longest remaining 8-mile gap between the existing Los Angeles River Greenway Trail and the existing LA River Trail along the LA River, allowing for a continuous 32-mile path extending from Griffith Park through Downtown Los Angeles to the City of Vernon and connecting to Long Beach along the LA River. Land uses within the Project study area and surrounding area are predominantly industrial or contain infrastructure such as utility and flood-control facilities, with some residential, commercial, religious, and open space land uses near the Project. The Project would improve health, economic, environmental, transportation, and equity conditions throughout and beyond the Project study area.

The Project objectives include:

> Providing, to the extent feasible, a seamless pedestrian and bicycling path between the San Fernando Valley in Los Angeles and the LA River Bicycle Path in Long Beach.

> Improving safety for pedestrians and bicyclists from existing conditions.

> Increasing access from local neighborhoods to employment centers, regional destinations, resources, and amenities, including healthcare services.

> Reducing vehicle miles traveled by allowing people to walk and bicycle on a dedicated, vehicle-separated path through and within Los Angeles County, thereby reducing trip lengths and expanding travel choices.

> Improving access to opportunity for historically under-invested communities, especially for low-income households earning less than $60,000 per year and in marginalized communities.

> Creating a path that feels safe, comfortable, and is a world-class transportation facility open to people of all ages and abilities.

> Creating a path that meets the needs of both recreational and utilitarian users.

2.0 Draft EIR Review Period Process

The following list summarizes the activities completed at the start of and during the Draft EIR Review Period process for the Project:

> Filing a NOA with the County Clerk/Recorder of Los Angeles County and with the State Clearinghouse, including a Notice of Completion (NOC) to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) State Clearinghouse, to formally initiate the Draft EIR review period.

> Placing legal NOA notices in newspapers of general circulation.

> Mailing the NOA to potentially affected government agencies, residents, tribal groups, and businesses to advise them of Project initiation and to invite participation in public hearings.

> Placing copies of the Draft EIR for review at local repositories in the corridor.

> Translating key documents from English to Spanish.

> Holding meetings with potentially affected and/or interested parties in the Project Area.

> Recording comments that were received at, and subsequent to, the public hearings.

Comments received during the Draft EIR Review Period process become part of the public record as documented in this summary report. The comments and questions received during the Draft EIR Review Period process will be reviewed, considered by Metro, and responded to in the Final EIR.

The first step in the Draft EIR Review Period for this Project was the filing of a NOA (California Code of Regulations, Title XIV, 15105). The NOA was filed with both the Los Angeles County Clerk and State Clearinghouse on December 18, 2025, including a NOC with the State Clearinghouse. The NOA provided notice for responsible agencies (the three cities along the corridor and Caltrans) and members of the public to transmit their comments on the content of the Draft EIR, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, by February 2, 2026, or within 47-days of receipt of the NOA from the lead agency. A Lead Agency is defined by the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15367, as the public agency with the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a Project. As the Lead Agency for the Project, Metro is responsible for preparing an EIR. The NOA, supplemental documents, and distribution list are available in Appendix A of this report.

The Draft EIR Public Review Period is required by CEQA policies. During the Draft EIR Public Review Period, Metro hosted three in-person public hearings and one virtual public hearing where the public was able to provide comments. The Draft EIR Public Review Period also includes consultation with resource agencies, other local, state, and federal agencies, and cooperating and responsible agencies, including the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). As the Lead Agency for this Project, Metro invited all interested individuals and organizations, public agencies, and Native American Tribes to comment on the content of the Draft EIR, including the Proposed Project, the route options studied, the impacts evaluated, and the evaluation methods used.

2.1 Draft EIR Review Period Notification

Per CEQA Guidelines, Section 15105, a Public Review Period is required when issuing the availability and completion of a Draft EIR. Metro hosted public hearings where the public was able to provide comments regarding the content and findings of the overall project plans. Metro conducted three in-person public hearings and one virtual public hearing during the Public Review Period. Additional details of those meetings can be found in Section 3 (Public Hearing Activities and Outcomes) of this report. Per CEQA requirements, Metro notified federal, state, county, and city agencies within the project study area, including responsible agencies, public agencies that have legal jurisdiction with respect to the Project, and other organizations or individuals that requested notice. Additionally, a copy of the NOA was filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk and State Clearinghouse. Legal advertisement notices were published in three newspapers of general circulation in the Project area, 15,046 postcards mailed, and 47,975 flyers were delivered door-to-door to residents and businesses within the study area.

2.2 Legal Ads – Newspapers

As required by CEQA Guidelines, Section 15105, legal advertisement notification of the NOA and Draft EIR Review Period for the Project was conducted in areas affected by the Project. Notices were published in three newspapers of general circulation in the affected areas as required by Section 6061 of the Government Code. The three publications listed in the table below were selected because they were the highest circulation newspapers within communities located in the Project area. All legal advertisements and proof of publication certificates are located in Appendix A of this report.

Table 1 Legal Ads

Publication	Date
Los Angeles Times	December 18, 2025
La Opinión	December 18, 2025
Daily News	December 18, 2025

2.3 Agency Notification

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15105 requires that upon completion and availability of a Draft EIR, the lead agency shall immediately send notice of that by mail or an equivalent procedure to each responsible agency, the Office of Planning and Research, and those public agencies having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the Project that are held in trust for the people of the State of California.

Once notified, those agencies shall respond to the lead agency on the content of the Draft EIR and environmental issues related to their agency's area of statutory responsibility to be responded to in the Final EIR. The information shall be specified in writing and shall be communicated to the lead agency by certified mail or equivalent procedure within the Public Review Period specified in the NOA. The lead agency shall request similar guidance from appropriate federal agencies under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15105.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15105 recommends the lead agency to provide notice of at least one public hearing to any county or city that borders on a county or city within which the Project is located, unless otherwise designated annually by agreement between the lead agency and the county or city. Metro mailed letters, including a copy of the NOA and copies of the Draft EIR and other technical reports on a flash drive, inviting relevant public agencies to participate in the public hearings and be aware of the Draft EIR Review Period.

2.4 Mailings and Other Notification Methods

To maximize public awareness, a variety of notification methods were implemented in advance of the public hearings. These included:

> Mailing bilingual (English/Spanish) notices to 15,046 addresses.

> Distributing electronic noticing to the Project database of over 6,689 contacts.

> Distributing 47,975 flyers door-to-door within the project study area.

> Advertisements on Metro's Project website.

> Obtaining paid media advertisements and earned media through organic publicly gained media, including stories from local blogs, print, and online newspapers advertising the meetings, including Rafu Shimpo and El Classificado.

Table 2 Display Ads

Paid Media Advertisements	Date
Rafu Shimpo	December 18, 2025
El Classificado	December 18, 2025


All forms of noticing provided information on the Project and public hearing details (dates, times, links, and in-language services) as well as contact information for accessing additional Project details. Additionally, notices provided information on the public comment period deadline and the various methods the public could submit comments for consideration in the Draft EIR.

All meeting notices were produced in English and Spanish, including mailing to a total of 15,046 property owners, business owners and non-owner-occupied residents, located within approximately 1-mile from each of the alignment alternatives. Notification efforts also included communicating via email with over 6,689 interested contacts in the Project's database that included contact names, organizations (if any), mailing addresses, email addresses, and contact information for all federal, state, and local elected offices and city staff within the Project area.

In addition to legally required notification mailings, notification methods included meeting flyer distribution to a total of 47,975 residents and businesses within approximately 1-mile from the alignments leading up to the public hearings. Print and online media notifications were also provided throughout the Project area during the 47-day Review Period. Additional information about these notification methods is available in Appendix A of this report. The figure below includes the areas where both flyer distributions and postcard mailing were distributed.

Figure 2A Postcard Notification Map

Los Angeles River Path—Postcard Distribution Map



Metro

Figure 2B Flyer Notification Map

Los Angeles River Path—Walking Man Map




Figure 3 Draft EIR Postcard Notification



2.5 Title VI, Environmental Justice, Limited English Proficiency, and Metro's Public Participation Plan

During the Draft EIR Review Period process, accommodations were made to expand access for participants with limited English proficiency (LEP) and Metro's Equity Focused Communities (EFC). Bilingual notices were developed and distributed through several different methods, including mail delivery, flyer delivery, email, and newspaper advertisements.

Materials were developed in English and Spanish, including a Spanish online StoryMap, and translation request forms were made available prior to the public hearings. Meeting times and materials were selected to allow for greater participation of historically underserved, low-income, and hard-to-reach communities by providing a virtual public hearing and a weekend morning public hearing. All materials were tailored to reach LEP individuals, given the demographics within the Project area. Additionally, public notices included the Metro LEP phone number, which gives the public the ability to make Metro aware of any language or Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodations required for attendance at any of the public hearings. A Spanish-language interpreter with simultaneous interpretation was present at each of the three in-person public hearings and available via Zoom at the virtual public hearing.

Non-traditional, targeted community outreach efforts included in-person transit rider intercepts at high ridership transit stations and stops in the study area (refer to Section 2.7 for more information). To ensure participation of LEP and EFCs communities, Metro applied additional efforts in notifying communities of the public hearings and Review Period and developed a separate online StoryMap presentation in Spanish to elicit feedback on the Project from LEP individuals, as well as to broaden the dialogue about the Project with the general public. The online StoryMap presentation was available for review in English and Spanish throughout the Review Period. Additionally, the Review Period was set to 47 days to provide adequate opportunity for review of materials and to provide feedback during the holiday period.

2.6 Tribal Consultation

In accordance with California Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), which, among other factors, resulted in updates to the CEQA Guidelines Initial Study Checklist to include questions related to impacts to tribal cultural resources, Metro notified Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed Project on December 18, 2025. Consultation with an affiliated tribe is required within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation. Metro notified the following tribal organizations: Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, Gabrielino/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Gabrielino/Tongva Nation, Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe. The outreach letter mailed by Metro can be found in Appendix A of this report.

2.7 Transit Rider Intercepts

Outreach efforts to existing transit riders were conducted to help ensure that those taking transit within the study area were aware of the project and had opportunities to provide feedback during the Draft EIR Review Period. To accomplish this effort, transit riders were interviewed at key high-ridership rail stations and bus stops throughout the study area.

Table 3 Transit Rider Intercepts

Rail Station/ Bus Stop Location	Date	No. Of Transit Riders
Mariachi Plaza Station	January 14, 2026, 6 am – 10 am	50
Lincoln/ Cypress Station	January 15, 2026, 8 am – 10 am	50
Little Tokyo/ Arts District Station	January 20, 2026, 8 am – 10 am	80
Chinatown Station	January 20, 2026, 4 pm – 6 pm	100
52nd St/ Atlantic	January 22, 2026, 3 pm – 7 pm	110
	Total	**390**

3.0 Public Hearing Activities and Outcomes

3.1 Public Hearings


In accordance with CEQA guidance, Metro conducted four public hearings (three in-person and one virtually on Zoom) during the 47-day Review Period. Notification of the public hearings was conducted in compliance with CEQA guidelines and as outlined in Sections 1 and 2 of this report. More information on the public hearings, including dates and attendance can be found in Table 5 of Section 3.2.


All in-person public hearings were held in the same format, consisting of an open house with display boards, a presentation by the project team on the Project, alignments and options considered, environmental impacts and mitigations, copies of the Draft EIR, and a court reporter and comment station, followed by a public comment period where individuals from the public could provide oral comments for the record. For those choosing not to speak publicly, comment cards and a court reporter were available throughout the public hearings for the public to provide oral and written comments. The virtual public hearing consisted of a presentation followed by a public comment period where individuals could virtually raise their hand and provide oral comments on the record. Additionally, for those choosing not to speak publicly, a Q&A feature was enabled during the virtual public hearing for the public to write in comments and ask clarifying questions directly on the Zoom platform. A phone number was also available during the virtual public hearing so that those dialing in on their phones could provide text comments.

An online StoryMap presentation was developed and made available throughout the Review Period that provided information on the Project, environmental process, and interactive maps of the alignments and options in both English and Spanish. Figure 4 below is a screenshot of the StoryMap made available during the Public Review Period and included in notices to the public. The StoryMap enabled the public to access materials traditionally available only during in-person settings at the public's convenience from their homes. This format continued to support Metro's goal of providing a safe and equitable environment for all participants and viewpoints.

In addition, a PlanEngage site was created as an engagement tool that provided access to the entire Draft EIR in an interactive and easy-to-use interface. The PlanEngage site also served as a platform for community members to add their public comments. The site was available in English and included a welcome page with step-by-step instructions on how to navigate the site and provide comments. It also included a tab for the Spanish translation of the Executive Summary. The entire platform was also compatible with built-in translation functions in community members' Internet browsers. Members of the public could use the site to view the Draft EIR in detail and navigate to specific areas of interest using the built-in tabs. Additionally, select maps in the PlanEngage site were interactive.

Figure 4 Online StoryMap Presentation





Materials provided at all the public hearings and online StoryMap presentation included the Project alternative maps, environmental process information, the Draft EIR and non-CEQA technical reports, Project impacts and mitigations, and examples of potential path features. All materials provided at the meetings, including the presentation, were also made available on the Project website (www.metro.net/lariverpath).

Government agencies, elected officials, and special districts (such as public utilities and school districts) were also invited to attend any of the in-person and virtual public hearings. Table 4 below summarizes the various government agencies, elected officials and special districts in attendance at each of the meetings.

Table 4 Government Agencies, Elected Officials, and Special Districts Represented at the Public Hearings

Meeting	Representative Organization
Public Hearing #1 Lincoln Heights – January 21, 2026, 6:30 – 8:30 pm	> None present
Public Hearing #2 Maywood – January 27, 2026, 6:00 – 8:00 pm	> City of Maywood
Public Hearing #3 Virtual – January 29, 2026, 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm	> City of Los Angeles Council District 1 Staff > City of Los Angeles Council District 14 Staff > Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) > Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) > Caltrans District 7
Public Hearing #4 Boyle Heights – January 31, 2026, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm	> None present

3.2 Public Participation

A total of 156 stakeholders signed into the public hearings during the Review Period. Some stakeholders did not sign in when attending the public hearings, so the total number of stakeholders in attendance at the public hearings may be more than 156. A total of 102 comments were received at the public hearings via verbal public comment and written comment during the in-person and virtual public hearings.

Table 5 Public Participation by Public Hearing

Public Hearing	Date	No. Of Attendees	No. Of Comments*
Public Hearing #1 – Lincoln Heights	January 21, 2026 6:30-8:30pm	28	Verbal Comments: 6 Written Comment Cards: 3
Public Hearing #2 – Maywood	January 27, 2026 6-8pm	23	Verbal Comments: 19 Written Comment Cards: 9
Public Hearing #3 – Virtual	January 29, 2026 6-8pm	86	Verbal Comments: 24 Written Zoom Q&A: 12
Public Hearing #4 – Boyle Heights	January 31, 2026, 10am-12pm	19	Verbal Comments: 17 Written Comment Cards: 11
	Totals	**156**	**Verbal Comments: 66** **Written Comments: 35**

**Number of verbal comments includes both verbal comments provided by microphone or through Zoom during the public comment portion of the public hearings and written comments provided directly to a court reporter or the Zoom Q&A function.*

4.0 Summary Draft EIR Review Period Comments

Throughout the duration of the Draft EIR Review Period, a total of 433 comment submissions (encompassing approximately 880 individual, delimited comments) were received through five methods, including via the Project email address, written public meeting comments, oral public hearing comments (including via court reporter and Zoom), PlanEngage online comments, and through the Project phone line. Comments were accepted approximately two weeks after the Draft EIR Review Period close date of February 2, 2026, to provide a grace period. The sections below provide a breakdown of these comments by source, which communities they address, environmental topics, preferences on alignments and whether they are from agencies/elected offices.

A breakdown of the number of comments collected via each method is included below:


> 150 comments via email.

> 179 PlanEngage online comments.

> 2 calls via the information phone line.

> 102 written and oral public comments at the public hearings.

Figure 5 Comments by Source



4.1 Summary of Comments from Agencies

Per CEQA requirements, responsible and trustee agencies were provided with sufficient information on the Project and potential environmental effects to enable them to provide meaningful responses or comments related to their areas of statutory responsibility. A total of 14 agency comments were submitted during the comment period.

Table 6 Agency Comments

#	Agency	Date Submitted
1	Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA)	12/30/26
2	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	1/15/26
3	California Department of Fish and Wildlife	1/26/26
4	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	1/26/26
5	Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority	1/26/26
6	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/29/26
7	Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts	1/30/26
8	City of Vernon	2/2/26
9	Los Angeles Department of Water & Power	2/2/26
10	Caltrans District 7	2/6/26
11	Gateway Cities Council of Governments	2/16/26
12	U.S. Army Corp of Engineers	3/2/26
13	LADOT, DCP, and BOE	3/5/26
14	City of Los Angeles Council District 1	3/6/26

The following are sample excerpts from feedback received from agencies:

Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA)

> Supports the project for improving connectivity between biking infrastructure and regional rail.

> Highlights the presence of active, high-frequency rail operations in the corridor and the need to ensure compatibility with existing and future rail activity.

