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



Board Report

File #: 2025-0167, File Type: Plan

Agenda Number: 12.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE MAY 14, 2025

SUBJECT: FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN FOR THE NORTH HOLLYWOOD TO PASADENA BUS RAPID TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION

ADOPT the First/Last Mile Plan for the North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Project (Attachment A).

<u>ISSUE</u>

The North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Corridor Project First/Last Mile (FLM) Plan (Plan) (Attachment A) was prepared by Metro in coordination with local jurisdictions and community members to propose safety and accessibility improvements to encourage more people to walk, bike, and roll to transit. The Plan includes a project list of FLM improvements for four BRT stations along a 19-mile route, including North Hollywood Station (City of Los Angeles), Olive/ Riverside Station (City of Burbank), Central/Lexington Station (City of Glendale), and Colorado/Lake Station (City of Pasadena). Adoption of the Plan by the Metro Board better positions FLM improvements for funding and implementation and encourages local agencies to design and construct FLM projects to create safe, accessible BRT stations for all transit riders.

BACKGROUND

The North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Project is a 19-mile BRT corridor with 22 stations. The BRT will serve as a key regional connection between the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys and traverse the communities of North Hollywood, Burbank, Glendale, Eagle Rock, and Pasadena. The project is currently in design with an anticipated opening date of early 2028. The project is anticipated to attract approximately 30,000 riders daily when it opens. It aims to meet the priorities set out in Metro's Vision 2028 strategic plan to offer high-quality mobility options and outstanding trip experiences while enhancing the quality of life of the communities it serves. To encourage more people to walk, bike, and roll to the future BRT stations and address safety issues, the FLM Plan presents a comprehensive project list to improve safety, comfort, and access for people walking, biking, and rolling to transit.

The Plan includes a list of pedestrian and wheel projects that improve safety, comfort, and access to

the four selected North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Project stations. Pedestrian projects are identified within the half-mile radius around each station, and wheel projects (including bicycles, scooters, and other modes of non-motorized wheeled transportation) are identified within the 3-radius around each station.

The Metro FLM methodology, described in the 2021 First/Last Mile Guidelines, was used as the basis for Plan development. A summary of the planning steps are as follows:

- Existing Conditions Analysis
- Technical and Community Walk/Wheel Audits and Pathway Network Development
- Community Engagement
- Project Development
- Draft and Final FLM Plan

The Plan includes the following core products and supporting documents detailing the planning process in a series of appendices. The full Plan is available in Attachment A.

- Pathway Maps with FLM projects on Primary Pathways
- Project Lists
- Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimates for FLM projects
- Conceptual Illustrations

DISCUSSION

This FLM Plan was developed in accordance with established Metro Board policies, including the FLM Guidelines and produces a FLM plan for four stations, one station in each jurisdiction: North Hollywood Station (City of Los Angeles), Olive/ Riverside Station (City of Burbank), Central/Lexington Station (City of Glendale), and Colorado/Lake Station (City of Pasadena).

Due to differences between BRT and rail transit projects, the FLM Guidelines' approach to FLM planning for BRT projects differs in some respects. Of note, BRT projects do not require a local 3% contribution, and as such lack the specific FLM implementation incentive allowing credit toward the 3% requirement. FLM planning for BRT is conducted as a planning service and as encouragement for local implementation. As called for in the FLM Guidelines, the Plan covers a subset of BRT stations, determined through a technical assessment and coordination with local jurisdictions to identify high priority stops, as described in the 2021 FLM Guidelines. As such, staff conducted a detailed technical analysis to select the four stations for FLM planning. Additional details are provided in the Station Selection Memo, available in Attachment B - FLM Plan Appendix (Appendix A, Station Selection Memo, p.1).

