



**Metro®**

*Watch online: <http://boardagendas.metro.net>  
Listen by phone: Dial 888-251-2949 and enter Access Code:  
8231160# (English) or 4544724# (Español)*

**Agenda - Final**

**Wednesday, September 15, 2021**

**10:30 AM**

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

## **Planning and Programming Committee**

*Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker, Chair*

*Ara Najarian, Vice Chair*

*Kathryn Barger*

*James Butts*

*Hilda Solis*

*Tony Tavares, non-voting member*

*Stephanie Wiggins, Chief Executive Officer*

**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD 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 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 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.

**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 Secretary 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 [www.metro.net](http://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 before an agency involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use, including all contracts (other than competitively bid, labor, or personal employment contracts), shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contributions in an amount of more than \$250 made within the preceding 12 months by the party, or his or her agent, to any officer of the agency, additionally PUC Code Sec. 130051.20 requires that no member accept a contribution of over ten dollars (\$10) in value or amount from a construction company, engineering firm, consultant, legal firm, or any company, vendor, or business entity that has contracted with the authority in the preceding four years. Persons required to make this disclosure shall do so by filling out a "Disclosure of Contribution" form which is available at the LACMTA Board and Committee Meetings. 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 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please telephone (213) 922-4600 between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Our TDD line is (800) 252-9040.

## 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 or (323) 466-3876. Live Public Comment Instructions can also be translated if requested 72 hours in advance.



**323.466.3876**

x2 *Español (Spanish)*

x3 *中文 (Chinese)*

x4 *한국어 (Korean)*

x5 *Tiếng Việt (Vietnamese)*

x6 *日本語 (Japanese)*

x7 *русский (Russian)*

x8 *Հայերէն (Armenian)*

## HELPFUL PHONE NUMBERS

Copies of Agendas/Record of Board Action/Recordings of Meetings - (213) 922-4880 (Records Management Department)

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

Internet Access to Agendas - [www.metro.net](http://www.metro.net)

TDD line (800) 252-9040

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

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

Live public comment can only be given by telephone.

The Committee Meeting begins at 10:30 AM Pacific Time on September 15, 2021; you may join the call 5 minutes prior to the start of the meeting.

Dial-in: 888-251-2949 and enter  
English Access Code: 8231160#  
Spanish Access Code: 4544724#

***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 solo se pueden dar por telefono.

La Reunion de la Junta comienza a las 10:30 AM, hora del Pacifico, el 15 de Septiembre de 2021. Puedes unirte a la llamada 5 minutos antes del comienso de la junta.

Marque: 888-251-2949 y ingrese el codigo  
Codigo de acceso en ingles: 8231160#  
Codigo de acceso en espanol: 4544724#

***Los comentarios del público se tomara 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," OR "GENERAL COMMENT."

Email: BoardClerk@metro.net

Post Office Mail:

Board Administration

One Gateway Plaza

MS: 99-3-1

Los Angeles, CA 90012

## CALL TO ORDER

## ROLL CALL

APPROVE Consent Calendar Items: 5, 6, and 7.

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

## CONSENT CALENDAR

5. **SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM &  
MEASURE R TRANSIT INVESTMENTS PROGRAM  
UPDATE - SOUTH BAY SUBREGION**

[2021-0527](#)

### RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING:

1. Programming of an additional \$2,157,200 within the capacity of Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 50), as shown in Attachment A;
2. Programming of an additional \$28,498,120 within the capacity of Measure M MSP - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 66), as shown in Attachment C;
3. Programming of an additional \$113,230,555 within the capacity of Measure R South Bay Transit Investments Program, shown in Attachment D; and

B. DELEGATING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee the authority to:

1. Amend Measure M MSP and Measure R Transit Investments Program funding agreements to modify the scope of work of projects and project development phases consistent with eligibility requirements;
2. Administratively extend funding agreement lapse dates for Measure M MSP and Measure R Transit Investments Program funding agreements to meet environmental, design, right-of-way, and

construction time frames; and

- C. AUTHORIZING the CEO or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and/or amendments for approved projects.