> Recommends design and safety measures near rail corridors.

> Advises coordination on crossings, utilities, and construction activities with SCRRA and the CPUC.

> Emphasizes proper drainage, landscaping restrictions, lighting, and submission of detailed plans for review.

> Suggests studying noise impacts from train operations and considering mitigation measures such as sound barriers.

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

> Acknowledges jurisdiction over rail crossings and role in ensuring safety for crossings along the proposed bike path.

> Notes that the project will run parallel to multiple active rail lines and pass over/under several grade-separated crossings and provides a list of those rail lines/crossings.

> Recommends evaluating the impacts of increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic near rail infrastructure and implementing, safety improvements.

> Advises incorporating ADA-compliant design, restricted access to rail tracks with fencing or other deterrence measures, and adequate lighting along the path.

> States that any crossing modifications will require CPUC authorization and should align with environmental justice goals, including safety, public health, and equitable community access.

City of Los Angeles Council District 1

> Supports Option 1 and the Mostly West project alternative. As a secondary option, an access point near Spring Street must be prioritized, as this location leverages existing and planned bicycle paths and avoids hazardous at-grade crossings with the heavy rail lines along Main Street.

> Notes that if the Naud Street access point alternative is implemented, extensive signage must be provided to guide cyclists along Spring and Main Streets.

> Urges selection of a full-length alternative that closes the 8-mile gap, with consideration of phasing, value engineering, and flexibility for future access points.

> Opposes routing through the Lincoln Heights Jail site, suggests using Avenue 19 bike lanes if needed.

> Emphasizes key design considerations, including wider paths, accessibility for all users, minimal sharp turns, and incorporation of shade and native landscaping for climate resilience.

> Recommends enhanced safety features, including solar lighting, emergency call boxes, and avoiding hazardous crossings.

> Mentions extending Metro's Ambassador program for safety and user support.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

> Concern with potential impacts to these facilities and rights-of-way that may result from the implementation of the proposed Project and assert that they be allowed to maintain rights-of-way and access to their facilities and properties at all times for repair and maintenance.

> Requires that any design plans for any activity in the area of Metropolitan's pipelines or facilities be submitted for review and written approval and note that property rights must be obtained from Metropolitan for any project activities within Metropolitan's property.

Los Angeles Unified School District

> Concerns around the project's environmental impact on students and residents within the 15 District sites and schools located in the Project's study area.

> Requests close coordination during construction to minimize disruptions to schools, including scheduling work during non-school hours and involving District representatives in planning.

> Emphasizes protecting students and staff from air quality impacts through strict dust control, low-emission equipment, and limiting construction during school sessions.

> Raises concerns about hazardous materials and recommends routing construction traffic away from school sites.

> Highlights need to mitigate noise and vibration, including adhering to District noise standards, installing noise barriers, and scheduling loud activities outside school hours.

> Stresses maintaining safe and efficient traffic conditions, ensuring school bus access, and avoiding delays or disruptions to school transportation.

> Calls for strong pedestrian safety measures, including safe routes to schools, traffic controls, crossing guards, and restrictions on construction vehicle staging near schools.

> Underscores importance of ongoing communication with school administrators and prioritizing student safety throughout the project.

Gateway Cities Council of Governments

> Strongly supports the project goal to create a 32-mile continuous active transportation corridor.

> Emphasizes that the project would benefit Southeast LA communities facing major environmental justice, air quality, public health, and connectivity challenges.

> Recommends a short-term gap closure strategy advanced by Festival Trail to create a channel bikeway using existing Measure M funding before the LA 28 Olympics.

> Recognizes this short-term connection as complementary to the long-term project as opposed to a replacement.

> Supports advancement of fully integrated, grade-separated path in the future while encouraging pursuit of immediate opportunities to improve transportation access before 2028.

U.S. Army Corp of Engineers

> Notes that the proposed project would modify portions of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' LA River Ecosystem Restoration (LARER) Project.

> Notes that the proposed path must not adversely affect the hydraulic capacity of the Los Angeles River.

> Cautions that the bottom-of-channel alternative presents life safety concerns and may require additional access ramps and notes that path segments that include piers or are incised into levee embankments may require review beyond the district level.

> A risk-based analysis may be required if submitting a Section 408 permission request.

> Homeless encampments will not be permitted along the bike path or within the channel invert and recommends coordination with LAHSA.

> Requests the development of an Operations & Maintenance (O&M) manual and states that USACE will not assume additional O&M responsibilities.

> Advises alternative alignments at the top of bank or outside of the Los Angeles River channel should be considered to address hydraulic and safety concerns.

Los Angeles Department of Water & Power (LADWP)

> Raised concerns that the project could significantly impact LADWP facilities, including transmission lines, service roads, and the Main Street General Construction Headquarters, which LADWP will not allow to be used.

> LADWP emphasized that the project must not interfere with the LA100 renewable energy initiative or compromise system reliability.

> Strict requirements were outlined for maintaining access roads, safety clearances, and protection of power infrastructure, with concerns about construction risks near transmission towers.

> LADWP called for clear identification of project ownership and responsibility for operations, maintenance, and liability.

> Concerns that impact to utilities may be greater than stated in the Draft EIR and should potentially be classified as significant, requiring further environmental review.

Caltrans

> Supportive of the goals of the project and specifically supportive of project alternatives that fully close the 8-mile active transportation gap along the LA River.

> Recommends studying "perceived risk" for path users, such as enclosed or dimly lit areas along the path. This will help determine what types of safety features might be needed (CCTV, call boxes, pedestrian scale lighting, gated access, etc.).

> Question if any bike racks or rest areas are being considered at locations along the actual route.

> Offer to partner with Caltrans planners and engineers on implementing design elements that improve safety and mobility.

> Notes the need for a permit at locations where the project interacts with State ROW.

City of Vernon

> Supportive of the project goals.

> Urges safety measures for pedestrians and cyclists on the path, especially in industrial environments. Recommends considering lighting, clear sightlines, emergency call stations, and safe separation from vehicular traffic.

> Request for Metro to articulate specific design standards and mitigation measures that will ensure user safety throughout the corridor, particularly near industrial facilities and access points.

> Concerns from local commercial and industrial businesses include potential unauthorized access, trespassing, theft, and operational disruptions. Calls for detailed security strategies in affected Vernon segments and design that avoids inadvertent access points into private properties or sensitive industrial infrastructure.

> Recommends formal coordination with local law enforcement and emergency responders for the path segments within the City of Vernon's jurisdiction.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

> Raises concerns about potential impacts to sensitive species, particularly the endangered least Bell's vireo, and recommends updated surveys and mitigation measures, including possible permits for species "take."

> Notes potential impacts to the LA River's hydrology, streambed, and water quality, requiring notification and possible permits for any alterations.

> Recommends implementing best management practices to control erosion, sediment, and pollution, and avoid harmful materials in habitat areas.

> Calls for additional hydrology studies to assess impacts on flow, erosion, and downstream conditions.

> Emphasizes need for comprehensive mitigation, monitoring, and reporting plans to address biological impacts.

> Requires reporting of any special-status species findings and documentation of injured or dead wildlife during construction.

> Notes that project approval will require compliance with environmental regulations, permits, and associated filing fees.

Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts

> Notes responsibility for regional sewer infrastructure and requests detailed project plans for review before providing approvals.

> Requires coordination to identify and address sewer facilities within the project area, including use of GIS tools and submission of plans.

> States that approval is required for any construction near or over sewer lines or within sewer easements.

> Directs project proponents to follow established buildover procedures and coordinate with District staff prior to construction.

Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority

> Notes that it is one of two state conservancies that have jurisdiction in the Los Angeles River watershed.

> Recommends increasing the number and frequency of access points (ideally every 0.5–1 mile).

> Support access points proposed in Options 1 and 2, such as those connecting to Ed P. Reyes River Greenway and LA State Historic Park.

> Encourages stronger integration with existing and future open space assets, including key sites like state parks and planned restoration areas.

> Supports design features that include wider path edges, green space, and amenities to improve safety, comfort, and user experience.

> Emphasizes importance of fully closing the 8-mile gap and discourages phased approaches that delay complete connectivity.

> Acknowledges high project costs but supports pursuing cost-effective design solutions while maintaining core project goals.

> Stresses need for timely project delivery to maximize public benefits.

> Urges identification of a dedicated long-term operator for the project, with sustained funding as a top priority.

Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), Department of City Planning (DCP), and Bureau of Engineering (BOE)

> Strong overall support for the LA River Path Project and emphasis on advancing a full-length alternative that closes the entire 8-mile gap.

> Does not support shortened alternatives.

> Recommends frequent, well-distributed access points on both riverbanks, especially in Equity Focus Communities, and strong connections to transit (including Union Station) and existing/planned bike networks.

> Prefers top of bank and incised path designs over elevated structures due to safety, urban design, and maintenance concerns. Recommends wider paths (16–20 ft) for multi-modal use.

> Notes that bottom of bank designs that are vulnerable to flooding or that limit lighting and access are not preferred.

> Calls for enhanced design quality and amenities, including shade, lighting (solar/dark-sky compliant), wayfinding, landscaping, emergency infrastructure, and restrooms.

> Stresses need for regional coordination with major projects such as Link US and compliance with City design/zoning regulations.

> Raises concerns about operations, maintenance, and ownership, urging Metro to clearly define responsibility and funding, with no assumed City burden without agreement.

> Recommends thorough evaluation of environmental impacts, utility coordination, and long-term maintenance costs in the Final EIR.

4.2 Summary of Comments from Stakeholder Groups

The following come from each comment submitted by 18 stakeholder groups, including local businesses, homeowners' associations, special associations, and other groups. The excerpts below highlight key themes in each of the comments submitted. Stakeholder Groups are generally supportive of the project but highlight concerns regarding budget, the length of the project timeline, and safety amenities.

Table 7 Stakeholder Comments

#	Agency	Date Submitted
1	IBEW Local 11	12/30/25
2	South Pas Active	1/10/26
3	Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council (DTLANC)	1/16/26
4	Arts District Little Tokyo Neighborhood Council	1/27/26
5	People for Mobility Justice	1/27/26
6	SELA Bicycle Center	1/27/26
7	South East LA Collaborative	1/27/26
8	Valley Industry & Commerce Association (VICA)	1/28/26
9	Walk 'n Rollers	1/29/26
10	Friends of the LA River	1/31/26
11	BikeLA	1/31/26
12	Bike Long Beach	1/31/26
13	Move LA	2/2/26
14	Festival Trail	2/2/26
15	East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice	2/2/26
16	Los Angeles WaterKeeper	2/2/26
17	League of Women Voters of Los Angeles County	2/3/26
18	Boyle Heights Neighborhood Council	3/19/26

The following are sample excerpts from feedback received from stakeholder groups:

IBEW Local 11

> Supports project for its potential to improve public health and community cohesion.

South Pas Active

> Supports in-channel option as the most feasible and cost-effective.

> Emphasizes need for completion before the 2028 Olympics and improved regional bike connectivity.

Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council (DTLANC)

> Strongly supports the project as a critical regional connection that closes the bike path gap, enhances mobility, and provides access to recreation and open space.

> Urges prioritizing connectivity in implementation, focusing first on linking existing northern segments and expanding south into Downtown LA.

> Supports west-bank alignment (Alternative 1) to maximize access and usage, particularly for dense communities like the Arts District and Little Tokyo.

> Recommends increasing access points and connections to key streets (e.g., 7th Street, Olympic Blvd) and integrating future development opportunities.

> Emphasizes safety and design features, including lighting, emergency systems, and durable, low-maintenance infrastructure.

> Raises concerns about reliance on privately owned public spaces (POPS) and stresses the need to maintain fully public access.

> Highlights importance of a strong operations and maintenance plan, recommending partnerships (e.g., MRCA) over sole City responsibility.

> Supports enhanced public safety strategies, including ranger programs and coordinated oversight along the river corridor.

Arts District Little Tokyo Neighborhood Council

> Supportive of project goals.

> Concern around the proposed budget of $1.1 to $1.3 billion exceeding the Measure M allocation of $365 million.

> Recommends Metro pursue alternative delivery methods, including public-private partnerships, and requires an evaluation of lower-cost design proposals, including in-channel bike path options.

> Urges the project be delivered in a timely manner consistent with regional priorities.

People for Mobility Justice

> Raises questions about safety improvements and infrastructure changes around access points, including road diets.

SELA Bicycle Center

> Expresses strong support and excitement for the project.

> Recommends wider paths to accommodate all users and improved signage and wayfinding.

> Requests for increased community outreach and extended comment period.

> Suggests opening completed sections as soon as construction finishes.

South East LA Collaborative

> Requests extension of the public comment period.

> Encourages more in-person engagement with local leaders.

Valley Industry & Commerce Association (VICA)

> Supports completing the project in a fiscally responsible manner consistent with Measure M funding through the in-channel construction option.

> Emphasizes the importance of closing the bike path gap within existing funding and a predictable timeline.

> Notes that the in-channel design would significantly reduce costs associated with land acquisition, utility relocation, and permitting.

Walk 'n Rollers

> Supports in-channel option as the most efficient, affordable, and timely approach.

> Emphasizes community-building benefits and Olympic timeline.

Friends of the LA River

> Strong support for the project, emphasizing the importance of improving both transportation and the surrounding river environment.

> Recommends incorporating native landscaping and habitat features to enhance biodiversity, reduce heat, and support ecological functions.

> Suggests integrating Indigenous cultural recognition elements, including signage and design features that acknowledge local tribal history.

> Highlights need for clearer signage, safer path design, better lane separation, additional trash receptacles, and emergency infrastructure to improve safety and user experience.

BikeLA

> Supportive of project objectives, however, argues that the proposed path alternatives extend the project timeline.

> To avoid project timeline delays, BikeLA recommends evaluating the in-channel path alternative.

> Refers to CEQA Guidelines to evaluate feasible options that could better achieve project objectives by reducing implementation time.

Bike Long Beach

> Supports an in-channel option for the path.

> Notes that this alternative can be built with existing funding and can be built quickly.

> Refers to Hydrological studies that confirm that the in-channel path built six inches above the floor of the channel can be used 350 days of the year as well as the Arroyo Seca path and Peters Canyon Trail (in Orange County) that are located in channel.

> Highlights that this option can be built by 2028.

Move LA

> Supports the in-channel alternative as the only feasible option within existing funding.

> Emphasizes urgency, faster construction timeline (as early as 2028), and accessibility benefits, including safety for all users. Notes that partial-year closures due to flooding are preferable to project delays or completion.

Festival Trail

> Comments on concerns around project delay and cost estimates of the options studied in the Draft EIR.

> Highlights that earlier studies (since 2014) found the in-channel bike path to be feasible, cost-effective, and strongly supported, but it was not advanced.

> Argues that current alternatives studied in the Draft EIR are overly complex, significantly over budget, and delayed compared to initial projections.

> Claims the proposed alternatives do not meet Metro's own criteria for feasibility, particularly regarding cost and constructability.

> Advocates for reconsideration of the in-channel alternative as a superior option that could be built faster, at lower cost, and still meet project goals.

> Challenges the Draft EIR's rejection of the in-channel option, stating concerns about flooding, safety, access, and design are speculative and inconsistent with how other alternatives are evaluated.

> Emphasizes that an in-channel path would still improve connectivity and mobility compared to existing conditions, even with potential limitations like periodic flooding.

East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice

> Requests extension of public comment.

> Raises concerns about construction impacts, including noise, air quality, hazardous materials, and soil contamination.

> Emphasizes need for safety improvements, full project connectivity, and year-round accessibility.

> Advocates for increased green space, culturally relevant community design, and inclusion of tribal communities.

> Highlights dangerous traffic conditions near access points and need for infrastructure improvements.

> Requests more outreach, multilingual engagement, and youth engagement.

Los Angeles WaterKeeper

> Supports the project for improving connectivity, recreation, and safe, vehicle-free mobility along the LA River

> Raises concerns about adding permanent concrete infrastructure that could limit future river restoration and naturalization efforts.

> Urges selection of alternatives that minimize impacts on long-term ecological goals, including habitat, water quality, and climate resilience.

> Emphasizes the importance of aligning the project with ongoing and future restoration initiatives rather than hindering them.

> Notes potential long-term cost and feasibility challenges if new infrastructure must later be modified or removed.

> Encourages expansion of similar multi-modal path improvements along the full length of the LA River to ensure equitable access.

League of Women Voters of Los Angeles County

> Raises concerns about flood risk and climate impacts associated with in-channel construction.

> Supports alternative approaches that reduce concrete use and improve river capacity during storm events.

> Emphasizes need for long-term, climate-resilient design.

Boyle Heights Neighborhood Council

> Strongly recommends advancing Option 2, a new station entrance at E 1st St/Mission and the "Mostly East Bank" alignment as the preferred alternative.

> Recommends adding multiple new access points (e.g., 4th St, 7th St, Olympic Blvd, Washington Blvd) to enhance connectivity and provide safer alternatives for cyclists in high-risk corridors.

> Advocates for inclusion of local vendors through dedicated kiosks and funding programs to modeled after CALCRG to support Boyle Heights businesses and economic opportunities.