Plan Summary and Key Findings

Of the 22 BRT stations, four stations, one in each jurisdiction, were identified based on a technical analysis of key criteria and coordination with local jurisdictions, including population and job density, projected ridership, pedestrian and bicyclist collisions, Metro Equity Focus Community (EFC) classification, points of interests, existing and planned high-quality bike facilities, identified FLM challenges, and alignment with city plans. The BRT stations were ranked using data from each

File #: 2025-0167, File Type: Plan

category, and stations with the highest scores from each metric were selected for the FLM Plan. The selected stations were presented to each jurisdiction for feedback and concurrence. Each selected station represents the highest need for improved safety conditions for pedestrians and wheel users. The selected stations have a wide range of challenges, including poor sidewalk conditions, lack of shade, unsafe crossings along freeway overpasses, complex intersections, incomplete bike networks, unsafe vehicle speeds, and lack of adequate pedestrian lighting, and others.

In Los Angeles, the North Hollywood station received the highest score of 60, followed by the Vineland/Hesby station with a score of 56. The North Hollywood station scored well in the categories of ridership, safety, and planning context. In Burbank, the Olive/Riverside station also scored 60, followed by the Olive/San Fernando station with a score of 56. The Olive/Riverside station performed well in the activity and planning context categories. In Glendale, the Central/Lexington station scored 76, ahead of the Broadway/Glendale station, which scored 56. Central/Lexington station scored well in the activity and planning context categories. Colorado/Lake station in Pasadena scored 84, compared to Memorial Park's score of 76. Colorado/Lake scored well in the planning context category. Attachment B (Appendix A, Station Identification Analysis Memo, p. 1) contains additional details on the station identification scores. A summary of scores for each station is provided in Attachment C.

The Plan presents a comprehensive project list designed to improve safety conditions and accessibility, ultimately enhancing the overall experience for transit riders of all ages and abilities. Projects are identified along primary and secondary pathways connecting to each selected station. A primary pathway offers a direct route to a station, typically located on a major street with high foot traffic. A secondary pathway may intersect with a primary pathway, providing connections through smaller, local streets.

In total, 381 projects were identified, including 250 walk projects and 131 wheel projects. Each station's total number of projects varies by existing conditions, land uses, and input received by local agency staff and local stakeholders. The full list of projects for each station is included in the Plan, available in Attachment B (Appendix H, Project List and Cost Estimates, p. 253).

The Plan includes detailed findings for each of the four selected stations, available in Attachment B (Appendix B, Existing Conditions Analysis, p. 9).

Process

Following community engagement and coordination with city staff, the project team developed a list of FLM projects and conceptual illustrations on primary and secondary pathways for each station. The team identified projects based on community needs and city staff recommendations, resulting in a set of FLM projects on primary and secondary pathways.

The full Plan process documentation is available in Attachment A (About the Plan, p.10).

Coordination with Local Agencies

FLM projects require close coordination with the local agencies that control the rights-of-way around Metro stations. At the onset of the planning process, the project team met with city staff from the City

File #: 2025-0167, File Type: Plan

of Burbank, City of Los Angeles, City of Glendale, and City of Pasadena to reach concurrence on the station selection and invited staff to participate in technical and community walk audits to assess the station areas. In the later phases of the plan development, the project team held office hours with each local agency to review pathway networks and engagement outcomes. Metro also held working sessions with all cities to review the draft project lists and conceptual designs. Metro tracked all city comments and addressed them in the final FLM Plan.

Metro staff also met with Caltrans staff and provided a review period for input on the project lists and conceptual designs. Metro also provided updates at the Arroyo-Verdugo Joint Powers Authority (AVJPA) and a presentation to the Glendale City Council, upon staff request.

Following the adoption of the FLM Plan, Metro will continue to coordinate with cities as they choose to advance FLM projects. Staff anticipate commencing post-plan activities with cities to provide technical assistance, such as identifying funding sources and grant writing assistance, as described in the FLM Guidelines. Cities that choose to advance FLM projects are eligible for technical assistance upon request. Cities that implement FLM projects identified in the FLM Plan are responsible for the design, construction, operations, and maintenance of those projects.

The Plan includes a section that details public agency coordination, which can be found in Attachment A (Local Community Engagement and Agency Coordination, p. 28), as well as a section outlining available grant funding sources and technical assistance for implementing FLM projects, available in Attachment A, (Next Steps, p. 132).