**Attachments:**      [Attachment A - Transpo. System Mobility Imp. Prgrm \(Ex. Line 50\) Project List](#)  
[Attachment B - South Bay Highway Ops. Imp. Prgrm \(Ex. Line 63\) Project List](#)  
[Attachment C - Transpo. System Mobility Imp. Prgrm \(Ex. Line 66\) Project List](#)  
[Attachment D - Measure R Transit Investments Program Project List](#)

**6. SUBJECT:      MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM      [2021-0526](#)**  
**UPDATE - ARROYO VERDUGO SUBREGION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

- A. REPROGRAMMING of projects in the Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Modal Connectivity and Complete Streets Program, as shown in Attachment A; and
- B. DELEGATING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee the authority to:
1. Amend Measure M MSP funding agreements to modify the scope of work of projects and project development phases consistent with eligibility requirements;
  2. Administratively extend funding agreement lapse dates for Measure M MSP funding agreements to meet environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction time frames; and
- C. AUTHORIZING the CEO or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and/or amendments for approved projects.

**Attachments:**      [Attachment A - Modal Connectivity and Complete Streets Project List](#)  
[Attachment B - Transit Program Project List](#)  
[Attachment C - Active Transportation Project List](#)

**7. SUBJECT:      CULVER CITY STATION ADJACENT DEVELOPMENT      [2021-0449](#)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer or their designee to execute amendments to a Perpetual Easement Agreement and Perpetual Reciprocal Easement Agreement, accept Grant Deeds and enter into other related documents with Ivy Station LLC and/or its affiliates under common control (Developer) for the mixed-use development adjacent to the Metro E Line

(Expo) Culver City Station.

**Attachments:**      [Attachment A - Site Map  
Presentation](#)

**NON-CONSENT**

- 8. SUBJECT: FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN FOR PURPLE (D LINE)  
EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT - SECTION 1** [2021-0485](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

ADOPT First/Last Mile Plan (Plan) for Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project Section 1 (Attachment A).

**Attachments:**      [Attachment A - First/Last Mile Plan for Purple \(D Line\) Extension Transit Project  
Presentation](#)

- 9. SUBJECT: NORTH HOLLYWOOD TO PASADENA BUS RAPID  
TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT** [2021-0490](#)

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to:

- A. INCREASE Contract Modification Authority (CMA) specific to Contract No. AE49369000 with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. in the amount of \$580,000, increasing the total authorized CMA amount from \$676,889 to \$1,256,889 to support the additional environmental technical work needed for the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR); and
  
- B. INCREASE CMA specific to the On-Call Communications Bench Contract No. PS44432010 with The Robert Group - Task Order No. 09 in the amount of \$380,000, increasing the total authorized CMA amount from \$100,000 to \$480,000 to implement additional community engagement activities to support the Final EIR, focusing outreach activities to better engage transit riders and equity focused communities.

**Attachments:**      [Attachment A-1 - Procurement Summary](#)  
[Attachment A-2 - Procurement Summary](#)  
[Attachment B-1 - Contract Modification Change Order Log](#)  
[Attachment B-2 - Contract Modification Change Order Log](#)  
[Attachment C-1 - DEOD Summary](#)  
[Attachment C-2 - DEOD Summary](#)

- 
10. SUBJECT: ALAMEDA CORRIDOR-EAST (ACE) PROJECT MEASURE R WORKING CAPITAL LOAN RESTRUCTURING [2021-0531](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to negotiate and execute a project amendment to the ACE Measure R Master Funding Agreement which will restructure the associated working capital loan by extending the loan term an additional three years and restructure the loan maturity terms to allow for adjustment based on a percentage of the outstanding loan balance, thereby allowing for additional pre-payments.

**Attachments:** [Attachment A - SGVCOG Letter on Loan Repayment and Request](#)  
[Attachment B - ACE Project Equity Outreach Process](#)  
[Presentation](#)

11. SUBJECT: I-710 SOUTH CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS STATUS UPDATE AND RESPONSE TO MOTION 47 [2021-0530](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE I-710 South Corridor Project Motion 47 Response.

**Attachments:** [Attachment A - Motion 47](#)  
[Attachment B - I-710 Conformity Technical Response by EPA 3-25-2021](#)  
[Attachment C - 710 Task Force](#)

12. SUBJECT: I-710 SOUTH CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS STATUS UPDATE AND RESPONSE TO MOTION 48 [2021-0310](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE I-710 South Corridor Project Motion 48 Response.