> Emphasizes need for strong safety, lighting, and design features, including cameras, solar lighting, and eliminating low-visibility areas.

> Recommends incorporating shade, heat-reducing materials, and greenery to improve comfort and environmental resilience.

> Calls for continued community engagement and collaboration to ensure equitable benefits for Boyle Heights residents.

4.3 Summary of Comments from Community Members

Metro received a total of 433 comments during the Draft EIR Review Period, which are summarized below. Public comments were received through five primary means including: 102 oral and written comments during the public hearings, 179 through written comments submitted to the online PlanEngage website, 150 comments received electronically through Project email, and 2 transcribed comments received on the Project's telephone line.

The majority of community members generally indicated support for the Project during the Draft EIR Review Period. Community members also identified several areas of concern, such as budget, safety, and maintenance as well as potential path amenities for consideration in the final design.

4.3.1 Categories of Comments

Other comments received from the communities focused on the following concerns below:

> **Aesthetics, Community Character, and Quality of Life:** Many comments suggest the Project would be a valued resource to many communities. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  > Attractive landscaping and green spaces.
  > Consistent and dependable maintenance.
  > Respect for tribal areas.
  > Preservation of cultural heritage.
  > Added amenities such as shade, seating, water fountains, and restrooms.

> **Biological Resources:** The Project should consider actively protecting and restoring local ecology where applicable. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  > Native plant beds and functional habitats to enhance biodiversity.
  > Alignment with existing regional ecosystem restoration goals.
  > Minimization of light pollution to protect nocturnal wildlife.
  > Educational signage highlighting Indigenous and endemic species.

> **Budget/Cost:** Many comments emphasized for the Project to consider fiscal responsibility and built without further delay. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  > Project completion within the budget and available funding.
  > Consideration for narrower path widths as a cost-effective planning option.
  > Reconsideration for the "In-Channel" path design.
  > Limiting the number of access points to reduce costs.
  > Utilizing existing City/County systems for long-term maintenance.

- **Businesses:** Some comments suggested how the Project could provide economic resources and opportunities for the local communities. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  - Dedicating vendor and commercial spaces exclusively to local small businesses.
  - Partnering actively with local non-profits and Indigenous organizations to implement environmental and cultural enhancements.
- **Construction:** Concerns and suggestions were raised to reduce construction impacts and ensure an on time completion. Feedback on the subject highlighted:
  - Expediting the construction timeline to ensure timely completion.
  - Mitigation of construction-related noise, vibration, air pollution, and hazardous soils.
  - Coordination with existing infrastructure and other regional initiatives.
- **Environmental Justice:** Some comments emphasized the need for mitigation to prioritize communities disproportionately affected by environmental burdens. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  - Mitigation of construction-related impacts to suppress hazardous materials in the local community.
  - Integration of ecological features to support conservation efforts.
- **Landscape/Greenspace:** There is a unified perspective among stakeholders that the Project should enhance the natural environment and provide increased access to green space. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  - Creation of safe, navigable, and well-landscaped access routes.
  - Designing smooth, paved surfaces for diverse active transportation users (like cyclists, pedestrians, and inline skaters).
- **Outreach:** Comments from the East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice voiced concerns and suggestions for additional public engagement and outreach. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  - An extension of the public comment period.
  - Additional targeted stakeholder engagement.
  - More information about the project's timeline and board presentation dates.
- **Property:** Comments emphasized the need for coordination with adjacent properties, agencies and utilities. The feedback that was submitted highlighted:
  - Protection of existing critical infrastructure.
  - Maintained access for existing utility and transit facilities.
  - Inter-agency coordination during project construction phase to avoid disruptions or damage to property.
  - Inclusion of clear legal and operation boundaries discussing rights-of-way and easements.
- **Safety/Security:** Many comments voiced the need for prioritizing safety and security features in the Project design. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  - Wide paths for different speeds and modes (e.g. pedestrians, electrical vehicles, skaters).
  - Consistent and adequate lighting under bridges and tunnels, ensuring visibility.
  - Dedicated emergency infrastructure.

- **Air Quality:** Concerns raised about air pollution during construction and operation, and suggestions for reducing air quality impacts. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  - Utilizing zero-emissions technology and equipment during the construction phase to minimize localized air, noise, and vibration impacts.
  - Implementing strict measures to prevent the airborne spread of hazardous particulate matter and contaminated soils during excavation, particularly near historic rail yards and highly polluted industrial corridors like Boyle Heights.
  - Protecting historically marginalized and burdened communities from the cumulative health impacts of existing environmental pollution combined with new construction-related emissions.
- **Alignment Alternatives and Path Type:** Many comments suggested varied alignment preferences and suggestions, as well as design ideas. While opinions on specific placements differ, feedback on this subject highlighted:
  - An in-channel path type to reduce costs and expedite the project timeline.
  - Overall support for the project, including a few preferences for Options 1 and 2 alignment.
  - Mixed comments on path width included both the support for the wide path to accomodate safe separation of modes, and narrow 10-12 ft path width to reduce cost of project.
- **Path Amenities:** Comments emphasized the need for path amenities, like restrooms, drinking fountains, lighting, among others. Feedback included:
  - Incorporating shade coverage and access to public drinking water/water fountains.
  - Installation and maintenance of public restrooms along the route.
  - Installation of bike share station along the path.
  - Installation of lighting to increase visibility while limiting color temperate to minimize light pollution.
- **Hydrology/Flood Risk:** Some comments voiced suggestions for managing water quality and water flow during construction and operation. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  - Transparent assessment and mitigation of hydrology and water quality impacts.
  - Protecting the new infrastructure from heavy rain and high-water flows.
  - Minimizing the installation of bulky concrete structures that could impede natural water flows or damage ecological restoration.
- **Time Efficiency:** Many comments suggested expediting the Project and reducing any further delays to reduce the Project timeline. Feedback on this subject highlighted:
  - Expediting the project timeline ensuring completion and full usability as soon as possible.
  - Prioritizing a functional and value-engineered path over complex and expensive designs.
  - Project completion before the Los Angeles 2028 Olympics and Paralympics.
- **Access Points and Connectivity:** There is an overall desire to have more accessible access points along the chosen route, no matter which alignment is chosen. Comments related to this topic included preferences for potential additional entrances to be considered and/or connectivity at the following locations, listed in order of frequency of mention:
  - Boyle Heights
  - Vernon
  - West Bank
  - LA State Historic Park
  - East Bank
  - Olympic Boulevard
  - Arts District.

5.0 Next Steps

The comments and questions received during the Draft EIR Review Period will be analyzed and responded to in the Final EIR and considered in the recommendation to the Metro Board of Directors for a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The Metro Board of Directors is anticipated to meet in fall 2026 to vote for an LPA during a public Board meeting. It is anticipated that the Final EIR will be available for review and public comment in 2027. Outreach activities and efforts will be available throughout the Project. Metro will share responses to common community concerns and questions on the Project website (**metro.net/lariverpath**).

Attachment F

Figure F-1: Modified Option 2 LPA alignment



- **Full 8-miles gap closure**
  - ✓ Alignment: Option 2 (70%); Modified (30%)
  - ✓ 10 Access Points
  - ✓ 3 Bike/Ped Crossings
  - ✓ Path Typology: On-street (8%), Top-of-Bank (26%), Incised (30%), Elevated (36%)
- **No Environmental Impact**
- **ROM Cost: $827 M (2025$)**
  - ✓ Measure M: $433M (2025$)

Description of Locally Preferred Alternative (Modified Option 2)

Modified Option 2, which bridges the 8-mile gap, includes approximately 10-miles of core path and connectors, includes 3 new river crossings, and provides 10 new access points (7 on the east bank and 3 on the west bank). Modified Option 2 delivers the highest path user demand (see the CBA Attachment G), lowers vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and provides the most direct access to EFCs. Additionally, it offers direct connections to major destinations, including Union Station, Downey Recreation Center, Pico/Aliso Station, and PARC at Sixth Street.

In addition, for environmental clearance, the Modified Option 2 includes a design variation to provide access at Seventh Street (east bank), and does not preclude the bike/ped river crossing and access point at the Bandini-Soto commercial center (west bank). Both could be future opportunities if additional funding were available.

Modified Option 2 alignment is described below in the northern, middle, and southern sections:

- North Section (Riverside Drive to Broadway/Spring Street): In this section, Modified Option 2 starts at the intersection of Avenue 19 and San Fernando Road, connects via existing bike lanes on Avenue 19 to the Ed Reyes Greenway, transitioning to an east-bank TOB path serving Lincoln Heights with access to Downey Recreation Center and Broadway/Spring Streer. This section also provides access to Chinatown and the LA State Historic Park at Broadway/Spring Street.

- Middle Section (Broadway/Spring to Sixth Street): In this section, Modified Option 2 becomes elevated near Albion Park, to provide a connection to Albion Park, Mission Road/Cesar Chavez Avenue, and First Street (close to Pico/Aliso Station), serving Boyle Heights. Within this section, the Modified Option 2 also crosses the rail tracks within the channel to the west bank to provide access to Union Station, and serving Little Tokyo, and the Arts District. South of Union Station, the path continues as a west-bank incised path, providing access to Sixth Street, PARC, using the existing tunnel at Sixth Street.

- South Section (Sixth Street to Atlantic Boulevard): In this section, Modified Option 2, starts rising to transition as an elevated section and providing access to Washington Boulevard. The path continues to remain elevated to avoid the temporary sheet-pile embankment on the west side before crossing to the east-bank TOB right-of-way. Once on the east bank, Modified Option 2 runs TOB to Atlantic Boulevard primarily with access at Downey Road and Atlantic Boulevard (incised briefly to maneuver under the existing bridges), finally crossing to the west bank to connect with the existing Maywood bike path.

Modified Option 2 would not introduce any new environmental impacts.

Table F-1: Cost and Funding (based on available Measure M: $433 M (2025$)

LPA / IOS Segment	Gap Closure Length	Cost (2025$)	Funding Gap (2025$)
LPA: Riverside Drive to Atlantic Boulevard	8-miles	$872 M	$439 M
IOS - TOTAL	**5.5-miles**	**$436 M**	**$3 M**
IOS-North *Riverside Drive to Broadway/Spring Street*	*0.75-miles*	*$35 M*	
IOS-South *Sixth Street to Atlantic Boulevard*	*4.75-miles*	*$401 M*	

Unfunded Middle Section Broadway/Spring Street to Sixth Street	2.5-miles	$436 M	$436 M

Figure F-2: Modified Option 2 Initial Operating Segments



IOS – North

(Riverside to Broadway/Spring)

Interim Connection
(Broadway/Spring to Sixth)

NOT METRO PROJECT

IOS – South

Sixth to Atlantic


- **ROM Cost for IOS-north + IOS-south: $436M (2025$)**
  - ✓ Measure M: $433M (2025$)

LA RIVER PATH: 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 costs. The CBA framework methodology includes two components – a Weighted Benefits Analysis (WBA) and a Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR).

The CBA evaluated five 8-mile alternatives studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the LA River Path Project, as well as the staff-recommended Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), also called Modified Option 2. The five alternatives evaluated from the Draft EIR include the Proposed Project (PP), Option 1 (O1), Option 2 (O2), the Mostly-East Bank Alternative (ME), and the Mostly-West Bank Alternative (MW).The evaluation is based on data collected during the Draft EIR process.

Figure 1. Map of 8-mile Alignments Studied in the Draft EIR and Staff-Recommended LPA



Weighted Benefits Analysis:

The WBA is a points-based evaluation comparing the LPA with the five 8-mile Draft EIR alternatives across five goals that are weighted per the Metro-adopted CBA methodology. This considers project benefits using relevant quantitative and qualitative metrics within each of the five goal categories. These metrics, presented in Table 1, are scored relative to each other on a seven-point scale, with seven being the highest/best performing.

Table 1: Weighted Benefit Score

Goals	LPA	Draft EIR Alternatives					Key Performance Indicators Evaluated
	Modified Option 2	PP	O1	O2	ME	MW	
	Average Score by Goal (Unweighted)						
Mobility & Accessibility (Weight: 40%)	6.0	6.2	**6.4**	6.1	6.2	6.2	User Demand; Connectivity to Jobs, Housing and Opportunities; Travel Time Savings; Comfort Rating; Access to Neighborhood Amenities; Out of Pocket Travel Costs; Public Transit Connectivity and Access; Integration with Existing and Planned Bicycle Network; Disadvantaged Communities Served; Seasonal Path Closure Vulnerability
Safety & Health (Weight: 15%)	5.4	**5.9**	5.8	5.7	5.6	**5.9**	Crash Reduction from On-Street Corridor; Mortality Reduction Benefits for Physical and Mental Health; Construction Impacts on Surrounding Communities; Access to Healthcare, Parks, and Recreation
Environmental Sustainability (Weight: 15%)	6.4	**6.5**	6.4	6.2	6.0	6.4	Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction; Tail Pipe Pollutant Reduction; Greenhouse Gas Emissions Generated During Construction; Reduction in Fuel Consumption (Gallons of Fuel); Landscaped Area at Access Points
Operational Sustainability & Delivery (Weight: 15%)	**5.9**	4.8	3.9	5.0	4.6	4.2	Estimated Costs; Estimated Operations and Maintenance Level of Effort; Estimated Time for Delivery; Degree of Complexity of Permitting Agency Coordination; Adjacent Project Coordination Complexity; Easement Needs
Economic Impact (Weight: 15%)	5.0	6.3	6.3	6.2	5.8	**6.9**	Job Creation from Project Spending; Connectivity to Jobs; Access to Retail; Consumer Spending
Total Weighted Score	5.8	**6.0**	5.9	5.9	5.8	6.0	**All alternatives offer significant benefits and demonstrate comparable WBA scores ranging from 5.8 to 6.0 out of 7.0 total possible points.**

**7-point scale with 7 as the highest/best performing. Displayed scores are rounded to the nearest tenth. Highest score in each category is bolded and underlined.*

The WBA component finds that all six alternatives offer significant benefits and demonstrate comparable scores ranging from 5.8 to 6.0 out of 7.0 total possible points. All alternatives score comparably with respect to path user demand, and connectivity to jobs, housing, amenities, public transit, and the existing and planned bicycle network. Under the WBA theme of Operational Sustainability & Delivery, the LPA scores the highest due to its higher cost effectiveness and lower degree of complexity with permitting and coordination with adjacent projects.

Benefit-Cost Ratio:

The BCR compares a project's total monetized costs against a set of calculated monetizable benefits. It is important to note that many costs and benefits of such an

active transportation project cannot be monetized, so the BCR is presented alongside the WBA for a more holistic interpretation of costs as they relate to benefits.

The monetized cost included in the BCR is the project capital cost per alternative. On the benefits side, the BCR monetizes the following benefits: journey quality, travel time savings, traffic safety and accident reductions, active transportation health benefits, emissions reductions, and vehicular operating cost savings. A higher benefit-to-cost ratio means there are more monetized benefits for every dollar spent.

Table 2: Benefit-Cost Ratio

	LPA	Draft EIR Alternatives				
	Modified Option 2	Proposed Project	Option 1	Option 2	Mostly-East Bank	Mostly-West Bank
BCR*	**0.23**	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.13

**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.*

Metro's BCR analysis for the project relies on a modified version of the Caltrans Cal-B/C Active Transportation model. The modified BCR model applies the best available modeling tools and assumptions to interpret the benefits of active transportation investments. The model builds upon existing methods, industry best practices, and peer review across consulting firms, while incorporating the Board-adopted CBA framework for evaluating project alternatives.

The LPA presents the highest BCR (highest monetized benefits compared to costs). The LPA is expected to produce $0.23 of monetized benefits per dollar invested over a 20-year analysis period. The Draft EIR alternatives have a lower BCR because they deliver similar or fewer benefits than the LPA, but at a higher cost.

Although the BCR analysis indicates that the alternatives will cost more than the monetizable benefits they create, it is important to note that not all benefits or costs are quantifiable or easily monetized, such as providing access for and serving disadvantaged communities, improving the user experience, and improving health outcomes. In addition to connectivity benefits, the project will also act as a recreational facility and open space, offering benefits at a larger regional scale that are atypical for active transportation projects and therefore not easily monetized. Such qualitative and quantitative metrics that may not be monetizable are incorporated into the WBA, allowing the overall CBA methodology to include metrics related to equity, health, and economic impacts that are not commonly measured through the BCR approach alone.

Next stop: a more connected bike path.



Planning & Programming Committee
November 18, 2026
Executive Management Committee
November 19, 2026
File ID: 2026-0638

Metro

RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

A. **APPROVING the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)** for the LA River Path project as Modified Option 2, an 8-mile gap closure path between Riverside Drive and Atlantic Boulevard evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR);

B. **APPROVING an approximately 5.5-mile gap closure through two simultaneous Initial Operating (IOS) Segments** - IOS-North between Riverside Drive and Spring Street; and IOS-South, between Sixth Street and Atlantic Boulevard;

C. **AUTHORIZING** Staff to work with the City of Los Angeles to bridge the 2.5 mile gap between IOS-north and IOS-south, to prioritize planned Class IV cycle tracks, in combination with the existing on-street bike lanes, which can serve as an interim connection until funding for the off-street river channel paths between Broadway/Spring Street and Sixth Street is secured.