Community Engagement

The project team included strategic partnerships with four community-based organizations (CBOs): Bike LA, Los Angeles Walks, Day One, and Walk Bike Glendale. The CBOs served as liaisons between the project team and community members in each jurisdiction. Their local knowledge of the community was invaluable in informing the project's engagement plan and identifying popular community events for engagement activities.

The outreach conducted was comprised of 12 key engagement activities, including four community walk audits, four pop-up events, and four presentations at standing community meetings. In addition to these engagement events, the project team conducted an online map-based survey to ensure broad and inclusive outreach efforts for those who could not attend in-person events that received 202 responses. Additionally, the project team also used a targeted outreach approach by attending community meetings in each jurisdiction of engaged residents ranging from transit to sustainability advocates. The community feedback resulted in diverse responses representing the key needs of transit riders at each station, translating to a robust project list that reflects community needs. Community participation was integral to the decision-making process and crafting a project list that truly reflects the needs and aspirations of each community. Following Board adoption of the FLM Plan, Metro will continue to coordinate with community members and CBO partners as cities choose to advance FLM projects.

The Plan includes a Community Engagement Summary Memo, available in Attachment B (Appendix E, Community Engagement Findings Summary, p.110).

Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety

To analyze pedestrian and bicyclist safety in the project area, intersections and corridors were analyzed to identify collision data within each jurisdiction. Among the four jurisdictions, Glendale, Los Angeles, and Pasadena reported the highest number of pedestrian/motor vehicle and bicyclist/motor vehicle collisions, based on data from the Statewide Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) between January 1, 2018, and December 31, 2023. The recommendations in the Plan aim to address safety equitably across all jurisdictions. High traffic speeds and volumes on major arterial streets contribute to unsafe streets along much of the transit corridor and specific pedestrian and bicyclist safety hotspots identified in the safety analysis Additional details are available in the Metro Safety Analysis Tool in Attachment B (Appendix C, Safety Analysis Tool, p. 60). The Plan proposes projects that would improve the safety on the streets where these collisions happen and include feedback from the community. This includes improvements such as traffic calming and high visibility crosswalks, which were a priority in community feedback. Additionally, lack of shade and need for increased tree canopy was consistent across all four stations. FLM improvements such as landscaping and shade and bus stop improvements can combat the impacts of extreme heat especially within equity-focused communities.

Each selected station area has various safety and accessibility challenges. The North Hollywood station features complex intersections and underpasses, creating challenges for pedestrians and cyclists. Community feedback resulted in project recommendations to improve multi-modal connections and enhance safety. At the Olive/ Riverside station connectivity is hindered by the SR-134 freeway which presents opportunities to improve pedestrian and cyclist access in this area. Community feedback also emphasizes the need for increased shade and tree canopy in the station area. Much of the neighborhood surrounding Central/Lexington station is classified as a Metro EFC and presents a key opportunity to improve safety and accessibility. Lastly, community feedback for the Colorado/Lake Station indicated a need for additional shade and traffic calming treatments to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists, which is reflected in the project list.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

The recommended action has no direct safety impact. This Plan presents project proposals that promote improved safety for people walking or using non-motorized wheeled transportation around future North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT stations.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Impact to Budget

Adoption of this Plan has no impact on the budget. Preparation of the Plan is included in the FY26 adopted budget at project number 471401, task 01.01.

Project implementation is led by local jurisdictions; Metro support in implementation may come in the form of grant writing assistance and eligibility in future Metro Active Transportation (MAT) funding cycles.

EQUITY PLATFORM

The Plan proposes projects that will improve safety, comfort, and accessibility for the most vulnerable users of our streets - pedestrians and bicyclists. The North Hollywood to Pasadena Transit Corridor reflects a broad user base across four jurisdictions. Based on the online survey data, and to capture the voices of these communities and engage those who are often underrepresented in public participation processes, engagement materials were provided in English, Spanish and Armenian. There are several census tracts located in Metro EFCs, notably in the Cities of Los Angeles and Glendale. Multiple census tracts in the City of Pasadena displayed higher amounts of environmental burdens under the California Healthy Places Index and multiple census tracts in the City of Burbank displayed an above average pollution burden under CalEnviroScreen.