**Attachments:** [Attachment A - Motion 48](#)  
[Attachment B - Clean Truck Program MOU](#)  
[Attachment C - I-710 Conformity Technical Response by EPA 3-25-2021](#)  
[Attachment D - Reimagining Highway Improvements](#)  
[Attachment E - 710 Task Force](#)

13. SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO MOTION 18.1 BY DIRECTORS HAHN, GARCETTI, MITCHELL, BUTTS, AND DUTRA [2021-0566](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE this report on funding, financing, and limiting the impact to the project delivery schedule while minimizing the use of toll revenue bonds



for the I-105 ExpressLanes Project while meeting state grant requirements with the goal of delivering the project ahead of the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles.

**Attachments:**      [Attachment A - Board Motion 18.1](#)  
[Attachment B - Overview of Net Toll Revenue Grants](#)

(ALSO ON CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE)

**14. SUBJECT: COUNTYWIDE PLANNING MAJOR PROJECT STATUS** [2021-0602](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE oral report on the Countywide Planning Major Project Status.

**SUBJECT: GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT** [2021-0567](#)

RECEIVE General Public Comment

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

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

**Adjournment**



**Board Report**

**File #:** 2021-0527, **File Type:** Program

**Agenda Number:**

**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 15, 2021**

**SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM & MEASURE R TRANSIT INVESTMENTS PROGRAM UPDATE - SOUTH BAY SUBREGION**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

A. APPROVING:

1. Programming of an additional \$2,157,200 within the capacity of Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 50), as shown in Attachment A;
2. Programming of an additional \$28,498,120 within the capacity of Measure M MSP - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 66), as shown in Attachment C;
3. Programming of an additional \$113,230,555 within the capacity of Measure R South Bay Transit Investments Program, shown in Attachment D; and

B. DELEGATING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee the authority to:

1. Amend Measure M MSP and Measure R Transit Investments Program funding agreements to modify the scope of work of projects and project development phases consistent with eligibility requirements;
2. Administratively extend funding agreement lapse dates for Measure M MSP and Measure R Transit Investments Program funding agreements to meet environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction time frames; and

C. AUTHORIZING the CEO or their designee to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and/or amendments for approved projects.

**ISSUE**

Measure M MSPs and Measure R South Bay Transit Investments Programs, whose funds are limited to capital uses, are included in the Measure M and/or Measure R Expenditure Plans. The update approves additional eligible projects for funding and allows the South Bay Subregion and implementing agencies to revise scopes of work, schedules, and project budgets. This update includes changes to projects that previously received prior Board approvals and funding allocations.

The Board's approval is required to program additional funds and acknowledge the updated project lists, which will serve as the basis for Metro to enter into funding agreements and/or amendments with the respective implementing agencies.

## **BACKGROUND**

On May 24, 2018, a Funding Agreement was executed between Metro and the South Bay cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) for the Planning Activities (Plan development and updates) for the MSPs. This fiscal year, staff will work with the SBCCOG to amend the Funding Agreement to incorporate the planning activities for the Local Travel Network (LTN) and LTN Wayfinding and Sharrow Design initiatives included in the SBCCOG annual work plan.

In September 2019, the Metro Board of Directors approved South Bay Subregion's first MSP Five-Year Plan and programmed funds in: 1) Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (expenditure line 50); 2) South Bay Highway Operational Improvements (expenditure line 63); and 3) Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (expenditure line 66). In August 2020, as part of the annual update, additional funds were programmed in the South Bay Highway Operational Improvements and Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Programs (expenditure line 66).

In July 2021, the Metro Board of Directors approved the Measure R Ordinance Amendment that authorized the transfer of up to \$400 million from the Measure R Highway Capital Subfund to eligible Transit Capital projects. The South Bay Transit Investments Program was added to the Measure R Expenditure Plan, and the Measure R Transit Investments Program Guidelines were also approved.

## **DISCUSSION**

Metro staff worked closely with the SBCCOG and the implementing agencies on project eligibility reviews for this annual update. To confirm project eligibility and establish the program nexus during project reviews, Metro reviewed detailed scopes of work, project location information, schedules, total estimated expenses, and links between provided information and funding requests. For those proposed projects with funds programming in FY 2023-24 and beyond, Metro accepted higher level, relevant project details for the review process. Through an annual process, Metro staff will work with the SBCCOG and the implementing agencies to update and refine project details. Those projects are proposed for conditional approval as part of this action. Final approval of funds for those projects shall be contingent upon the implementing agency demonstrating the eligibility of each project as required in the Measure M Master Guidelines and/or the Measure R Transit Investments Program Guidelines.