OVERVIEW OF LA RIVER PATH

The LA River Path is working to fill an 8-mile contiguous gap in active transportation along the LA River - an important link in Downtown Los Angeles.

- **Regional Context:** First segment of a bike path was constructed in 1977 (LA River/Rio Hondo Trail – 20+ miles)

- **Development of the Project:**
  - ✓ Metro conducted a Feasibility Study for the LA River Path Bike Path Gap Closure in 2016
  - ✓ Funding for the current project approved by voters through Measure M in 2016
  - ✓ Metro's Environmental Scoping conducted in 2019
  - ✓ Metro released the Draft Environmental Impact Report in December 2025

- **Project Objectives:**
  - ✓ Seamless Path
  - ✓ Access
  - ✓ Equity
  - ✓ Health
  - ✓ Safety
  - ✓ Efficient and Sustainable
  - ✓ User Experience



DRAFT EIR COMMENTS SUMMARY

- Draft EIR released on Dec. 18, 2025
  - ✓ 47-day public comment period through Feb. 2, 2026
- Draft EIR Public Hearings
  - ✓ Three (3) in-person and one (1) virtual
  - ✓ Over 156 total attendees
- Winter Outreach during 2026 Draft EIR Period
  - ✓ 15,046 mailed postcards (English/Spanish)
  - ✓ 47,975 door-to-door flyers to residents and businesses
  - ✓ Email notices to over 6,689 contacts
  - ✓ Advertisements on Metro's Project website, LA Times, La Opinion, Daily News, Rafu Shimpo and El Clasificado
- Total public responses received: 800+ comments through 439 submittals sent via email, online portal, phone calls, written and oral submittals at the public hearings


Top Themes that emerged from Public Responses to the Draft EIR

- Alignment Alternatives and Path Types (72% of submissions)
  - ✓ Bottom-of-Channel (26% of submissions)
- Path Amenities (6% of submissions)
- Safety / Security (5% of submissions)
- Cost and Schedule (4% of submissions)
- Other Miscellaneous Topics (9% of submissions)

BOTTOM OF CHANNEL OPTION – CHALLENGES

- **From Design and Maintenance Perspective**
  - ✓ Raises life and safety concerns during rain events
    - During typical rain events, within 24-hours, water reaches a height between 3 to 6 feet, at a speed of 24 mph
    - Challenging for emergency responders to reach any person caught in a flooding event
    - Liability concern
    - US Army Corps of Engineers recommends not to enter the river for 72 hours after a rain event
  - ✓ Difficult to maintain public safety presence at the bottom of the channel
  - ✓ Minimal opportunity to provide path lighting
  - ✓ Will require US Army Corps permits to conduct major repair works after rain events

- **From CEQA (EIR) Perspective (CEQA Guideline Section 15126.6(c))**
  - ✓ Bottom of Channel alternative does not meet most of the basic project objectives (equity, safety, access, and user experience)



LA River during/after Rain Event, in the Frogtown Neighborhood in the City of Los Angeles
Source: LA Times, 2023

DRAFT EIR KEY CONCERNS RAISED BY STAKEHOLDER AGENCIES

US Army Corps of Engineers

- *Raised life/safety concerns over the Bottom-of-channel option related to flooding and security access*
- Will not provide O&M for this project.

City of Los Angeles

- Has preference to top-of-bank and incised path elevations instead of elevated structures, where possible
- *Is concerned about Bottom-of-channel options due to life/safety issues related to flooding and lighting/access constraints*
- Would like Metro to become the project's intended owner/operator – COLA is open to forming an O&M cost-sharing partnership

LA DWP Los Angeles Department of Water & Power

- Opposes Main Street access through LADWP property on the west bank
- Proposed project owner will be responsible for liability and O&M
- Requires 20-foot-wide access to all LADWP facilities and 14-foot vertical clearance over existing access roads

County of Los Angeles


- No formal comments on the Draft EIR
- *Expressed concerns over any Bottom-of-Channel alignment, during meetings with Metro*

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE DRAFT EIR

- Seven Alternatives
  - ✓ Five 8-mile Alternatives
    - Proposed Project, Option 1, Option 2, Mostly East, Mostly West
  - ✓ Two Shorter Alternatives
    - Shortened North, Shortened South

- Based on the Alternatives, project features include:
  - ✓ 4-7 New Bridges
  - ✓ 9-11Access Points
  - ✓ 3 Path Typologies (elevated, top-of-bank, incised)

- Cost: $1,082million - $1,266million (five 8-mile alternatives only)







STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR LPA – MODIFIED OPTION 2

- **What is Modified Option 2?**
  - ✓ Modified Option 2 is Draft EIR Alternative Option 2, combined with alignment segments from two other Draft EIR Alternatives to address concerns and issues from partnering agencies, and respond to public input regarding access and cost.
- Concerns were raised over access points to the Project, and the LPA works to address these concerns.
- Various Path Types are used to solve issues of safety, connectivity, and reduce cost.
- The LPA provides 10 access points and has 3 bridge crossings

- Rough Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate for LPA: $872M (2025$)
  - ✓ Measure M funds available: $433M (2025$)






STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR INITIAL OPERATING SEGMENTS


- **Two Simultaneous IOSs: closing 5.5 miles gap**
  - ✓ IOS-North: Riverside Drive to Broadway/Spring Street (approx.) 0.75 miles of gap closure
    - 3 access points (Ed P. Reyes River Greenway, Broadway/Spring, Albion Park)
  - ✓ IOS-South: Sixth Street to Atlantic Boulevard (approx.) 4.75 miles of gap closure
    - 4 access points (Sixth, Washington, Downey, Atlantic)
    - 2 Crossings (Redondo Junction, Atlantic)
- Combined ROM Cost Estimate for IOSs: $436M (2025$)
  - ✓ Measure M: $433M (2025$)
  - ✓ Continue exploring additional funding
- Continue community engagement during Final EIR phase
- The remaining gap of 2.5 miles (Broadway/Spring to Sixth) can be closed in the interim via City of Los Angeles existing and planned bike network



INTERIM GAP CLOSURE (BROADWAY/SPRING TO SIXTH)

- Interim gap closure between Broadway/Spring and 6th Street could be achieved via existing/planned bike lanes
  - ✓ Includes LADOT Spring/Alameda Project – forecast completion in 2027
  - ✓ Would connect to EFCs in Boyle Heights via First and Sixth Street bridges
  - ✓ Class IV along Alameda Street identified in City's 2035 Mobility Plan
  - ✓ Metro seeks partnership from the City of Los Angeles to prioritize planned bike network to facilitate the interim gap closure. Metro will not be responsible for funding the interim closure.





LEGEND

- Metro Rail Lines & Stations (A D D E)
- LA River Path - IOSs
- Access Points
- Existing On-Street Bike Lanes
- Planned Class II/IV Bike Lanes
- Metro Rail Stations

METRO COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS: LPA vs. DEIR 8-mile ALTERNATIVES

Weighted Benefits Analysis (WBA)

- Points-based evaluation comparing key performance indicators (KPIs) across five goals
- KPIs are scored on a **7-point scale**, with 7 being the highest/best performing
- Allows use of **quantitative** and **qualitative** information

Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)

- Calculated using the California Life-Cycle Benefit/Cost Analysis Model as a starting point.
- Model compares **project costs** against **societal benefits** that can be monetized.
- Not all benefits (or costs) can be easily monetized, especially regional benefits of active transportation projects at this scale.

Weighted Benefits Analysis (WBA)	LPA	Avg. DEIR Alts
Mobility/Accessibility (40%)	6.0/7	6.2/7
Safety/Health (15%)	5.4/7	5.8/7
Environmental Sustainability (15%)	6.4/7	6.3/7
Operational Sust. Delivery (15%)	5.9/7	4.5/7
Economic Impact (15%)	5.0/7	6.3/7
Total Weighted Benefits Score	**5.8/7**	**5.9/7**

Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)	LPA	Avg. DEIR Alts
Total Monetized Benefits	$163.83	$165.08
Total Costs	$872M	$1,168M
Benefit Cost Ratio	**0.23**	**0.14**

LPA performs significantly better in operational sustainability and deliverability metric, and provides almost double the return on investment when compared to the other alternatives

NEXT STEPS

As Metro owns less than 1% of the property along the 8-mile gap, and consistent with Board direction, Metro will not take responsibility for operation and maintenance. Metro will continue to work with the City and County to identify a lead on implementing, operating and maintaining the LA River Path.

With the Board's approval, staff will:

- Continue to support the County in conducting the LA River Governance Model Study of the 51-mile LA River Bicycle Path
- Upon commitment of a Project Owner and Maintenance Agency for the LA River Path project, initiate the Final EIR for the IOS-North and IOS-South only
- Work with the City of Los Angeles to complete the 2.5 mile gap between IOS-North and IOS-South by leveraging existing on-street bike lanes and planned Class IV cycle tracks in Downtown LA, to serve as an interim connection until the remaining in-channel path may be funded, permitted and delivered
- Continue to engage with communities and stakeholders through environmental clearance and planning

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

File #: 2026-0726, **File Type:** Program **Agenda Number:** 6.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 18, 2026

SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM ANNUAL UPDATE - GATEWAY CITIES SUBREGION

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING programming an additional $222,633,182 in Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - I-605 Corridor “Hot Spot” Interchange Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 61), as shown in Attachment A; and

B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and/or amendments for approved projects.

ISSUE

Measure M MSPs are included in the Measure M Expenditure Plan, which is an attachment to the Measure M Ordinance. All MSP funds are limited to capital projects. This update allows the Gateway Cities Subregion and implementing agencies to approve new eligible projects for funding, and revise the project scope of work, project budget, and schedule for previously funded projects. Funds are programmed through Fiscal Year (FY) 2029-30. The Board’s approval is required to program additional funds and to acknowledge the updated project list (Attachment A), which serves as the basis for Metro entering into agreements and/or amendments with the respective implementing agencies.

BACKGROUND

Based on the Measure M Expenditure Plan, a total of $284.26 million was forecast to be available for programming for the Gateway Cities Subregion (Subregion) for FY 2017-18 to FY 2029-30. In prior actions, the Board approved programming $59.84 million in support of 12 local multimodal projects. Therefore, $224.42 million is available to the Subregion for programming under this update. To date, $39.55 million (66% of programmed funds) has been expended. Two projects have been closed out and audited, and three others are complete and being closed out. Staff will continue working with the implementing agencies to advance the delivery of all projects.

Consistent with the Board-adopted Measure M Guidelines, agencies requesting funds must provide documentation demonstrating project need, multimodal transportation benefits that enhance safety, and community support. Councils of Government and implementing agencies lead and prioritize all proposed transportation improvements, including the environmental process, outreach, final design, and construction.

DISCUSSION

The jurisdictional requests for updates presented herein were approved and forwarded by the cities/Subregion. Metro staff worked closely with the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) to review and confirm the eligibility of proposed project updates, including changes to the scope of work, schedule, and/or funding requests, as applicable.

The GCCOG subregion has prioritized programming its available Measure M MSP funds to construct Highway capital projects planned and designed with Measure R 20% Highway Capital funds allocated to the Gateway Cities I-605 Corridor “Hot Spots” Interchange Improvements (Measure R Expenditure Line 35).

Metro, on behalf of the GCCOG, completed a feasibility study for improvements on I-605 and intersecting corridors (I-405, SR-91, I-105, I-5, and SR-60) to identify congestion “Hot Spots” and develop preliminary improvement concepts for implementation on local arterials and the State Highway System as part of the “Hot Spots” Program. The GCCOG and local agencies are implementing more than 50 multimodal improvement projects identified in the study. Metro is leading the environmental planning and design of eight multimodal highway capital projects on behalf of the Subregion. Metro is administering the construction of three of these projects and will provide construction oversight for an additional three projects. Metro has secured more than $150 million in state and federal grant funds to leverage local Highway Capital funds.

The passage of Measure M made more than $1 billion in Highway Capital funds available to the Subregion to implement its subregional priority projects. The Subregion has leveraged and would like to continue leveraging its Measure M MSP funds to apply for federal and state funding sources to construct highway capital projects planned and designed with Measure R funds.

All Measure M MSP funds must be expended within three years from the fiscal year in which the funds are programmed, according to the Measure M Guidelines Timely Use of Funds Lapsing Policy. Staff will continue working with the implementing agencies and encouraging timely completion of the projects. Additionally, all projects are subject to a close-out audit after completion, according to the Measure M Guidelines.

I-605 Corridor “Hot Spot” Interchange Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 61)

The update includes funding for three projects being led by Metro on behalf of GCCOG, as follows:

Metro/GCCOG

- Program $11,506,099 in FY 2026-27 for MM5509.11 - Southbound I-605 Beverly Blvd

Interchange Improvement Project, an existing Measure R funded project (#AE39064000). The funds will be used for the project's construction phase.

The Southbound I-605 Beverly Blvd Interchange Improvement Project will enhance safety, mobility, and operational efficiency by constructing new and realigned ramps along southbound I-605 at Beverly Boulevard, covering approximately 0.5 miles (Attachment B) in the City of Pico Rivera. The interchange suffers from limited transition distance between ramps, contributing to driver confusion and a higher-than-average collision rate. According to the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), 41 collisions have occurred within the project limits since January 2025. The predominant collision patterns are rear-end collisions (56%) and sideswipe collisions (28%), as identified in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report (TOAR) during the project approval/environmental document (PA/ED) phase. This Project will likely increase VMT.

The improvements include a modified diamond interchange configuration with a southbound loop on-ramp and a retaining wall adjacent to the western right-of-way line. A new 500-foot freeway sound wall will be installed near the southbound off-ramp to mitigate noise impacts on nearby residents. Drainage systems will be upgraded to enhance stormwater management, including new bioswales and basins. A new intersection at Beverly Boulevard will be built, enabling westbound movement from the southbound off-ramp. Yellow signal backplate borders will improve visibility at four intersections, along with updated traffic striping and pavement markers to further enhance safety.

This project will construct high-visibility crosswalks, ADA-curb ramps at six locations, and widened sidewalks at a further five locations. The project does not require any residential or business displacements or property acquisitions. The project is funded through a combination of federal and subregional Measure R funds. Additional funding is needed to fully fund the construction phase. Construction will be carried out under a cooperative agreement between California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and Metro, with Caltrans designated as the Local Agency responsible for advertising, awarding, and administering the contract. Metro's Program Management will provide oversight of Caltrans implementation of construction phase.

- Program $139,172,083 as follows: $46,390,695 in FY 2027-28, $46,390,694 in FY 2028-29, and $46,390,694 in FY 2029-30 for MM5509.12 - Westbound SR-91 Improvement Project - Alondra Blvd to Shoemaker Ave, an existing Measure R funded project (#MR315.74). The funds will be used for the project's construction phase.

  The Westbound (WB) SR-91 Improvement Project will improve safety by addressing weaving conflicts and non-standard merging distances with the addition of a new mixed-flow lane, auxiliary lanes, and interchange modifications for three miles on SR-91 and I-605 in the cities of Artesia and Cerritos (Attachment C). The corridor has closely spaced freeway entrances and exit ramps, which, combined with the deficient capacity of the existing two-lane connector to I-605, create a safety hazard and result in higher-than-average collision rates compared with similar facilities on the Statewide Highway System (SHS). According to the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), 72 collisions occurred within the project limits since January 2025. The predominant collision patterns are rear-end collisions (69%) and

sideswipe collisions (18%), as identified in the TOAR during the PA/ED. This project will likely increase VMT.

This project will construct a new mixed-flow lane in the westbound direction on SR-91 from Artesia Blvd to the I-605 connector, a new SR-91/I-605 connector, maintain auxiliary lanes between on and off-ramps, reconfigure ramps to increase merging distances, and replace the overcrossing at Gridley Road and Bloomfield Avenue. These improvements will help reduce the concentration of collisions along the corridor.

This project incorporates Complete Streets and Multimodal improvements. Bicycle elements include Class II bicycle lanes along Pioneer Blvd; bike refuge lanes that create a separate protected lane for cyclist between right-turn and through lane drivers at high-speed freeway ramp intersections, including at WB 91 at Pioneer Blvd, Norwalk Blvd, and Bloomfield Ave; as well as bicycle signage. Pedestrian improvements include new sidewalks, high-visibility crosswalks, lighting, ADA-accessible curb ramps, and the elimination of high-speed WB on-ramps at unsignalized pedestrian crossings. Additional pedestrian elements include in-line barriers that provide physical separation between the sidewalks on the Bloomfield Ave and Gridley Road overcrossings and the roadway. This project does not require any residential or business displacements.