The plan was developed with extensive community feedback and participation from CBOs, which is summarized in the Community Engagement section of this report. More details are available in Attachment B (Appendix E, Community Engagement Findings Summary, p. 110). The partnership with CBOs was invaluable, ensuring a thorough engagement process that reached community groups typically not involved in planning. Additionally, CBO partners contributed valuable input to strategize ways to maximize engagement across all efforts, including in-person meetings, online outreach, community pop-up events, and virtual community meetings.

If cities decide to move forward with the projects proposed in the plan, additional community outreach is recommended to ensure that the benefits of the transit project are equitably distributed. Projects the cities plan to implement will be constructed, operated, and maintained by those cities.

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. The item supports Metro's systemwide strategy to reduce VMT through planning activities that will improve and further encourage transit ridership and using active transportation including walking, biking, use of mobility devices, scooters, skateboards, other non-car mode of travel. Metro's Board-adopted VMT reduction targets were designed to build on the success of existing investments, and this item aligns with those objectives.

*Based on population estimates from the United States Census and VMT estimates from the highway performance monitoring system data between 2001-2019.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The recommended actions support two Strategic Plan goals:

• Deliver outstanding trip experiences (Goal #2): the FLM plan recognizes that trip experience

includes time getting to and from transit stations. The Plan prepares projects that make trip experiences safer, more comfortable, and more accessible.

• Transform LA County through collaboration and leadership (Goal #4): Metro is uniquely situated to prepare FLM plans that span jurisdictional boundaries. In adopting this Plan, Metro is leading this area by preparing FLM projects at future North Hollywood, Olive/Riverside, Cental/Lexington, and Colorado/Lake Stations.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could decide not to approve the FLM Plan. This is not recommended for the following reasons:

- Previous Board action (Motion 14.1, 2016) directs FLM projects to be incorporated into transit corridor project delivery; and
- An adopted Plan better positions the FLM projects for future grant funding opportunities.

NEXT STEPS

Following the adoption of the FLM Plan, staff anticipate commencing post-plan activities with cities to provide technical support and grant writing assistance to secure funding to advance FLM projects to design and construction. Cities that choose to advance FLM projects toward design and construction upon request are eligible for technical assistance. Cities who implement projects identified in FLM Plans are responsible for the construction, operations, and maintenance of those projects.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - First/Last Mile Plan for North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Attachment B - First/Last Mile Plan for North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor - Appendix Attachment C - North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor First/Last Mile Station Identification Analysis Summary

Prepared by:	 Isabelle Garvanne, Senior Transportation Planner, First/Last Mile Planning, (213) 547- 4245 Hannah Brunelle, Senior Director, First/Last Mile Planning, (213) 922-4847 Jacob Lieb, Deputy Executive Officer, First/Last Mile Planning, (213) 922-4272 Avital Barnea, Senior Executive Officer, Multimodal Integrated Planning, (213) 547-4317 Nicole Ferrara, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-4812
Reviewed by:	Ray Sosa, Chief Planning Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 547-4274

File #: 2025-0167, File Type: Plan

Agenda Number: 12.

ie N. Wi ph Ste ľ Chief Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT A

First/Last Mile Plan for North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor

Document Available Online at:

Link

ATTACHMENT B

First/Last Mile Plan for North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor - Appendix

Document Available Online at:

<u>Link</u>

Attachment C

North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit First/Last Mile Plan Station Identification Analysis Summary*

*full details are available in Attachment B: Station Identification Analysis Memo