---

The changes in this annual update include additional programming in the Transportation System & Mobility Improvement Programs (Attachments A & C) and the Transit Investments Program (Attachment D). There are no changes in the South Bay Highway Operational Improvements Program (Attachment B).

Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 50)

This update includes funding adjustments to one existing project as follows:

*Torrance*

- Program an additional \$2,157,200 in FY 24 for MM4601.05 - Torrance Schools Safety and Accessibility Program. The funds will be used to complete the Plan Specification and Estimates (PS&E) and construction phases of the project.

Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 66)

This update includes funding adjustments to one existing project and five new projects as follows:

*LA City*

- Program \$17,518,670 in FYs 23, 24, and 25 for MM5508.14 - Alameda St (South) Widening from Anaheim St to Harry Bridges Blvd Project. The funds will be used to complete the construction phase of the project.

*Manhattan Beach*

- Program an additional \$7,310,000 in FYs 23 and 24 for MM5508.04 - Advanced Traffic Signal System Project. The funds will be used to complete the PS&E and construction phases of the project.

*Manhattan Beach*

- Program \$1,200,000 in FYs 22 and 23 for MM5508.15 - Aviation Blvd Eastbound Left-Turn Improvements Project. The funds will be used to complete the Project Development, Project Approval/Environmental Document (PAED), PS&E, and construction phases of the project.

*Rolling Hills Estates*

- Program \$229,450 in FYs 22, 23, and 24 for MM4602.10 - Rolling Hills Road Bike Lanes Project. The funds will be used to complete the PAED and PS&E phases of the project.

*Torrance*

- Program \$1,631,000 in FY 22 for MM5508.16 - Torrance Transit Park and Ride Regional Terminal Project, an existing project funded by Measure R (MR312.23) Highway Operational

---

funds. The funds will be used to complete the construction phase of the project.

*Torrance*

- Program \$609,000 in FY 22 for MM5508.17 - Crenshaw Blvd Improvements from Del Amo to Dominguez Street Project, an existing project funded by Measure R (MR312.60) Highway Operational funds. The funds will be used to complete the construction phase of the project.

Measure R Transit Investments Program

This update includes programming to nine new projects as follows:

*Carson*

- Program \$3,525,000 in FYs 22 and 23 for Carson Circuit: Fashion Outlet Regional Transit Center Project. The funds will be used to complete the PAED, PS&E, Right-of-Way (ROW), and construction phases of the project.

*Gardena*

- Program \$12,375,000 in FYs 23 and 24 for GTRANS: Purchase of up to 15 Expansion Buses Project. The funds will be used to complete the construction Capital phase of the project.

*Gardena*

- Program \$2,000,000 in FYs 22 and 23 for GTRANS: Solar Energy Generation/Bus Fueling Infrastructure Project. The funds will be used to complete the PS&E and construction phases of the project.

*Redondo Beach*

- Program \$32,090,555 in FYs 26, 27, 28, and 29 for Beach Cities Transit: Transit Operations & Maintenance Facility Project. The funds will be used to complete the Environmental, PS&E, and construction phases of the project.

*Torrance*

- Program \$4,500,000 in FYs 22 and 23 for Torrance Transit: Return of the Red Car Urban Circulator Trolley Project. The funds will be used to complete the construction capital phase of the project.

*Torrance*

- Program \$20,000,000 in FYs 22 and 23 for Torrance Transit Expansion Buses Project. The

---

funds will be used to complete the construction capital phase of the project.

*Torrance*

- Program \$35,000,000 in FY 22 for Torrance Transit Regional Transit Center Parking Structure Project. The funds will be used to complete the construction capital phase of the project.

*Torrance*

- Program \$240,000 in FYs 22 and 23 for Micro transit Expansion of the Torrance Community Transit Program. The funds will be used to complete the construction capital phase of the project.

*Torrance*

- Program \$3,500,000 in FYs 22 and 23 for Construction of Heavy-Duty Electric Vehicle Charging Station Project. The funds will be used to complete the construction capital phase of the project.

**DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

Programming of Measure M MSP funds to the South Bay Subregion projects will not have any adverse safety impacts on Metro's employees or patrons.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

In FY 2021-22, \$7.11 million is budgeted in Cost Center 0441 (subsidies budget - Planning) for the Active Transportation Program (Project #474401), and \$11 million is budgeted in Cost Center 0442 (Highway Subsidies) for the Transportation System Mobility Improvement Program (Project #475502). Upon approval of this action, staff will reallocate necessary funds to appropriate projects within Cost Centers 0441 and 0442. Since these are multi-year projects, Cost Centers 0441 and 0442 will be responsible for budgeting the cost in future years.

Funding for Measure R Transit Investments Program projects is not included in the FY 2021-22 budget. The source of funding would be a transfer of available cash from the Measure R highway subfund.

Impact to Budget

The sources of funds for these projects are Measure M Highway Construction 17% and Measure R Transit Capital. These fund sources are not eligible for Metro bus and rail operating and capital expenditures.

**EQUITY PLATFORM**

This report seeks board approval of programming of funds, as proposed by the cities and/or

---

implementing agencies and approved by the South Bay Subregion. Cities and/or implementing agencies lead and prioritize all proposed transportation improvements, including procurement, the environmental process, outreach, final design, and construction. Metro will continue to work with the SBCCOG and cities to encourage engagement of stakeholders, including those with the greatest mobility needs, that can enhance continued efforts to fund projects that improve transportation deficiencies.

The Subregion consists of 15 cities and the adjacent unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. Cities within the defined South Bay subregional boundary of the Measure M and Measure R programs are equity-focused cities/communities including Gardena, Hawthorne, Inglewood, City of Los Angeles, unincorporated County of Los Angeles. Based on the scopes submitted to Metro by the implementing agencies, local improvements have historically been within the public right-of-way and focused on infrastructure upgrades and/or enhancements such as, traffic signal upgrades, signal synchronization, turn pockets, intersection, curb, sidewalk, bike lanes, and center median improvements.

Future annual subregional reports presented to the Board for approval will identify any project level issues of concerns raised through cities' process.

### **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 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 and Measure R Transit Investments Program projects for the South Bay Subregion. This is not recommended as the Subregion developed the proposed projects in accordance with the Measure M Ordinance, Guidelines and the Administrative Procedures, as well as the Measure R Transit Investments Program Guidelines.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Metro staff will continue to work with the Subregion to identify and deliver projects. Funding Agreements will be executed with those who have funds programmed in FY 2021-22. Program/Project updates will be provided to the Board on an annual basis.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

---

Attachment A - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (expenditure line 50)  
Project List

Attachment B - South Bay Highway Operational Improvements Program (expenditure line 63) Project  
List

Attachment C - Transportation System and Mobility Improvements Program (expenditure line 66)  
Project List

Attachment D - Measure R Transit Investments Program Project List


Prepared by: Fanny Pan, DEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3433

Isidro Panuco, Senior Manager, Highway Programs, (213) 418-3208

Shawn Atlow, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3327

Laurie Lombardi, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3251

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



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer



**South Bay Subregion  
Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Transportation System & Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 50)**

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	Prior Year Prog	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25
1	INGLEWOOD	MM5502.02	ITS (GAP) CLOSURE IMPROVEMENTS	CONSTRUCTION		\$13,500,000		\$13,500,000	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 7,500,000				
2	INGLEWOOD	MM5502.03	INGLEWOOD INTERMODAL TRANSIT/PARK AND RIDE FACILITY **	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		9,193,082		9,193,082	4,596,541	4,596,541				
3	LA CITY	MM4601.01	SAN PEDRO PEDESTRAIN IMPROVEMENTS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		7,245,710		7,245,710	774,500	456,155	1,759,559	4,255,496		
4	LA CITY	MM4601.02	WILMINGTON NEIGHBORHOOD STREET IMPROVEMENTS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		3,000,600		3,000,600		175,035	187,538	2,638,027		
5	LA CITY	MM4601.03	AVALON PROMENADE AND GATEWAY *	CONSTRUCTION		8,050,000		8,050,000				8,050,000		
6	LA COUNTY	MM5502.04	182ND ST/ ALBERTONI ST. TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYNCH PROGRAM *	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		4,228,500		4,228,500				4,228,500		
7	LA COUNTY	MM5502.06	VAN NESS TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYCH PROGRAM *	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		1,702,000		1,702,000				1,702,000		
8	LA COUNTY	MM5502.07	DEL AMO BLVD (EAST) TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYCH PROGRAM *	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		1,324,500		1,324,500				1,324,500		
9	LA COUNTY	MM4601.04	WESTMONT/WEST ATJENS PEDESTRIAN IMRROVEMENTS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		6,682,000		6,682,000	571,200	428,400	2,021,066	3,661,334		
10	SBCCOG	MM5502.05	SOUTH BAY FIBER NETWORK	CONSTRUCTION		6,889,365		6,889,365	4,165,114	2,724,251				
11	TORRANCE	MM4601.05	TORRANCE SCHOOLS SAFETY AND ACCESSIBILITY PROGRAM	PS&E CONSTRUCTION	Chg	5,027,800	2,157,200	7,185,000	51,600	2,406,500	1,839,200	730,500	2,157,200	
12	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	MM5502.08	PALOS VERDES DRIVE NORTH AT DAPPLEYGRAY SCHOOL	PAED, PS&E, ROW, CONSTRUCTION		1,554,300		1,554,300	51,300	63,000	1,440,000			
13	INGLEWOOD	MM5502.09	PRAIRIE AVE DYNAMIC LANE CONTROL SYSTEM	PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		13,120,000		13,120,000	6,560,000	6,560,000				
<b>TOTAL PROGRAMMING AMOUNT</b>						<b>\$81,517,857</b>	<b>\$ 2,157,200</b>	<b>\$83,675,057</b>	<b>\$22,770,255</b>	<b>\$24,909,882</b>	<b>\$ 7,247,363</b>	<b>\$26,590,357</b>	<b>\$ 2,157,200</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