Metro and Caltrans, in coordination with the GCCOG, are pursuing a joint nomination for Cycle 5 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) funds to fully fund the project's construction phase, and Measure M MSP funds are being programmed for the required local match. This project is currently funded through a combination of state and subregional Measure R funds. Metro will be the implementing agency for this project. This corridor ranks in the 93rd percentile for Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) truck volumes compared to similar facilities. This project will improve interregional freight movement by upgrading nonstandard features to accommodate anticipated future growth, enhancing network resiliency and the reliability of connections. SR-91 is the nearest east-west gateway to the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. This project is a priority project to improve the movement of people and goods, as the facility is part of the Primary Highway Freight System under Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)'s National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) and has been further identified as part of California's Freight Mobility Plan's (CFMP) Freight Investment Plan.

- Program $71,955,000 as follows: $40,000,000 in FY 2027-28, $30,000,000 in FY 2028-29, and $1,955,000 in FY 2029-30 for MM5509.13 - SR-91 Central Ave to Acacia Ct Improvement Project, an existing Measure R funded project (#MR315.76). The funds will be used for the project’s right-of-way and construction phases.

  The SR-91 Central Ave to Acacia Ct Improvements project will improve safety in the area by consolidating multiple access points from the Central Avenue, Wilmington Avenue, and Acacia Court interchanges into a single access point, a collector-distributor (C-D) road on SR-91 in the Cities of Compton and Carson. (Attachment D). The corridor has inadequately spaced on- and off-ramps, which, combined with high freight volumes and congestion, cause higher-than-average collision rates compared with similar facilities on the SHS. Forty-two collisions have occurred within the project limits since January 2025, according to SWITRS. The predominant

collision patterns are rear-end collisions (42%), sideswipe collisions (19%), and broadside collisions (16%), paralleling those identified in the TOAR during the PA/ED phase. This Project will likely increase VMT.

This project entails constructing a concrete barrier separated C-D road system parallel to the SR-91 mainline, connecting Central Avenue, Wilmington Avenue, and Acacia Court on- and off -ramps. By consolidating access and redirecting nonstandard weaving movements to the C-D road, merge and diverge movements would be lengthened and improved, reducing the concentration of collisions along the corridor and improving safety for users. The project does not require any residential or business displacements.

This project incorporates Complete Streets and Multimodal improvements. The Project will add Class II buffered bike lanes with Bicycle Tolerant Drainage Grates and Conflict Zone Green Paint on Artesia Boulevard and on Albertoni Street. Pedestrian elements include LED lighting, ADA-compliant curb ramps, high-visibility crosswalks, leading pedestrian intervals, and ADA-accessible pedestrian signals. Bridge access and sidewalks on Central and Wilmington Avenues will be provided to eliminate existing gaps to the bridge and intersections between eastbound and westbound Artesia Boulevard. A traffic island with a pedestrian refuge area at the Acacia Court/Artesia Boulevard intersection in the southeast quadrant will be built with a marked crosswalk, accessible pedestrian signals, pedestrian countdown displays at the marked crosswalk, and rectangular rapid-flashing beacons. An existing transit stop will be relocated and will include improved assets such as a concrete bus pad, a transit shelter, a bench, transit information, and pedestrian scale lighting.

Metro and Caltrans, in coordination with the GCCOG, are pursuing a joint nomination for Cycle 5 TCEP funds to fully fund the project's construction phase, and Measure M MSP funds are being programmed for the required local match. The project is currently funded by subregional Measure R funds. Right-of-way and construction will be carried out under a cooperative agreement between Caltrans and Metro, with Caltrans designated as the Local Agency responsible for advertising, awarding, and administering the contract. Metro's Program Management will provide oversight of Caltrans implementation of construction phase. The corridor ranks in the 96th percentile for AADT truck volumes among facilities, with trucks accounting for approximately 10% of traffic. According to SCAG's Heavy-Duty Truck model, heavy-duty daily truck trips across the SCAG region are expected to increase nearly 22 percent at an annual rate of 0.73 percent from 2019 through the 2050 horizon year. SR-91 serves as a gateway to/from the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach, which combined handle nearly 40 percent of the nation's containerized imports and 24 percent of the nation's exports (by volume). Ongoing challenges in meeting anticipated travel demand from projected growth in truck and vehicle traffic throughout the region, and freeway geometry that does not meet current Caltrans Highway Design Manual Standards, such as nonstandard shoulder and lane widths, have created safety and freight deficiencies within the project limits. This project will improve safety for all users and enhance the reliability of the movement of goods and people along SR-91, strengthening this crucial freight corridor.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

Programming of Measure M MSP funds to the Gateway Cities Subregion projects will not have any adverse safety impacts on Metro's employees or patrons. It will improve safety for drivers, pedestrians, bicyclists, and people accessing transit.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2026-27, $6.41 million is budgeted in Cost Center 0442 (Highway Subsidies) for the I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements Program (Project 475509).

Upon approval of this action, staff will budget necessary funds to appropriate projects within Cost Center 4720. Since these are multi-year projects, the Cost Center and the Chief Planning Officer will be responsible for coordinating the programming and budgeting costs in future fiscal years.

Impact to Budget

The sources of funds for these projects are Measure M Highway Construction 17%. These fund sources are not eligible for Metro bus and rail operations expenses.

EQUITY PLATFORM

The Gateway Cities Subregion consists of 27 cities and unincorporated communities in Los Angeles County. Forty-seven percent of census tracts in the subregion are designated as Equity Focused Communities (EFCs). Cities within the subregion where most census tracts are EFCs include Bell (85% designated as EFCs), Bell Gardens (89% designated as EFCs), Commerce (100% designated as EFCs), Compton (70% designated as EFCs), Cudahy (100% designated as EFCs), Huntington Park (100% designated as EFCs), Maywood (100% designated as EFCs), Paramount (72% designated as EFCs), and South Gate (86% designated as EFCs).

The Subregion's proposed modal connectivity and safety improvement projects offer a range of potential equity benefits for all roadway users, including pedestrian and crosswalk safety improvements, ADA compliance improvements, bicycle infrastructure improvements, and traffic calming measures. Efforts are ongoing to collaborate with the subregion to ensure that equity is considered in the prioritization and completion of projects. This update includes additional funding for projects within the EFCs of Compton and Pico Rivera.

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. Each project's VMT outcome is included in the brief project description earlier in this report.

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.

*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 Metro Vision 2028 Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling by alleviating the current operational deficiencies and improving mobility along the projects.

Goal 4: Transform LA County through regional collaboration by partnering with the Gateway Cities Council of Governments and the local jurisdictions to identify the needed improvements and take the lead in development and implementation of their projects.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could elect not to approve the additional programming of funds for the Measure M MSP projects for the Gateway Cities Subregion. This is not recommended, as the Gateway Cities Subregion developed the proposed projects in accordance with the Measure M Ordinance, Guidelines, and Administrative Procedures, and this may impact the competitiveness for grant opportunities.

NEXT STEPS

Metro staff will continue to work with the subregion to identify and deliver projects. Program/Project updates will be provided to the Board annually.


ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 61) Project List
Attachment B - SB I-605 Beverly Interchange Improvements Project Map
Attachment C - WB SR-91- Alondra Blvd to Shoemaker Ave Improvement Project Map
Attachment D - SR-91 Central Ave to Acacia Ct Improvement Project Map

Prepared by: F. Pan, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development
A. Roa, Transportation Planner, Countywide Planning & Development

L. Lombardi, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development
N. Ferrara, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, Countywide Planning & Development

Reviewed by: R. Sosa, Chief Planning Officer, Countywide Planning & Development



Stephanie Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer

Gateway Cities Subregion
Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements (Expenditure Line 61)

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Prior Allocation	Allocation Change	Current Allocation	Prior Years Programming	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	FY 2029-30
1	Bellflower	MM5509.01	Lakewood Blvd Arterial Improvement Project	PS&E Construction	Closd	$ 1,507,041		$ 1,507,041	$ 1,507,041				
2	Bellflower	MM5509.08	Foster Road Traffic Signal Upgrades	PS&E Construction		850,000		850,000	850,000				
3	Cerritos	MM5509.02	Del Amo Blvd Bridge Replacement & Traffic Signal Synch Project	PAED PS&E Construction		3,800,000		3,800,000	3,800,000				
4	Downey/ Pico Rivera	MM5509.03	Telegraph Rd Traffic Safety Enhancements Phase II	PS&E Construction	Closd	350,000		350,000	350,000				
5	GCCOG	MM5509.00	Planning Activities for Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Programs ^	Planning		360,000		360,000	360,000				
6	LA County	MM5509.04	Carmenita Rd and Imperial Hwy Intersection Improvements	PS&E Construction	Compl	1,930,000		1,930,000	1,930,000				
7	Long Beach	MM5509.05	Studebaker Rd - Loynes Dr Complete Streets	PAED PS&E Construction		8,750,000		8,750,000	8,750,000				
8	Long Beach	MM5509.09	Artesia "Great" Street Project (CFP F7316/F9130 + MR312.70/MR315.70)	PS&E Construction	Compl	13,668,000		13,668,000	13,668,000				
9	Metro/ GCCOG	MM5509.11	Southbound I-605 Beverly Blvd Interchange Improvement Project (AE39064000)	Construction	New		11,506,099	11,506,099		11,506,099			
10	Metro/ GCCOG	MM5509.12	Westbound SR-91 Improvement Project - Alondra Blvd to Shoemaker Ave (MR315.74)	Construction	New		139,172,083	139,172,083			46,390,695	46,390,694	46,390,694
11	Metro/ GCCOG	MM5509.13	SR-91 Central Ave to Acacia Ct Improvement Project (MR315.76)	ROW Construction	New		71,955,000	71,955,000			40,000,000	30,000,000	1,955,000
12	Norwalk	MM5509.06	Firestone Blvd Widening Project, Phase I	Construction		18,284,900		18,284,900	18,284,900				
13	Pico Rivera	MM4302.01	Pico Rivera Regional Bikeway Project	PS&E Construction	Audit	2,697,000		2,697,000	2,697,000				
14	Pico Rivera	MM5509.10	Washington Blvd Bridge Reconstruction	PAED PS&E Construction		3,739,267		3,739,267	367,622	43,729	488,021	2,839,895	

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Prior Allocation	Allocation Change	Current Allocation	Prior Years Programming	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	FY 2029-30
15	Whittier	MM5509.07	Beverly Blvd at Norwalk Blvd Realignment Project	PAED PS&E ROW Construction		3,900,000		3,900,000	2,400,000	1,500,000			
			Total Programming Amount			**$59,836,208**	**$ 222,633,182**	**$282,469,390**	**$ 54,964,563**	**$13,049,828**	**$86,878,716**	**$79,230,589**	**$ 48,345,694**

^ Subregion Planning Activities (0.5%) for MM MSP.

I-605 at Beverly Bl Interchange Improvements Project

Study Area



Metro

Westbound SR-91 Improvement Project


Study Area



Metro

SR-91/Central Av to Acacia Ct Improvement Project

Study Area



Metro

Measure M Multi-year Subregional Program Annual Update - Gateway Cities Subregion

Planning and Programming Committee
November 18, 2026

Metro

Gateway Cities Subregion

- One Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) available to Subregion
  - I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements (expenditure line 61)
- Funds are limited to Capital projects
  - Environmental Phase and forward

Los Angeles County Transportation Expenditure Plan

(2015 $ in thousands)

ATTACHMENT A
Groundbreaking Sequence
(Exceptions Noted)

For Reference Only	Project (Final Project to be Defined by the Environmental Process)	Notes	Schedule of Funds Available: Ground-breaking Start Date[1]	Schedule of Funds Available: Expected Opening Date (3 year range)	Subregion[2]	2016 - 2067 Local, State, Federal, Other Funding 2015$	Measure M Funding 2015$	Most Recent Cost Estimate 2015$**	Modal Code
	Multi-Year Subregional Programs			1st yr of Range					
47	Metro Active Transport, Transit 1st/Last Mile Program	p	FY 2018	FY 2057	sc	$0	$857,500	$857,500	H
48	Visionary Project Seed Funding	p	FY 2018	FY 2057	sc	$0	$20,000	$20,000	T
49	Street Car and Circulator Projects	k,p	FY 2018	FY 2022	sc	$0	$35,000	$35,000	T
50	Transportation System and Mobility Improve. Program		FY 2018	FY 2032	sb	$0	$293,500	$293,500	H
51	Active Transportation 1st/Last Mile Connections Prog.		FY 2018	FY 2057	w	$0	$361,000	$361,000	H
52	Active Transportation Program		FY 2018	FY 2057	nc	$0	$264,000	$264,000	H
53	Active Transportation Program		FY 2018	FY 2057	gc	$0	TBD	TBD	H
54	Active Transportation Program (Including Greenway Proj.)		FY 2018	FY 2057	sg	$0	$231,000	$231,000	H
55	Active Transportation, 1st/Last Mile, & Mobility Hubs		FY 2018	FY 2057	cc	$0	$215,000	$215,000	H
56	Active Transportation, Transit, and Tech. Program		FY 2018	FY 2032	lvm	$0	$32,000	$32,000	T
57	Highway Efficiency Program		FY 2018	FY 2032	lvm	$0	$133,000	$133,000	H
58	Bus System Improvement Program		FY 2018	FY 2057	sg	$0	$55,000	$55,000	T
59	First/Last Mile and Complete Streets		FY 2018	FY 2057	sg	$0	$198,000	$198,000	H
60	Highway Demand Based Prog. (HOV Ext. & Connect.)		FY 2018	FY 2057	sg	$0	$231,000	$231,000	H
61	I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements ®		FY 2018	FY 2057	gc	$240,000	$1,000,000	$1,240,000	H
62	Modal Connectivity and Complete Streets Projects		FY 2018	FY 2057	av	$0	$202,000	$202,000	H
63	South Bay Highway Operational Improvements		FY 2018	FY 2057	sb	$600,000	$500,000	$1,100,000	H
64	Transit Program		FY 2018	FY 2057	nc	$500,000	$88,000	$588,000	T
65	Transit Projects		FY 2018	FY 2057	av	$0	$257,100	$257,100	T
66	Transportation System and Mobility Improve. Program		FY 2018	FY 2057	sb	$0	$350,000	$350,000	H
67	North San Fernando Valley Bus Rapid Transit Improvements	p,s	FY 2019	FY 2023	sc	$0	$180,000	$180,000	T
68	Subregional Equity Program	p,s	FY 2018	FY 2057	sc	TBD	TBD	$1,196,000	T/H
69	Countywide BRT Projects Ph 1 (All Subregions)	l,p	FY 2020	FY 2022	sc	$0	$50,000	$50,000	T
70	Countywide BRT Projects Ph 2 (All Subregions)	l,p	FY 2030	FY 2032	sc	$0	$50,000	$50,000	T
71	Active Transportation Projects		FY 2033	FY 2057	av	$0	$136,500	$136,500	H
72	Los Angeles Safe Routes to School Initiative		FY 2033	FY 2057	cc	$0	$250,000	$250,000	H
73	Multimodal Connectivity Program		FY 2033	FY 2057	nc	$0	$239,000	$239,000	H
74	Countywide BRT Projects Ph 3 (All Subregions)	l,p	FY 2040	FY 2042	sc	$0	$50,000	$50,000	T
75	Arterial Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	nc	$0	$726,130	$726,130	H
76	BRT and 1st/Last Mile Solutions e.g. DASH		FY 2048	FY 2057	cc	$0	$250,000	$250,000	T
77	Freeway Interchange and Operational Improvements		FY 2048	FY 2057	cc	$0	$195,000	$195,000	H
78	Goods Movement (Improvements & RR Xing Elim.)		FY 2048	FY 2057	sg	$0	$33,000	$33,000	T
79	Goods Movement Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	nc	$0	$104,000	$104,000	T
80	Goods Movement Projects		FY 2048	FY 2057	av	$0	$81,700	$81,700	T
81	Highway Efficiency Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	nc	$0	$128,870	$128,870	H
82	Highway Efficiency Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	sg	$0	$534,000	$534,000	H
83	Highway Efficiency, Noise Mitig. and Arterial Projects		FY 2048	FY 2057	av	$0	$602,800	$602,800	H
84	ITS/Technology Program (Advanced Signal Tech.)		FY 2048	FY 2057	sg	$0	$66,000	$66,000	H
85	LA Streetscape Enhance. & Great Streets Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	cc	$0	$450,000	$450,000	H
86	Modal Connectivity Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	lvm	$0	$68,000	$68,000	H
87	Public Transit State of Good Repair Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	cc	$0	$402,000	$402,000	T
88	Traffic Congestion Relief and Improvement Program		FY 2048	FY 2057	lvm	$0	$63,000	$63,000	H
89	Traffic Congestion Relief/Signal Synchronization		FY 2048	FY 2057	cc	$0	$50,000	$50,000	H
90	Arroyo Verdugo Projects to be Determined		FY 2048	FY 2057	av	$0	$110,600	$110,600	H
91	Countywide BRT Projects Ph 4 (All Subregions)	p	FY 2050	FY 2052	sc	$90,000	$10,000	$100,000	T
92	Countywide BRT Projects Ph 5 (All Subregions)	p	FY 2060	FY 2062	sc	$0	$100,000	$100,000	T
93	**Multi-Year Subregional Programs Subtotal**					**$1,430,000**	**$10,253,700**	**$12,879,700**	
94	**GRAND TOTAL**					**$21,011,027**	**$31,243,641**	**$53,450,669**	

November 2026 Recommendation

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING programming an additional $222,633,182 in Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) – I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 61), as shown in Attachment A; and

B. AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and/or amendments for approved projects.

Recommended Projects

This update includes funding for three Multi-modal Highway projects.