North HollywoodVineland/HesbyEagle Rock PlazaColorado/Eagle RockColorado/To wnsendActivity412000Ridership84000Safety1612400Equity44400Planning Context2824121612Total6056201612City of BurbankOlive/RiversideOlive/San FernandoGlenoaks/Ala medaOlive/VerdugoOlive/Lake miAlameda/Nao miActivity1288404Safety044040Activity1288408Ridership4404040Equity0128040Planning Context442824322812Total605644403624City of Glendale		s are available in F		s Angeles			1				
North HollywoodVincland/HeskyPlazaRockwinsendActivity41200Safety16112400Safety16112400Equity44400Planing2824121612Context28291612Total605201612Total60520010Rodership68408Activity128840Rodership44040Safety01/ve/KamFernando63Rodership4404Safety01/ve/Kam64Planing4403Context44282228Planing65440Context4032Total6644Context403Ridership81208Rodership81204Rodership81214Safety2020244Rodership81214Rodership81214Rodership81214Rodership81214Rodership <th></th> <th colspan="6"></th> <th></th>											
Ridership 8 4 0 0 Safety 16 12 4 0 0 Equity 4 4 4 0 0 Equity 4 4 4 0 0 Planning 28 24 12 16 12 Total 60 55 20 16 12 City of Burbank Olive/Riverside Planning Alameda/Nao Ridership 4 4 0 4 4 Activity 12 8 8 4 0 Safety 0 4 4 0 4 0 Safety 0 4 4 0 4 0 Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 Context 6 76 8 76 6 76 6 76 6 Contaxt 8 12<		North Hollywood	Vineland/Hesby								
Safety 16 12 4 0 Equity 4 4 4 0 Planning 28 24 12 16 12 Total 60 56 20 16 12 City of Burbank Alameda/Nao Olive/Riverside Fernando Glenoaks/Ala Olive/Lake Alameda/Nao Ridership 4 4 0 4 0 4 Safety 0 12 8 8 4 0 4 Safety 0 12 8 0 4 0 4 0 Equity 0 12 8 0 4 0 4 0 Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 12 12 16 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 12 10 12 10 12 10 12 10 12 10 12 10 12	Activity	4	12	0	0	0					
Equity 4 4 4 0 0 Planning Context 28 24 12 16 12 Total 66 56 20 16 12 Total 66 56 20 16 12 Olive/Riverside Olive/San Fernando Glenoaks/Ala meda Olive/Verdugo Olive/Lake mi Alameda/Nao mi Activity 12 8 8 4 0 4 Safety 0 4 4 0 4 0 Planning Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 66 56 44 40 36 24 Dealty 0 12 8 0 4 0 Planning Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Central/Lexingto n Broadway/Glend Broadway/Bra dive Glenoaks/Gran difto Glenoaks/Pa digo Enoadway/Ver difto Glenoaks/Wes difto Me	Ridership	8	4	0	0	0					
Planning Context 28 24 12 16 12 Total 60 56 20 16 12 City of Burbank Activity 12 8 4 0 8 Activity 12 8 8 4 0 8 Ridership 4 4 0 4 0 4 Safety 0 4 4 0 4 0 Equity 0 12 8 0 4 0 Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 City of Glendale City of Glendale City of Glendale City of Glendaks/Gran Glenoaks/Pa Broadway/Ver Glenoaks/Wes Cantext Cativity 20 20 20 4 4 0 <th colspan<b<="" td=""><td>Safety</td><td>16</td><td>12</td><td>4</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></th>	<td>Safety</td> <td>16</td> <td>12</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Safety	16	12	4	0	0				
Context 28 24 12 16 12 Total 60 56 20 16 12 City of Burbank Olive/Riverside Fernando Glenoaks/Ala meda Olive/Verdugo Olive/Lake Alameda/Nao mi Activity 12 8 8 4 0 8 Ridership 4 4 0 4 0 4 Safety 0 4 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 Context Broadway/Glend Broadway/Fa Glenoaks/Gran nd Glenoaks/Pa Broadway/Ver dugo Glenoaks/Wes n Ridership 8 12 0 4 4 0 Safety 20 20 20	Equity	4	4	4	0	0					
Total 60 56 20 16 12 City of Burbank Olive/Riverside Fernando Glenoaks/Ala meda Olive/Nerdugo Olive/Lake Mameda/Nao meda Activity 12 8 4 0 4 Safety 0 4 4 0 4 Safety 0 12 8 4 0 4 Genoaks/Ma 0 4 0 4 0 4 Safety 0 12 8 0 4 0 Planning 0 12 8 0 4 0 Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 Context Broadway/Ver of Glendals Glenoaks/Gran drivew Glenoaks/Pa drivew Broadway/Ver of Glenoaks/Ves drivew 6 Ridership 8 12 0 4 4 0 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>											