\* Conditional programming approval as only high level scope of work was developed and reviewed. Future annual update process will reconfirm the programming.

South Bay Subregion  
 Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - South Bay Highway Operational Improvements (Expenditure Line 63)

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	Prior Year Prog	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25
1	CARSON	MM5507.02	CARSON STREET ITS PROJECT	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCITON		\$ 700,000		\$ 700,000		\$ 550,000	\$ 150,000			
2	CARSON	MM5507.03	SEPULVEDA BLVD WIDENING FROM ALAMEDA ST TO ICTF	PS&E, CONSTRUCITON		6,019,999		6,019,999		1,535,437	2,562,607	1,921,955		
3	GARDENA	MM5507.04	REDONDO BEACH BLVD ARTERIAL IMPROVEMENTS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCITON		5,567,000		5,567,000		104,000	516,000	2,320,000	2,627,000	
4	HAWTHORNE	MM5507.01	NORTH EAST HAWTHORNE MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT	PS&E, ROW, CONSTRUCTION		\$ 2,000,000		\$ 2,000,000		\$ 250,000	\$ 950,000	\$ 800,000		
5	INGLEWOOD	MM5507.05	MANCHESTER BLVD/PRAIRIE AVE ITS & TRAFFIC SIGNAL IMPROVEMENTS *	PAED, PS&E		500,000		500,000					500,000	
6	INGLEWOOD	MM5507.06	DOWNTOWN ITS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCITON		7,300,000		7,300,000			500,000	500,000	6,300,000	
7	LA COUNTY	MM5507.07	AVALON BOULEVARD TSSP IN THE CITY OF CARSON	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCITON		1,530,000		1,530,000		130,000	700,000	700,000		
8	METRO	MM5507.08	I-110 SOUTHBOUND OFF-RAMP TO PCH	PAED, PS&E		5,781,000		5,781,000		1,850,000	1,600,000	800,000	1,531,000	
9	METRO	MM5507.09	405/110 SEPERATION	PAED, PS&E		17,500,000		17,500,000		3,000,000	3,000,000	6,500,000	5,000,000	
<b>TOTAL PROGRAMMING AMOUNT</b>						<b>\$ 46,897,999</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 46,897,999</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 7,419,437</b>	<b>\$ 9,978,607</b>	<b>\$ 13,541,955</b>	<b>\$ 15,958,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

\* Conditional programming approval as only high level scope of work was developed and reviewed. Future annual update process will reconfirm the programming.