Top left: SB I-605 Beverly Interchange Improvement Project

Bottom right: SR-91 Central Ave to Acacia Ct Improvements Project: E Artesia Blvd and Wilmington Ave Intersection Improvements



* Images are for illustrative purposes only.

Next Steps

- Continue working with the Subregion to identify and deliver projects
- Return to the Board annually for Program/Project updates

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

Metro

Board Report

File #: 2026-0786, **File Type:** Plan **Agenda Number:** 7.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 18, 2026
EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 19, 2026

SUBJECT: MEASURE M 10-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, METRICS, AND WEIGHTING

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE the project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics and weighting, for the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment (Attachment A).

ISSUE

Section 7(g) of the Measure M Ordinance requires that, beginning in Fiscal Year 2027, Metro conduct a comprehensive assessment of the projects and programs in the Measure M Expenditure Plan that are completed or anticipated to be completed during the next ten-year period. Measure M Guidelines further establish that the assessments are to be coordinated with Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) updates, including LRTP performance metrics, and provide a comprehensive review to assess changes in circumstances affecting the delivery of projects and programs within their schedules as identified in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.

A project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics and weighting, is an effective tool for preparing a specific evaluation in the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment (Assessment), which assesses the performance of Measure M's Expenditure Plan major capital projects and Multiyear Subregional Programs (MSP). The complete list of Measure M projects and programs that will and will not be evaluated using this Project Evaluation Framework is included in Attachment B per the ordinance.

Staff presented the draft project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics and weighting, to the Executive Management Committee on October 15, 2026, which is now submitted to the Board for final consideration. Responses to questions regarding SGV Forward from the October 2026 Executive Management Committee meeting are addressed in Attachment C.

BACKGROUND

The Measure M Ordinance establishes an ongoing framework for oversight and accountability of all projects and programs funded through Measure M. At five-year intervals, Metro prepares a comprehensive assessment of all implemented projects and programs to evaluate overall program performance and identify opportunities to improve coordination, delivery, and effectiveness, informed by current practices, best practices, and organizational changes.

The first Measure M Five-Year Comprehensive Assessment and Equity Report was completed in 2023 and evaluated the initial five years of Measure M implementation, from July 2017 through June 2022. The current Assessment will build upon that effort by incorporating both a retrospective evaluation of Measure M program performance and an assessment of Measure M projects and programs completed or anticipated to be completed over the next ten-year period.

At its July 2026 meeting, the Board approved the Assessment objectives and criteria that describe the entirety of the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment, including the retrospective examination of the Measure M program achievements. In October 2026, staff presented the draft project evaluation framework to the Executive Management Committee to receive feedback.. The project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics and weighting, provides complementary tools for evaluating Expenditure Plan major projects and programs anticipated to be completed over the next 10-year period.

DISCUSSION

The Project Evaluation Framework establishes a consistent approach for evaluating the performance and potential benefits of Measure M-funded projects and programs. The framework is designed to support a transparent, data-driven, and policy-aligned evaluation that considers both project delivery and the broader transportation outcomes that Measure M investments intend to advance. The framework will complement the broader Assessment by providing a structured approach to evaluating future major projects, while the Assessment also considers the historical performance and implementation of the Measure M program as a whole.

Measure M Expenditure Plan projects with an Expected Opening Date of 2037 or earlier will be evaluated using this framework. Similarly, MSPs expected to deliver one or more projects or programs in 2037 or earlier will also be evaluated using this framework, consistent with the Measure M Ordinance and as identified in Attachment B.

The framework was developed to be consistent with the original goals in Measure M and best practices established in prior Metro evaluation approaches. The Project Evaluation Framework consists of three primary elements: Performance Metrics, Evaluation Categories, and Evaluation Category Weights.

Performance Metrics

The Measure M 10-Year Assessment takes place within a transportation landscape that has evolved since Measure M's adoption in 2016. Changes in travel behavior (largely influenced by the pandemic), emerging technologies, shifting economic conditions, demographic trends, and evolving policy priorities underscore the need to periodically reassess the Measure M investment plan. In

developing the performance metrics list for this evaluation, staff have aimed to be consistent with previous frameworks while recognizing that changing conditions and priorities should be taken into consideration when evaluating future projects.

The evaluation Performance Metrics, highlighted in Table 1 below, aim to be consistent with five previously approved Metro frameworks and guiding documents. These include:

- **Measure M Pre-Evaluation (2015)**: These metrics, approved in 2015 by the Board, were used to evaluate projects for inclusion in the 2016 Measure M ballot measure
- **Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) (2020)**: The 2020 LRTP calculated the existing and future performance of the LA County transportation system across a range of metrics, many of which are applicable for project performance evaluations
- **Measure M Five-Year Comprehensive Assessment and Equity Report (2023)**: The first five-year assessment focused on past project performance, and quantified system-wide performance for many metrics that are meaningful project evaluation metrics
- **Board Amendments**: Amendments adopted by the Board with the approval of the Measure M Five-Year Comprehensive Assessment and Equity Report (2023)
- **Recommended Goals, Objectives, and Metrics for Metro Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) (2025)**: This Board adopted framework provides a series of metrics that could be used to evaluate the benefits of major capital projects

Table 1 below highlights the proposed Assessment performance metrics and their alignment with previously established frameworks and studies.

Table 1. Proposed Project Evaluation Performance Metrics

Comprehensive Assessment Performance Metric	Measure M Pre-Evaluation (2015)	LRTP (2020)	MM 5yr Report (2023)	Board Amendments (2023)	CBA Goals & Metrics (2025)
Access to Opportunity: All destinations*	x	x	x	x	x
Access to Opportunity: Jobs & Retail*	x	x	x	x	x
Access to Opportunity: Quality of Life (parks, cultural centers, healthcare, schools, senior centers) *	x	x	x		x
Active transportation trips	x				
Average vehicle occupancy	x	x			
Fatal and Severe Injury Collisions	x	x		x	x
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		x		x	x
Gross regional product		x			x
Improved travel time reliability	x	x		x	x
Increased system-wide connectivity			x	x	
Increased person throughput		x		x	x
Investment in Equity Focus Communities	x	x	x	x	
Jobs/job years created	x	x			x
Non-SOV Mode Share	x	x			x
Reduced conflict points	x				x
System redundancy for emergency					x
Transit oriented development potential	x				x
Transit ridership	x	x	x	x	
Travel time improvement	x	x			x
Vehicle Hours of Delay		x		x	x
Vehicle Miles Traveled		x		x	x

**Access to Opportunity, including the precise destination definitions, is currently being defined.*

Evaluation Categories

In 2015, Metro established evaluation categories based on the Measure M Ordinance goals. The Assessment evaluation categories mirror the framework previously used to evaluate major capital projects in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.

The proposed evaluation categories include:

- Mobility
- Accessibility
- Transportation Safety
- Sustainability and Quality of Life
- Economy

Table 2 illustrates how the goals established in the Measure M ordinance are consistent with these evaluation categories.

Table 2. Measure M Goals and Project Evaluation Categories

Measure M Goal	Mob[1]	Acc[2]	Saf[3]	Sbl/QoL[4]	Ecn[5]
Improve freeway traffic flow; reduce bottlenecks and ease traffic congestion.	x				
Expand the rail and rapid transit system; accelerate rail construction and build new rail lines; enhance local, regional, and express bus service; and improve system connectivity.	x	x			
Repave local streets, repair potholes, synchronize signals; improve neighborhood streets and intersections, and enhance bike and pedestrian connections.	x	x	x	x	
Keep the transit and highway system safe; earthquake-retrofit bridges, enhance freeway and transit system safety, and keep the transportation system in good working condition.			x		
Make public transportation more accessible, convenient, and affordable for seniors, students, and the disabled and provide better mobility options for our aging population.	x	x			
Embrace technology and innovation; incorporate modern technology, new advancements, and emerging innovations into the local transportation system.	x				x
Create jobs, reduce pollution, and generate local economic benefits; increase personal quality time and overall quality of life.				x	x
Provide accountability and transparency; protect and monitor the public's investments through independent audits and oversight.			x		

(1)Mobility, (2)Accessibility, (3)Transportation Safety, (4)Sustainability and Quality of Life, (5)Economy

Evaluation Category Weights

The proposed evaluation category weights are consistent with previous Metro frameworks, including the Measure M Pre-Evaluation (2015) framework and the more recent CBA methodology. Table 3 shows the two previously adopted weighting frameworks, as well as the proposed weighting for the Assessment.

Table 3. Evaluation Categories and Weights

Measure M Pre-Evaluation Goals (2015)	Weight	CBA Goals (2025)	Weight	MM Comp Assessment	Weight
Mobility	45.0%	Mobility & Accessibility	40%	**Mobility**	**40%**
Accessibility	17.5%			**Accessibility**	**20%**
Economy	12.5%	Economic Impact	15%	**Economy**	**15%**
Safety	12.5%	Safety/Health	15%	**Transportation Safety**	**12.5%**
Sustainability & Quality of Life	12.5%	Environmental Sustainability	15%	**Sustainability & Quality of Life**	**12.5%**
		Operational Sustainability	15%		
TOTAL	100.0%	TOTAL	100.0%	**TOTAL**	**100.0%**

Attachment A shows the complete evaluation framework, which ties together the performance metrics, evaluation categories, and category weights. The proposed weighting is consistent with the previous frameworks, prioritizing Mobility and Accessibility the most and maintaining the importance of the other categories.

- **Mobility (40%)**: This category evaluates how effectively a project improves the movement of people and goods throughout the transportation system. Metrics such as average vehicle occupancy, travel time reliability, person throughput, travel time improvements, and reductions in vehicle hours of delay measure whether investments increase system efficiency, reduce time spent traveling, and maximize the use of available transportation capacity.

- **Accessibility (20%)**: This category assesses how well the transportation system connects people to destinations, services, and travel options. The included metrics measure access to opportunities, active transportation usage, system connectivity, non-single-occupancy vehicle mode share, and transit ridership to determine whether a project expands mobility choices and improves access for a broad range of users.

- **Economy (15%):** This category evaluates a project's contribution to regional economic vitality and prosperity. Through metrics that measure impacts on gross regional product and job creation, as well as access to employment and shopping centers, this category assesses how projects support workforce access and economic growth.

- **Transportation Safety (12.5%)**: This category focuses on reducing the risk and consequences of transportation-related incidents for all users. Metrics related to fatal and severe-injury collisions, conflict point reduction, and emergency system redundancy evaluate how projects enhance safety, improve network resilience, and provide reliable transportation access during emergencies.

- **Sustainability and Quality of Life (12.5%)**: This category explores the extent to which projects support environmental goals, equitable outcomes, and livable communities. Metrics such as access to destinations that enhance everyday life, investment in Equity Focus

Communities, potential for transit-oriented development, greenhouse gas emissions, and vehicle miles traveled assess how projects contribute to healthier, more sustainable, and more inclusive communities.

Results from the project evaluations, together with data gathered through the Assessment and stakeholder engagement, will inform staff recommendations, including any proposed amendments to the Measure M Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

There is no safety impact associated with the information contained in this report. This action would establish the evaluation framework, metrics, and weighting to guide the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment, including criteria to evaluate transportation safety.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Approval of the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment evaluation framework, metrics, and weighting does not directly impact the agency's finances.

EQUITY PLATFORM

The proposed evaluation framework, metrics, and weighting for the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment will guide a broad analysis of Measure M's impacts through Metro's Equity Platform framework. Metro serves riders throughout the Los Angeles region. The Assessment will consider the impacts of Metro's investments on the people of Los Angeles County by analyzing demographic disparities in ridership, mobility choices, and investments. Work on the Assessment also includes the development of an Access to Opportunity tool that will be used to deepen understanding of how Measure M investments have shaped access to opportunity in Los Angeles County.

Findings from the Assessment will be shared widely with stakeholders across the region to validate and contextualize the quantitative analyses. Through this engagement process, stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide perspectives on how the findings reflect or differ from their experiences with the Metro system. This input will help ground the data in the lived experiences of our riders and strengthen the overall assessment.

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

item supports Metro's systemwide strategy to reduce VMT through comprehensive planning activities that establish a consistent evaluation framework to evaluate Measure M projects that may benefit and further encourage transit ridership, ridesharing, and active transportation. This aligns with Metro's Board-adopted VMT reduction targets, which build on the success of existing investments.

*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 Assessment supports Strategic Plan Goal #5, which seeks to "Provide responsive, accountable, and trustworthy governance within Metro." The Assessment will provide transparency and accountability in the delivery of the Measure M program and seek to ensure its effective delivery over the next decade.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board may choose not to proceed with the recommended evaluation framework, metrics, and weighting; however, the proposed evaluation framework maintains continuity with the frameworks used to develop Measure M and aligns with more recent Board actions to establish a standard evaluation process.

NEXT STEPS

Upon approval of the evaluation framework, metrics, and weighting, staff will begin the technical work to evaluate the Measure M major capital projects and programs completed or anticipated to be completed in the next ten years.

Alongside the technical evaluation, Metro will engage stakeholders to gather input throughout the process. This outreach will help ensure the Assessment and any potential amendments reflect community perspectives. Metro will engage the MMITOC on this project as a standing item at regularly scheduled committee meetings.


In Spring 2027, staff will present a status update of the Assessment to the Board, including a discussion on implications of potential amendments. Based on the feedback received, staff will revise and release the completed Assessment and potential proposed amendments for public review. The Assessment and proposed amendments will subsequently be presented to the Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (MMITOC) as a standing agenda item for comment on the Assessment and to make requisite findings on amendments in Summer 2027. The final Assessment and recommended amendments will be presented to the Board for consideration in Fall 2027. At that time, if the Assessment is approved by a 2/3 vote, the Board may then consider amendments to the Measure M Ordinance and Expenditure Plan within the parameters established by the Ordinance.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Project/Program Evaluation Framework
Attachment B - Projects/Programs assessed and not assessed
Attachment C - SGV Forward

Prepared by: P. Backstrom, Senior Director, Countywide Planning and Development
R. Lum, Deputy Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development
M. Cano, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development
C. Hoshijima, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development
L. Lombardi, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development
A. Barnea, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development
K. Houston, Deputy Chief Auditor
T. Mengle, Executive Officer, Finance
N. Ferrara, Deputy Chief Planning & Development Officer, Countywide Planning & Development

Reviewed by: R. Sosa, Chief Planning Officer
S. Gookin, Deputy Chief Executive Officer



Stephanie Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT A

Project Evaluation Framework		
Category	**Weighting**	**Performance Metric**
Mobility	40%	Average vehicle occupancy
		Improved travel time reliability
		Increased person throughput
		Travel time improvement
		Vehicle Hours of Delay
Accessibility	15%	Access to Opportunity: All destinations
		Active transportation trips
		Increase system-wide connectivity
		Non-SOV Mode Share
		Transit ridership
Economy	15%	Access to Opportunity: Jobs & Retail
		Gross regional product
		Jobs/job years created
Transportation Safety	12.5%	Fatal and Severe Injury Collisions
		Reduced conflict points
		System redundancy for emergency
Sustainability and Quality of Life	12.5%	Access to Opportunity: Quality of Life (parks, cultural centers, healthcare, schools, senior centers)
		Greenhouse Gas Emissions
		Investment in Equity Focus Communities
		Transit oriented development potential
		Vehicle Miles Traveled

ATTACHMENT B

Table 1. Measure M Expenditure Plan – Projects in Comprehensive Assessment (CA) Analysis

PROJECTS WITH AN EXPECTED OPENING DATE OF 2037 OR EARLIER ARE INCLUDED IN THE CA			
Project Name *(2015 Expenditure Plan Project Name, if different)*	**Expected Opening Date** *(Per Measure M)*	**Subregion*** *(Per Measure M)*	**In Comprehensive Assessment**
LAX/Metro Transit Center *Airport Metro Connect 96th St. Station/Green Line Ext LAX*	CY 2021	sc	***Yes***
D Line Subway Extension Section 3 *Westside Purple Line Extension Section 3*	FY 2024	wc	***Yes***
High Desert Corridor *High Desert Multi-Purpose Corridor (HDMC)*	FY 2021	nc	***Yes***
I-5 N Cap. Enhancements (SR-14 to Lake Hughes Rd)	FY 2023	nc	***Yes***
A Line to Claremont *Gold Line Foothill Extension to Claremont*	FY 2025	sg	***Yes***
G Line Improvements *Orange Line BRT Improvements*	FY 2025	sf	***Yes***
North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit *BRT Connector Orange/Red Line to Gold Line*	FY 2022	av	***Yes***
		sf	***Yes***
East San Fernando Valley Light Rail Transit *East SF Valley Transit Corridor Project*	FY 2027	sf	***Yes***
Southeast Gateway Line *West Santa Ana Transit Corridor LRT*	FY 2028	gc	***Yes***
Crenshaw/LAX Track Enhancement Project	FY 2026	sc	***Yes***
SR-71 Gap from I-10 to Rio Rancho Rd.	FY 2026	sg	***Yes***
LA River Path *LA River Waterway & System Bikepath*	FY 2025	cc	***Yes***
LA River Path – San Fernando Valley *Complete LA River Bikepath*	FY 2025	sf	***Yes***
I-405 Sepulveda Pass ExpressLanes *Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor (Ph 1)*	FY 2026	sf	***Yes***
		wc	***Yes***
Vermont Transit Corridor	FY 2028	cc	***Yes***
SR-57/SR-60 Interchange Improvements	FY 2031	sg	***Yes***
K Line Extension to Torrance *Green Line Extension to Crenshaw Blvd in Torrance*	FY 2030	sb	***Yes***
Long Beach-East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan *I-710 South Corridor Project (Ph 1)*	FY 2032	gc	***Yes***
I-105 ExpressLanes from I-405 to I-605 *I-105 Express Lane from I-405 to I-605*	FY 2029	sc	***Yes***
Sepulveda Transit Corridor *Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor (Ph 2)*	FY 2033	sf	***Yes***
		wc	***Yes***
Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 *Gold Line Eastside Extension (One Alignment)*	FY 2035	gc	***Yes***
		sg	***Yes***