City of Burbank Olive/Riverside Fernando Glenoaks/Ala meda Olive/Verdugo Olive/Lake Alameda/Nao mi Activity 12 8 8 4 0 8 Ridership 4 4 0 4 0 4 Safety 0 4 4 0 4 0 Equity 0 12 8 0 4 0 Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 55 44 40 36 24 Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 55 44 40 36 24 Central/Lexingto Broadway/Glend ale Broadway/Bra dview Glenoaks/Pa cific Broadway/Ver dugo Glenoaks/Wes Ridership 8 12 0 4 4 0 Safety 20 20 20 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>											
Olive/Riverside Olive/San Fernando Glenoaks/Ala meda Olive/Verdugo Olive/Lake Alameda/Nao mi Activity 12 8 8 4 0 8 Activity 12 8 8 4 0 8 Safety 0 4 4 0 4 0 4 Safety 0 12 8 0 4 0 4 Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 City of Glendale City of Glendale City of Glendale City of Glendale Central/Lexingto Broadway/Glend Broadway/Ra Glenoaks/Gran Glenoaks/Pa Broadway/Ver Glenoaks/Wes nd 12 0 4 4 0 36 32 Activity 20 20 20 4 4 4 <t< td=""><td>Total</td><td>60</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>12</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Total	60				12					
Olive/Riverside Fernando meda Olive/Ledugo Olive/Lake mi Activity 112 8 8 4 0 8 Ridership 4 0 4 0 4 0 8 Safety 0 0 14 0 4 0 4 0 Equity 0 0 12 8 0 4 0 6 Planning 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 Contral/Lexingto Broadway/Grad Glenoaks/Grad Glenoaks/Pa Glenoaks/Pa Magon/ file 4 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10					< Comparison of the second sec						
Activity 12 8 8 4 0 8 Ridership 4 4 0 4 0 4 Safety 0 4 4 0 4 0 Equity 0 12 8 0 4 0 Planning 0 12 8 0 4 0 Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 City of Glendale City of Glendaks/Gran ale Glenoaks/Pa offic Broadway/Ver digo Glenoaks/Wes offic 8 8 Ridership 8 12 0 4 4 0 5 Safety 20 20 20 4 4 12 16 4 Memorial Park Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Lake 5 2 4 4 4 12 Memorial Park Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Hill 4 <td></td> <td>Olive/Diverside</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Olive/Diverside									
Ridership 4 4 0 4 0 4 Safety 0 4 4 0 4 0 Equity 0 12 8 0 4 0 Planning 4 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 City of Glendale City of Glendale Central/Lexingto Broadway/Glend Broadway/Broadway/Bra Glenoaks/Gran Glenoaks/Pa Broadway/Ver Glenoaks/Wes Activity 20 4 12 0 8 8 16	A otiviti (
Safety 0 4 4 0 4 0 Equity 0 12 8 0 4 0 Equity 0 12 8 0 4 0 Planning Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 Context 40 36 24 Central/Lexingto n Broadway/Glend ale Broadway/Ra dview Glenoaks/Gran dview Glenoaks/Pa cific Broadway/Ver dugo Glenoaks/Wes n Activity 20 4 12 0 8 8 Ridership 8 12 0 4 4 0 Safety 20 20 20 24 16 4 Otal 76 56 5 40 40 40 Colorado/Lake Memorial Park Robles Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Hill Activity </td <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	-										
Equity 0 12 8 0 4 0 Planning Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 City of Glendale City of Glendale Central/Lexingto n Broadway/Glend ale Broadway/Bra dview Glenoaks/Cran cific Broadway/Ver dugo Glenoaks/Wes n Activity 20 4 12 0 8 8 Ridership 8 12 0 4 4 0 6 Safety 20 20 20 4 8 16 6 Equity 8 12 8 8 4 12 Planning Colorado/Lake Memorial Park Station Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Hill A Activity 8 8 12 0 8 8 8 Safety 16 20 20 8 8 <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4</td> <td></td>	-	-		-			4				
Planing Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 City of Glendale Central/Lexingto n Broadway/Glend ale Broadway/Bra nd Glenoaks/Gran dview Glenoaks/Pa cific Broadway/Ver dugo Glenoaks/Wes n Activity 20 4 12 0 8 8 1 Activity 20 4 12 0 8 8 1 Activity 20 20 20 4 8 16 1 Equity 8 12 8 8 4 12 Planning Context 20 8 12 24 16 4 Total 76 56 52 40 40 40 Total 76 56 52 40 40 4	-	-		-			0				
Context 44 28 24 32 28 12 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 Total 60 56 44 40 36 24 Image: Context of Glendale Broadway/Glend ale Broadway/Bra on the state of the state		0	12	0	0	4	0				