PROJECTS WITH AN EXPECTED OPENING DATE OF 2037 OR LATER ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE CA			
Project Name *(2015 Expenditure Plan Project Name, if different)*	**Expected Opening Date** *(Per Measure M)*	**Subregion*** *(Per Measure M)*	**In Comprehensive Assessment**
Southeast Gateway Line (LAUS Segment) *West Santa Ana Transit Corridor LRT*	FY 2041	cc	**No**
		gc	**No**
Long Beach-East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan *I-710 South Corridor Project (Ph 2)*	FY 2041	gc	**No**
I-5 Corridor Improvements (I-605 to I-710)	FY 2042	gc	**No**
K Line Northern Extension *Crenshaw Northern Extension*	FY 2047	cc	**No**
		wc	**No**
I-405/I-110 HOV Connect Ramps & Interchange Improv	FY 2044	sb	**No**
I-605/I-10 Interchange	FY 2047	sg	**No**
SR 60/I-605 Interchange HOV Direct Connectors	FY 2047	sg	**No**
Lincoln Blvd BRT	FY 2047	wc	**No**
I-110 Express Lane Ext South to I-405/I-110 Interchange	FY 2046	sb	**No**
I-405 South Bay Curve Improvements	FY 2047	sb	**No**
Green Line Eastern Extension (Norwalk)	FY 2052	sc	**No**
SF Valley Transportation Improvements	FY 2050	sf	**No**
Sepulveda Pass Westwood to LAX (Ph 3)	FY 2057	sc	**No**
Orange Line Conversion to Light Rail	FY 2057	sf	**No**
City of San Fernando Bike Master Plan	FY 2054	sf	**No**
Historic Downtown Streetcar	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 *Gold Line Eastside Ext. Second Alignment*	FY 2057	sc	**No**
High Desert Corridor *High Desert Multi-Purpose Corridor - LA County Segment*	FY 2067	sc	**No**

***Subregion Abbreviations**

sc = Systemwide Connectivity Projects (no subregion)
av = Arroyo Verdugo
lvm = Las Virgenes Malibu
cc = Central City Area
sg = San Gabriel Valley
nc = North County
sb = South Bay
w = Westside
gc = Gateway Cities
sf = San Fernando Valley

Table 2. Measure M Expenditure Plan – Multi-Year Subregional Programs (MSPs) in CA Analysis

MSPS EXPECTED TO DELIVER ONE OR MORE PROJECT(S) BEFORE 2037 ARE INCLUDED IN THE CA			
Program Name *(2015 Expenditure Plan Project Name, if different)*	**Expected Opening Date*** *(Per Measure M)*	**Subregion**** *(Per Measure M)*	**In Comprehensive Assessment**
Metro Active Transport, Transit 1st/Last Mile Program	FY 2057	sc	***Yes***
Visionary Project Seed Funding	FY 2057	sc	***Yes***
Street Car and Circulator Projects	FY 2022	sc	***Yes***
Transportation System and Mobility Improve. Program	FY 2032	sb	***Yes***
Active Transportation 1st/Last Mile Connections Prog.	FY 2057	w	***Yes***
Active Transportation Program	FY 2057	nc	***Yes***
Active Transportation Program	FY 2057	gc	***Yes***
Active Transportation Program (Including Greenway Proj.)	FY 2057	sg	***Yes***
Active Transportation, 1st/Last Mile, & Mobility Hubs	FY 2057	cc	***Yes***
Active Transportation, Transit, and Tech. Program	FY 2032	lvm	***Yes***
Highway Efficiency Program	FY 2032	lvm	***Yes***
Bus System Improvement Program	FY 2057	sg	***Yes***
First/Last Mile and Complete Streets	FY 2057	sg	***Yes***
Highway Demand Based Prog. (HOV Ext. & Connect.)	FY 2057	sg	***Yes***
I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements	FY 2057	gc	***Yes***
Modal Connectivity and Complete Streets Projects	FY 2057	av	***Yes***
South Bay Highway Operational Improvements	FY 2057	sb	***Yes***
Transit Program	FY 2057	nc	***Yes***
Transit Projects	FY 2057	av	***Yes***
Transportation System and Mobility Improve. Program	FY 2057	sb	***Yes***
North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor *North San Fernando Valley Bus Rapid Transit Improvement*	FY 2023	sc	***Yes***
Subregional Equity Program	FY 2057	sc	***Yes***
Countywide BRT Projects Ph 1 (All Subregions)	FY 2022	sc	***Yes***
Countywide BRT Projects Ph 2 (All Subregions)	FY 2030	sc	***Yes***
Active Transportation Projects	FY 2032	av	***Yes***
Los Angeles Safe Routes to School Initiative	FY 2057	cc	***Yes***
Multimodal Connectivity Program	FY 2057	nc	***Yes***

**Expected Opening Dates listed in the Measure M Expenditure Plan consider full completion of all projects within the MSP*

MSPS NOT EXPECTED TO DELIVER ONE OR MORE PROJECT(S) BEFORE 2037 ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE CA			
Program Name *(2015 Expenditure Plan Project Name, if different)*	**Expected Opening Date*** *(Per Measure M)*	**Subregion**** *(Per Measure M)*	**In Comprehensive Assessment**
Countywide BRT Projects Ph 3 (All Subregions)	FY 2042	sc	**No**
Arterial Program	FY 2057	nc	**No**
BRT and 1st/Last Mile Solutions e.g. DASH	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Freeway Interchange and Operational Improvements	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Goods Movement (Improvements & RR Xing Elim.)	FY 2057	sg	**No**
Goods Movement Program	FY 2057	nc	**No**
Goods Movement Projects	FY 2057	av	**No**
Highway Efficiency Program	FY 2057	nc	**No**
Highway Efficiency Program	FY 2057	sg	**No**
Highway Efficiency, Noise Mitig. and Arterial Projects	FY 2057	av	**No**
ITS/Technology Program (Advanced Signal Tech.)	FY 2057	sg	**No**
LA Streetscape Enhance. & Great Streets Program	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Modal Connectivity Program	FY 2057	lvm	**No**
Public Transit State of Good Repair Program	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Traffic Congestion Relief and Improvement Program	FY 2057	lvm	**No**
Traffic Congestion Relief/Signal Synchronization	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Arroyo Verdugo Projects to be Determined	FY 2057	av	**No**
Countywide BRT Projects Ph 4 (All Subregions)	FY 2052	sc	**No**
Countywide BRT Projects Ph 5 (All Subregions)	FY 2062	sc	**No**
**Expected Opening Dates listed in the Measure M Expenditure Plan consider full completion of all projects within the MSP*			

****Subregion Abbreviations**

sc = Systemwide Connectivity Projects (no subregion)
nc = North County
av = Arroyo Verdugo
sb = South Bay
lvm = Las Virgenes Malibu
w = Westside
cc = Central City Area
gc = Gateway Cities
sg = San Gabriel Valley
sf = San Fernando Valley

ATTACHMENT C

SGV Forward: Project History and Funding Strategy

Question from Director Sandoval at the October 2026 Executive Management Committee

Why is SGV Forward not among the projects to be evaluated under the proposed framework?

The Ordinance limits the Assessment to projects and programs in the voter-approved Measure M Expenditure Plan that are completed or anticipated to be completed through 2037, and the framework will be applied only to those projects and programs. SGV Forward is not a line item in the Measure M Expenditure Plan and is therefore outside the scope of the Assessment. There has not been an amendment or request for an amendment to Measures M or R that would provide for Metro to assume SGV Forward met the Ordinance requirements for inclusion in the Assessment.

The following sections describe the history and intent of Measures R and M, as well as next steps for the SGV Forward proposal.

Measure R & M Eastside Extension Funding

In 2008, Measure R was approved by the voters and included in the Attachment A Expenditure Plan, a line item for the Gold Line Eastside Extension for an amount of $1.271 billion from Measure R. The 2016 voter-approved Measure M Expenditure Plan identified $4 billion for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project, with funding structured across two funding cycles for two different alignments. The Measure M funding for the first alignment contemplated transit investments from both the SGV and Gateway Cities subregions. The second alignment was coded as a System Connectivity investment and available beginning in FY53.

SGV Forward

In February 2020, the Board selected, the Washington Alignment and removed SR-60 and Combined Alternatives from further consideration. The Board also approved Metro staff prepare a feasibility study independent from the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project to evaluate other options that better serve the needs of the San Gabriel Valley.

As part of that action, the Board also approved Motion 8.1 which in summary, directed staff as Resolution E of the motion, to “Honor the commitment of $635.5 M made to the San Gabriel Valley subregion as part of the Measure R documentation. This commitment will be

recognized consistent with the funding years in the Measure R Expenditure Plan." Although not specifically identified in the Measure R Ordinance passed by the voters, the amount is equal to the Measure R funding split between the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities subregion. Resolution E also directed Metro staff to include development of a funding plan which could include "any potential inter-fund borrowing between Measure R & M, loan options, or other financial mechanisms necessary to retain overall equity while ensuring financial capacity to move the Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase 2 forward as an accelerated Pillar Project under Metro's Twenty-Eight by '28 initiative." Metro staff were directed to return in May 2020 to report back on a funding plan.

SGV Forward Feasibility and Funding Plan


Per the Board actions in February 2020, Metro staff reported in May 2020 and subsequently partnered with the SGVCOG to conduct the San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study. Completed in 2024, the study established a phased strategy for advancing transit improvements throughout the subregion, including near-term projects, mid-term investments in the SR-60 corridor, and a longer-term vision for an integrated transit network. This effort became the foundation for SGV Forward. The Board has approved $7,988,838 in funding for the feasibility study, outreach services, project definition, design refinements, cost estimation and environmental clearance of the SGV Forward.

Consistent with Board direction to ensure financial capacity to move the Eastside Extension Phase 2 forward as an accelerated Pillar project, adhere to Measure R & M requirements, and honor funding of a SGV investment during funding years assumed for the Measure R line item, staff returned in May 2020, with a funding plan that assigned all funding to the first alignment per the 2019 LRTP financial forecast to ensure capacity to move the Eastside Extension Phase 2 forward. The plan recommended an amendment to the Measure M ordinance that creates a new project or program for SFV Forward funded by a portion of the second alignment funding.

Metro is supportive of SGVCOG in finalizing engineering and environmental clearance of projects and pursuit of additional grant funding, identification of unallocated subregional, or provision of loans against the second alignment funding to implement SGV transit investments. Measure M includes several sources of funding that could fund SGV Forward. These include the Bus System Improvement program MSP, of which $116 million has yet to be programmed (excluding repayment of a Metro loan to SGVCOG), and a portion of the Bus System Improvement Program and First/Last Mile and Complete Streets MSPs. The cities within the SGVCOG also receive Measure M Local Return, estimated to total $25.6 million in fiscal year (FY) 2027, which could fund a portion of SGV Forward.

Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2

The initial operating segment (IOS) funding plan for Eastside Phase 2 was last presented to the Board in May 2024 (2024-0190), when the Final EIR was certified. It relies on committed Measure M and Measure R sales tax revenues, other local sales tax sources (Proposition A and Proposition C), secured state funds, and additional state and federal funding to be secured. Groundbreaking of the IOS is assumed in FY 2029 with completion anticipated in 2035-2037. The remaining funding to be secured totals approximately $3,943.0 million for the IOS. The project is now in early construction with $33 million in Measures R and M funding billed to the project to date. The Measure R Transit subfund commits $1.271 billion in 2008 year of expenditure dollars to the Eastside project. At present Measure R 35% actual receipts are down $975 million or 16% under original projections. Total Measure R 35% Transit subfund is underfunded by $3.0 billion or 26%, based on actual revenues with 3% annual growth from 2027-2039 as illustrated in the table below.



- 2010 – 2026 INCEPTION TO DATE (ITD)
Actual receipts are $975M, or 16% under original projections

- 2027 – 2039 FUTURE PROJECTED
Shortfall is $2,022M, or 26% under original projections based on 3% annual growth.

- TOTAL MEASURE R 35 REVENUES PROJECTION
Total MR35 subfund is underfunded by $3.0B, or 26%, based on actual revenues with 3% annual growth from 2027 - 2039

In summary, Measure R and Measure M did not provide for splitting the corridor into two concurrent projects. However, Metro continues to support SGV Forward consistent with the Board action in February 2020. Consequently, SGV Forward is not included in the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment, which evaluates Expenditure Plan projects and Multi-Year Subregional Programs (MSP) completed or anticipated to be completed through 2037, consistent with the Measure M Ordinance. Within the San Gabriel Valley subregion, staff will evaluate in the Assessment:

- The A Line Foothill Extension to Claremont, which has a $1 billion Measure M commitment (2015 dollars) and may be under construction during the evaluation period. To date, $1.149 billion has been spent on the A Line Foothill Extension. An additional contract covering construction from Pomona Station to a new Claremont station is still to be finalized.
- Four San Gabriel Valley MSPs, including Active Transportation Program, Bus System Improvement Program, First/Last Mile and Complete Streets, and Highway Demand Based Program totaling $715 million (2015 dollars).

Exclusion from the Assessment does not prevent the Board from advancing SGV Forward. Once the project has a defined scope, schedule, cost estimate, and completed environmental review, the Board may approve the project. Metro continues to support the SGV Forward program, including developing a funding strategy for near-term improvements of the project once schedule and cost estimates are developed.



Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment Project Evaluation Framework, Metrics and Weighting

Planning & Programming Committee
Executive Management Committee

File# 2026-0786
November 18, 2026
November 19, 2026

Metro

Requested Action

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE the project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics, and weighting, for the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment

Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment Framework

GOALS
Measure M
NOVEMBER 2016

OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA
Comprehensive Assessment
JULY 2026

METRICS & WEIGHTING

MM 5-Year
> State of the System and Quality of Life
> Program Delivery

MM 10-Year
> Capital Project Performance and Delivery Assessment

WE ARE HERE

FY23 — FY27 — FY32 — FY37

Project Evaluation Categories and Weighting

Measure M Evaluation Goals (2015)	Weight	CBA* Goals (2025)	Weight	MM Comp Assessment	Weight
Mobility	45.0%	Mobility & Accessibility	40%	**Mobility**	**40%**
Accessibility	17.5%			**Accessibility**	**20%**
Economy	12.5%	Economic Impact	15%	**Economy**	**15%**
Safety	12.5%	Safety/Health	15%	**Transportation Safety**	**12.5%**
Sustainability & Quality of Life	12.5%	Environmental Sustainability	15%	**Sustainability & Quality of Life**	**12.5%**
		Operational Sustainability	15%		
TOTAL	100.0%	TOTAL	100.0%	**TOTAL**	**100.0%**

**CBA: Cost-Benefit Analysis*

Project Evaluation Metrics

Consistent with past and current Metro frameworks

Mobility

- Average Vehicle Occupancy
- Travel Time Reliability
- Person Throughput
- Vehicle Hours of Delay
- Travel Time

Accessibility

- A2O[1] All Destinations
- Active Transportation Trips
- Systemwide Connectivity
- Mode Share
- Transit Ridership

Economy

- A2O Jobs & Retail
- Gross Regional Product
- Jobs/Job Years

Transportation Safety

- Fatal & Severe Injury Crashes
- Conflict Points
- System Redundancy

Sustainability & Quality of Life

- A2O Quality of Life
- GHG[2] Emissions
- Investment in EFCs[3]
- TOD[4] Potential
- Vehicle Miles Traveled


1. Access to Opportunity; 2. Greenhouse Gas Emissions; 3. Equity Focus Communities; 4. Transit-Oriented Development.

Complete Evaluation Framework

WEIGHTING	METRICS
40% Mobility	Average Vehicle Occupancy; Travel Time Reliability; Person Throughput; Vehicle Hours of Delay; Travel Time
20% Accessibility	A2O[1] All Destinations; Active Transportation Trips; Mode Share; Systemwide Connectivity; Transit Ridership
15% Economy	A2O Jobs & Retail; Gross Regional Product; Jobs/Job Years
12.5% Transportation Safety	Fatal & Severe Injury Crashes; Conflict Points; System Redundancy
12.5% Sustainability & Quality of Life	A2O Quality of Life; GHG[2] Emissions; Investment in EFCs[3]; TOD[4] Potential; Vehicle Miles Traveled

1. Access to Opportunity; 2. Greenhouse Gas Emissions; 3. Equity Focus Communities; 4. Transit-Oriented Development.

Milestone Schedule and Next Steps



Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

Metro

Board Report

File #: 2026-0799, **File Type:** Informational Report **Agenda Number:** 9.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 18, 2026

SUBJECT: COUNTYWIDE PLANNING MAJOR PROJECT STATUS REPORT

ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE

RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE status report on the Countywide Planning Major Project Status Report.