City of GlendaleCentral/Lexingto nBroadway/Glend aleBroadway/Bra ndGlenoaks/Gran dviewGlenoaks/Pa cificBroadway/Ver dugoGlenoaks/Wes nActivity20412088Ridership8120440Safety2020204816Equity81288412Planning Context2081224164Colorado/Lake StationMemorial Park StationColorado/Lake RoblesColorado/HillActivity881208Safety162020812Activity881200Ridership81288Safety1620208Equity01240Planning Context52242020		44	28	24	32	28	12				
Central/Lexingto nBroadway/Glend aleBroadway/Bra ndGlenoaks/Gran dviewGlenoaks/Pa cificBroadway/Ver dugoGlenoaks/Wes nActivity20412088Ridership8120440Safety2020204816Equity81288412Planning Context2081224164Total765652404040City of Pasadena RoblesMemorial Park StationColorado/Los RoblesColorado/HillActivity88120Ridership81288Safety1620208Equity01240	Total	60	56	44	40	36	24				
n ale nd dview cific dugo n Activity 20 4 12 0 8 8 Ridership 8 12 0 4 4 0 0 Safety 20 20 20 4 8 16 0 Equity 8 12 8 8 4 12 0 Planning 20 8 12 24 16 4 0 Context 20 8 12 24 16 4 0 Total 76 56 52 40 40 40 City of Pasadem Kolorado/Lake Memorial Park Station Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Hill Activity 8 12 0 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 12 16 </th <th></th> <th colspan="10">City of Glendale</th>		City of Glendale									
Activity 20 4 12 0 8 8 Ridership 8 12 0 4 4 0 Safety 20 20 20 4 8 16 Equity 8 12 8 8 4 12 Planning Context 20 8 12 24 16 4 Total 76 56 52 40 40 40 City of Pasadena Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Hill Activity 8 8 12 0 Ridership 8 12 8 8 Safety 116 20 20 8 Safety 116 20 20 8 Planning Context 52 24 20 20		Central/Lexingto	Broadway/Glend	Broadway/Bra	Glenoaks/Gran	Glenoaks/Pa	Broadway/Ver	Glenoaks/Wes			
Ridership 8 12 0 4 4 0 Safety 20 20 20 20 4 8 16 Equity 8 12 8 8 4 12 Planning Context 20 8 12 24 16 4 Total 76 56 52 40 40 40 City of Pasadem Colorado/Lake Memorial Park Station Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Hill Activity 8 12 8 8 8 Safety 16 20 20 8 8 Safety 16 20 20 8 8 Equity 0 12 4 0 Planning Context 52 24 20 20		n	ale	nd	dview	cific	dugo	n			
Safety 20 20 20 20 4 8 16 Equity 8 12 8 8 4 12 Planning Context 20 8 12 24 16 4 Total 76 56 52 40 40 40 City of Pasadena Colorado/Lake Memorial Park Station Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Hill Activity 8 8 12 0 Ridership 8 12 8 8 Safety 16 20 20 8 Equity 0 12 4 0 Planning Context 52 24 20 20	Activity	20	4	12	0	8	8				
Equity 8 12 8 8 4 12 Planning Context 20 8 12 24 16 4 Total 76 56 52 40 40 40 City of Pasadena Colorado/Lake Memorial Park Station Colorado/Los Robles Colorado/Hill Activity 8 8 12 0 Ridership 8 12 8 8 Safety 16 20 20 8 Equity 0 12 4 0 Planning Context 52 24 20 20	Ridership	8	12	0	4	4	0				
Planning Context2081224164Total765652404040City of PasadenaCity of PasadenaColorado/LakeMemorial Park StationColorado/Los RoblesColorado/HillActivity88120Ridership81288Safety1620208Equity01240Planning Context52242020	Safety	20	20	20	4	8	16				
Context2081224164Total765652404040City of PasadenaColorado/LakeMemorial Park StationColorado/Los RoblesColorado/HillActivity88120Ridership81288Safety1620208Equity01240Planning Context52242020		8	12	8	8	4	12				
Total765652404040City of PasadenaColorado/LakeMemorial Park StationColorado/Los RoblesColorado/HillActivity88120Ridership81288Safety1620208Equity01240Planning Context52242020											
City of PasadenaMemorial Park Colorado/LakeColorado/Los RoblesColorado/HillActivity88120Ridership81288Safety1620208Equity01240Planning Context52242020											
Memorial Park StationColorado/Los RoblesColorado/HillActivity88120Ridership81288Safety1620208Equity01240Planning Context52242020	Total	76			40	40	40				
Colorado/LakeStationRoblesColorado/HillActivity88120Ridership81288Safety1620208Equity01240Planning Context52242020											
Activity88120Ridership81288Safety1620208Equity01240Planning Context52242020		Colorado/Lake			Colorado/Hill						
Ridership 8 12 8 8 Safety 16 20 20 8 Equity 0 12 4 0 Planning Context 52 24 20 20	Activity										
Safety 16 20 20 8 Equity 0 12 4 0 Planning 52 24 20 20											
Equity01240Planning Context52242020	-										
PlanningContext52242020	-										
Context 52 24 20 20			12	Т	0						
Total 84 76 64 36		52	24	20	20						
	Total	84	76	64	36						