ISSUE

Countywide Planning and Development's (CPD) major projects status report is prepared by CPD, with support from Program Management, Operations, and Shared Mobility, to provide highlights of capital projects in the planning phases of development. These include transit corridor projects such as rail and bus rapid transit, regional rail, Measure M active transportation corridor projects, ExpressLanes projects, and complete streets and highway improvements.

BACKGROUND

Metro's mission is to provide a world-class transportation system that enhances the quality of life for all who live, work, and play within Los Angeles County. CPD oversees the planning of major capital projects to support this mission. The status report provides a quarterly update on major projects as they advance through alternatives and feasibility analyses, technical analyses for environmental certification, selection of preferred projects, cost estimation and funding development, and evaluation of project delivery methods. Following environmental planning milestones, projects typically transition from CPD to Program Management and are included in the Program Management Major Project Status report, which is provided on a quarterly basis to the Metro Board's Construction Committee.

DISCUSSION

The attached Project Status Report (Attachment A) provides an update on transit, active transportation corridors, ExpressLanes, and complete streets and highway projects in various stages of development.

EQUITY PLATFORM

powered by Legistar™

This report is provided on a regular basis and includes status updates for multiple projects; equity assessments are provided as baseline summaries with subsequent updates when equity conditions change. A refreshed set of baseline assessments were provided in the previous July 2026 quarter. There are no updates or changes to those project equity assessments this quarter.

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.

The projects in this report have mixed outcomes, but taken together, they will likely decrease VMT in LA County. Although some individual projects 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. The VMT outcomes for each project in this report were provided in detail in the previous July 2026 quarter (https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2026-0029/). There are no changes or updates to the VMT outcomes this quarter.

Within this suite of projects, Metro seeks to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips, provide a safe transportation system, multimodal options, improve safety and mobility; and increase accessibility to destinations via transit, cycling, walking, and carpooling. Some of the projects within this status report include items that will ease congestion for cars and trucks, or expand vehicle capacity, resulting in the possibility of increased VMT. Additionally, some projects reported here do not have a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) yet, and therefore the VMT outcome is not yet able to be determined, although Metro staff will ensure that the Board and public will have access to analysis related to VMT during the process of selecting an LPA or when any action on the project is being requested of the Board. Metro has a voter-approved mandate to deliver multimodal projects that enhance mobility while ensuring the efficient movement of people and goods, as required by state law.

*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 development of projects included in this report supports Strategic Plan Goal #1 by delivering high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling.

NEXT STEPS


Staff will continue to advance these projects through the planning phases. The next quarterly update will be provided in February 2027.

ATTACHMENT

Attachment A - Project Status Report

Prepared by: P. Wong, Deputy Executive Officer, Shared Mobility
M. E. Smith, Executive Officer, Complete Streets & Highways
A. Yoh, Senior Executive Officer, Mobility Corridors
A. Barnea, Senior Executive Officer, Multimodal Integrated Planning
D. Mieger, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development
S. Gota, Deputy Chief Operations Officer, Shared Mobility
N. Ferrara, Deputy Chief Planning Officer

Reviewed by: R. Sosa, Chief Planning Officer



Stephanie Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT A

Major Capital Projects Update
Countywide Planning and Development

November 18, 2026
#2026-0799

Presented By

Allison Yoh, Ph.D.
Senior Executive Officer
Systemwide Planning and Analysis

Avital Barnea
Senior Executive Officer
Multimodal Integrated Planning

Metro

Major Corridor Projects



Final Alignment TBD

Major Pillar Projects

A. Sepulveda Transit Corridor

B. Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2

Other Projects in Planning

- Link Union Station
- Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor
- Los Angeles River Path
- Antelope Valley Line - San Fernando Valley/Pacoima Metrolink Station and Mobility Hub

Metro

Sepulveda Transit Corridor

Phase	Environmental Review (California Environmental Quality Act / National Environmental Policy Act)

Recent Activities

- Continued geotechnical investigations
- Advanced design refinements to reflect Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) direction
- August: Published final federal Planning and Environmental Linkages Study
- October/November: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Scoping and Scoping Meetings (one virtual, four in-person) in Sherman Oaks, Culver City, Van Nuys and Westwood

Next Actions

- Concurrently advance CEQA/NEPA clearance focused on LPA, including publication of NEPA Notice of Intent (NOI) and CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP)
- Advance LPA design to inform CEQA/NEPA clearance
- Update cost estimates to reflect LPA design and Initial Operating Segment (IOS)

Challenges

- Navigating federal process with P3 approach



Opportunities


- Assess Public-Private Partnership (P3) as IOS delivery method

Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2

Phase	Environmental Review (National Environmental Policy Act)

Recent Activities

- September/November 2026: Coordinated with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to finalize the federal NEPA decision document, with a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).
- Coordinated with corridor cities and utility owners to finalize Preliminary Engineering (30% level of design)



Next Actions

- December 2026: Anticipate release of FONSI/NEPA pending FTA's approval
- Spring 2027: Advance Right-Of-Way (ROW)/utility coordination

Challenges

- Capital Investment Grants (CIG) Project Development (PD) phase requires completion within 2 years
- Identifying funding to complete the project is ongoing

Opportunities


- Complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to support federal funding eligibility
- Advance project through CIG Project Development
- Coordinate with City of Pico Rivera/Caltrans on Rio Hondo Washington Blvd Bridge to accommodate future E Line extension to Whittier

Link Union Station

Phase	Design

Recent Activities

- Metro was not awarded the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) Federal-State Partnership (FSP) for Intercity Passenger Rail grant; the project is applying for a Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) Grant with the state in November 2026



Next Actions

- Continue preparation of the Administrative Record
- Submission of 100% Design of Phase 2 Supplemental is scheduled for December 2026
- PMO is evaluating LAUS early work improvements within funding streams

Challenges

- Litigation from City of Vernon
- Limited grant funding opportunities in the near future

Opportunities

- In light of the recently executed Confidentiality Agreement, a future meeting is on the horizon with BNSF and City of Vernon

Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor (Segment B)

Phase	Planning / Design

Recent Activities

- Developing new design for ramp connection to LA River to avoid Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way
- Assisting local jurisdictions with 3rd Party coordination - UPRR, US Army Corps of Engineers
- Cities recently completed 60% design



Next Actions

- Continue to assist local jurisdictions with 3rd Party coordination
- Cities anticipate completing 100% design by early 2027

Challenges

- Timely 3rd Party reviews
- UPRR requested unplanned improvements associated with the railroad bridge over the LA River, which will result in delays and/or changes in design

Opportunities

- Continue to monitor potential funding opportunities as needed

Los Angeles River Path

Phase	Environmental Review (California Environmental Quality Act)

Recent Activities

- Continued to review and respond to public comments received on Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
- Finalization of Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to inform recommendation for Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and Initial Operating Segment (IOS)
- Met with City and County representatives to support scope, schedule and budget for LA River Governance Study

Next Actions

- Fall 2026: Staff recommendation to the Board on the LPA, delivery plan, and phased implementation



Challenges

- Multiple jurisdictions and adjacent projects requiring extensive 3rd party coordination

Opportunities

- LA River Governance Study as opportunity to identify lead agencies for LA River Path construction, operations and maintenance

AVL – San Fernando/Pacoima Metrolink Station and Mobility Hub (formerly the ESFV Shared ROW Study)

Phase	Planning / Design

Recent Activities

- August 2026: Executed task order for conceptual planning, environmental clearance and preliminary engineering for the station and mobility hub
- September 2026: Held internal Metro project kick-off meeting and began coordination with key project stakeholders
- Scheduling of stakeholder kick-off meeting with external agencies



Next Actions

- Continue preliminary engineering on rail crossing safety improvements
- Advance conceptual planning for Metrolink Pacoima station, mobility hub, and trackwork
- Continue stakeholder and public engagement

Challenges

- Right of way coordination with Metrolink and the adjacent Brighton to Roxford double track project

Opportunities

- Delivery of early improvements to address safety needs

Quarterly Major Projects Report
Complete Streets & Highway Projects



Presented by Avital Barnea

Senior Executive Officer, Multimodal Integrated Planning

Metro

November 18, 2026


I-605 Corridor Multimodal Improvements Project (I-605 CMIP)
(I-10 to I-105)

Purpose and Need
- Address safety and operational deficiencies, lack of multimodal transportation options.
- 8,697 collisions within I-605 project limits from 2021 – 2024
  - 2,764 injuries and 31 fatalities during this period
  - I-605 collision rate is 27.2% higher than the statewide average in the northbound direction and 17.5% higher in the southbound direction.

Status/Schedule
- Current Phase: Environmental and engineering studies for Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/DEIS) are underway.
- Coordination on local projects and complete street elements is ongoing with the Corridor Cities.
- Draft Communication Plan under review.
- Upcoming milestones: Data collection, preparation of engineering/environmental studies, and review of design packages with Caltrans will proceed through 2027/28 for the development of the initial Draft Project Reports and DEIR/DEIS in 2028/29.

Multimodal Scope
- Provide bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian trail improvements.
- Provide roadway connections to transit stations.
- Include Transportation System Management/ Transportation Demand Management (TSM/TDM) strategies.
- Provide managed lane improvements (High-Occupancy Vehicle lanes and/or ExpressLanes), interchange safety improvements, and direct connectors.

Project Benefits
- Enhance local and regional safety, connectivity, and access; increase person throughput while avoiding residential displacements.



Challenges
- Some partial right-of-way may be needed.
- Project alternatives are partially funded.

Metro & Caltrans Roles
- Metro: Project Sponsor for current phase.
- Caltrans: California Environmental Quality Act/National Environmental Policy Act (CEQA/NEPA) Lead.

I-405 Improvements (I-110 to Wilmington Avenue)

I-405 South Bay Curve Improvements

Purpose and Need

- Address traffic safety and operational needs.
- From April 2020 to March 2023, 612 collisions (278 northbound and 334 southbound) occurred within the project limits, and of these, over 75% were rear-end and sideswipe, indicating congestion.

Status/Schedule

- Current Phase: Environmental Phase- Project team is evaluating and drafting responses to comments received during public circulation
- Community Engagement: A 45-day public circulation of the Draft Environmental Document was from August 5th to September 21st. Two Public Hearings were held on August 20th and August 25th at the Carson Event Center.
- Next Major Milestone: Selection of Preferred Alternative

Multimodal Scope

- Build four auxiliary lanes (about 1 mile in each direction).
- New high-visibility crosswalks, pedestrian flashing beacons, cyclist signage, and new sidewalks
- Transportation System Management/ Transportation Demand Management (TSM/TDM) strategies.

Project Benefits

- Improve overall mobility and safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicular travel.



Challenges

- Construction not fully funded.

Metro & Caltrans Roles


- Metro: Sponsor for environmental phase.
- Caltrans: California Environmental Quality Act/National Environmental Policy Act (CEQA/NEPA) Lead.

Metro

SR-14 North Los Angeles County Safety & Mobility Improvements (Interstate 5 to Agua Dulce Canyon Rd)

Purpose and Need

- Enhance safety, mobility, and multimodal transportation options
- Lane drops and changes in grades cause safety and operational challenges
- From 2020 to 2022, 774 reported collisions, 314 fatal and injury collisions for all four segments



Status/Schedule

- Current Phase: Project Approval/ Environmental Documentation (PA/ED)- Caltrans is reviewing and approving technical studies to support DEIR/EA.
- Community Engagement: Quarterly coordination meetings with corridor stakeholders
- Next Major Milestone: Circulation of Draft Environmental Document expected in Summer 2027.

Multimodal Scope

- Lane gap closures where there are lane drops, Transportation System and Demand Management elements, safety enhancements, complete streets, and wildlife connectivity improvements.

Project Benefits

- Multimodal options to provide increased access, connectivity, and improved safety.
- Improve overall mobility and safety.

Challenges

- Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis and potential mitigations to be determined.

Metro & Caltrans Roles

- Metro: Sponsor for environmental phase.
- Caltrans: California Environmental Quality Act/National Environmental Policy Act (CEQA/NEPA) Lead.

Metro

I-405 ExpressLanes Project – Sepulveda Pass
(ExpressLanes from I-10 to US 101)

Purpose and Need
- Provide additional mobility options within the geographically constrained Project Corridor and provide resources to implement related projects and facilitate future improvements, including multi-modal options, within the Project Corridor.

Status/Schedule
- Current Phase: Environmental phase
- The release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/DEIS) starts on November 13, 2026, and ends on January 19, 2027.
- **3 Public Hearings to be Held:**
  - December 1, 2026 (Virtual)
  - December 2, 2026 (East Valley Adult Center)
  - January 12, 2027 (Westwood United Methodist Church)
- **3 Neighborhood Listening Sessions to be Held:**
  - January 9, 2027 (Newhall Farmers Market & Library)
  - January 10, 2027 (ONEgeneration Encino Farmers Market)
  - January 13, 2027 (Hawthorne Library)

Multimodal Scope
- Environmental document is evaluating potential multimodal elements.

Project Benefits
- Improve traffic flows, person throughput, and trip reliability.
- Incentivizes carpooling and transit
- Increases continuity of the planned regional ExpressLanes network



Challenges
- Construction not fully funded.

Metro

State Route 71 (SR-71)Gap Closure Project Phase 2
(Mission Boulevard to I-10)

Purpose and Need

- Close the last gap in SR-71. The project converts the final 2-mile expressway segment between Mission Blvd and I-10 into a full freeway, removing a major bottleneck and completing the regional HOV network.
- Strengthens a key goods movement link between I-10 and SR-60, In addition the rebuilt bridges give double-stacked freight trains room to pass underneath.
- Replacing aging, seismically deficient structures and adds soundwalls, landscaping and an ADA-compliant pedestrian crossing for Pomona residents.

Status/Schedule

- Current Phase: Design is at 100% PS&E. The ROW certification is scheduled to be completed by end of 2026.
- Community Engagement: Monthly coordination meetings with corridor stakeholders.
- Next Major Milestone: RTL in January 2027, with Construction expected to start in September 2027.

Multimodal Scope

- New HOV lanes in each direction close a gap in the regional HOV network
- A new ADA-compliant overcrossing at 9th Street gives pedestrians, cyclists and people with disabilities a safer way across the freeway.

Project Benefits

- Reduced congestion: shorter travel times for commuters, carpools, and transit.
- Improved freight movement: more reliable goods movement by truck and rail.
- Enhanced safety: modern, seismically sound bridges built to current standards.
- Cleaner, quieter communities: lower emissions, plus soundwalls and landscaping.



Challenges

- Lengthy utility and railroad reviews, UPRR coordination and constraints, and ROW activities could delay the start of construction

Metro & Caltrans Roles

- Metro: Funding, Measure M, TCEP, and INFRA grant
- Caltrans: Construction and CEQA/NEPA Lead.

Metro

I-605/Valley Boulevard Interchange Improvements

91/605/405 Hot Spots Program

Purpose and Need


- Improve safety and mobility due to high collision rates caused by weaving conflicts, freeway and ramp queuing, and congestion(1,126 collisions occurred within the project limits from 2016 to 2018).

Status/Schedule

- San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (COG) is the construction lead.
- Caltrans issued Right of Way Certification & Encroachment Permit to Metro on April 17 and April 20, 2026, respectively.
- Allocation request for construction funds was approved by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) at their 6-26-2026 2026 meeting.
- Target begin construction is March 2027.
- Community Engagement: COG to convene pre-construction public meetings.

Multimodal Scope

- Reconfigure ramps, upgrade and coordinate traffic/railroad signals.
- Upgrade Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) infrastructure (curb ramps, sidewalks, and pedestrian pathways) and rehab adjacent local roads.
- Install pedestrian gates at railroad crossings, special signals, shorter crosswalk, and median island refuge.



Project Benefits

- Reduce collisions, congestion, weaving conflicts, and queuing.
- Enhance pedestrian access and safety.
- Provide better truck access/maneuverability along freeway ramps.
- Improved railroad safety to reduce the potential for pedestrian, vehicular, and train (freight and passenger) conflicts.

Challenge

- Timely execution of COG tasks leading to advertising, awarding and initiating the construction contract after CTC approval.

Metro, Caltrans & COG Roles

- Caltrans provided oversight of environmental and design tasks led by Metro contractor.
- San Gabriel Valley COG to build project.

Metro