Metro

North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit Corridor First/Last Mile Plan

MAY 2025

FILE 2025-0167

Staff Recommendation

CONSIDER:

> ADOPTING First/Last Mile Plan for North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit Corridor

Stations Studied:

- North Hollywood (City of Los Angeles)
- > Olive/Riverside (City of Burbank)
- > Central/Lexington (City of

Glendale)

> Colorado/Lake (City of Pasadena)



Station Analysis and Selection

- City of Los Angeles
 - North Hollywood 60
 - Vineland/Hesby 56
 - Eagle Rock Plaza 20
 - Colorado/Eagle Rock 16
 - Colorado/Townsend 12
- City of Burbank
 - Olive/Riverside 60
 - Olive/San Fernando 56
 - Glenoaks/Alameda 44
 - Olive/Verdugo 40
 - Olive/Lake 36
 - Alameda/Naomi 24

- City of Glendale
 - Central/Lexington 76
 - Broadway/Glendale 56
 - Broadway/Brand 52
 - Glenoaks/Grandview 40
 - Glenoaks/Pacific 40
 - Broadway/Verdugo 40
 - Glenoaks/Western 36
- City of Pasadena
 - Colorado/Lake 84
 - Memorial Park Station 76
 - Colorado/Los Robles 64
 - Colorado/Hill 36

First/Last Mile Methodology and Process

Followed methodology established in the Board-adopted 2021 FLM Guidelines



Equity-Based Participatory Approach

Community Engagement

- Partnership with four CBOs:
 - LA Walks
 - Bike LA
 - Day One
 - Walk/Bike Glendale
- Community walk and bike audits (47 participants)
- Outreach pop-ups (240 participants)
- Community meetings (40 participants)
- Online survey (202 responses)

Local Jurisdiction Coordination

- Office Hours
 - Reviewed pathway maps, existing conditions, and engagement outcomes
- Project List and Conceptual Design Review
 - Reviewed and incorporated feedback



First/Last Mile Plan Results and Next Steps

Projects that improve safety, comfort, and access for pedestrians and wheeled users to stations.

Typical project types:

- New and improved sidewalks
- High visibility crosswalks
- Traffic calming
- Shade and landscaping
- High-quality bike facilities



Next Steps:

• Assist and coordinate implementation activities