South Bay Subregion

Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Transportation System & Mobility Improvements Program (Expenditure Line 66)

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	Prior Year Prog	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25
1	CITIES HEALTH DISTRICT	MM4602.01	DIAMOND ST TO FLAGLER LANE BICYCLE LANE	PS&E CONSTRUCTION		\$ 1,833,877		\$ 1,833,877	\$ 1,833,877					
2	EL SEGUNDO	MM4602.02	EL SEGUNDO BLVD	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		4,050,000		4,050,000		465,000	3,585,000			
3	HAWTHORNE	MM4602.03	HAWTHORNE MONETA GARDEN MOBILITY IMPROVEMENTS	PS&E, ROW, CONSTRUCTION		3,320,000		3,320,000	200,000	800,000	1,220,000	1,100,000		
4	HAWTHORNE	MM5508.07	ROSECRANS AVE MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, PHASE II FROM PRAIRIE AVE TO CRENSHAW BLVD	PAED, PS&E		260,000		260,000		20,000	20,000	40,000	180,000	
5	HAWTHORNE	MM5508.08	CRENSHAW BLVD SIGNAL IMPROVEMENT AND INTERSECTION	PAED, PS&E		260,000		260,000		20,000	20,000	40,000	180,000	
6	HERMOSA BEACH	MM5508.09	MOBILITY AND ACCESSIBLTY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT	PID, PAED		1,800,000		1,800,000		300,000	400,000	600,000	500,000	
7	INGLEWOOD	MM4602.06	FIRST/LAST MILE IMPROVEMENTS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		6,500,000		6,500,000			500,000	1,500,000	4,500,000	
8	INGLEWOOD	MM5508.10	CHANGEABLE MESSAGE SIGNS	PAED, PS&E		1,000,000		1,000,000					1,000,000	
9	LA CITY	MM4602.04	CROSSING UPGRADES AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		3,260,625		3,260,625	185,531	466,594	1,308,770	1,299,730		
10	LA CITY	MM5508.01	SIGNAL OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS	PAED,PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		2,500,000		2,500,000	230,000	240,000	90,000	1,940,000		
11	LA CITY	MM5508.02	ATSAC COMMUNICATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT IN SAN PEDRO	PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		2,500,000		2,500,000	250,000	750,000	1,500,000			
12	LA CITY	MM5508.03	ASTAC COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK INTEGRATION WITH LA COUNTY	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		2,000,000		2,000,000	40,000	160,000	400,000	1,400,000		
13	LA CITY	MM5508.14	ALAMEDA ST (SOUTH) WIDENING FROM ANAHEIM ST TO HARRY BRIDGES BLVD (MR312.48)	CONSTRUCTION	New	-	17,518,670	17,518,670				3,000,000	10,000,000	4,518,670
14	LA COUNTY	MM4602.05	DOMINGUEZ CHANNEL GREENWAY	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		3,600,000		3,600,000		408,000	259,500	2,932,500		
15	LA COUNTY	MM4602.07	WESTMONT/WEST ATHENS PEDESTRAIN IMPROVEMENTS, PHASE II	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		1,165,000		1,165,000		80,000	80,000	625,000	380,000	
16	MANHATTAN BEACH	MM5508.04	ADVANCED TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEM	PS&E, CONSTRUCTION	Chg	5,440,000	7,310,000	12,750,000	1,100,000	2,540,000	1,800,000	5,310,000	2,000,000	

ATTACHMENT C

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	Prior Year Prog	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25
17	MANHATTAN BEACH	MM5508.15	AVIATION BLVD EAST BOUND LEFT-TURN IMPROVEMENTS	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION	New	-	1,200,000	1,200,000			200,000	1,000,000		
18	PALOS VERDES ESTATE	MM5508.11	PALOS VERDES DRIVE WEST CORRIDOR EXPANSION PROJECT	PAED, PS&E		677,000		677,000		519,000	158,000			
19	RANCHO PALOS VERDES	MM5508.12	CONGESTION IMPROVEMENTS (25TH TO PV DR) **	PSR, PAED		1,330,000		1,330,000		90,000	120,000	120,000	1,000,000	
20	REDONDO BEACH	MM4602.08	NORTH REDONDO BEACH BIKEWAY (NRBB) EXTENSION -- FELTON LN TO INGLEWOOD AVE	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		1,000,000		1,000,000		500,000	500,000			
21	REDONDO BEACH	MM4602.09	BIKEWAY (NRBB) EXTENSION -- INGLWOOD AVE	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		200,000		200,000		60,000	140,000			
22	REDONDO BEACH	MM5508.05	REDONDO BEACH TRANSITY CENTER AND PARK AND RIDE	CONSTRUCTION		7,250,000		7,250,000	4,000,000	500,000	2,750,000			
23	REDONDO BEACH	MM5508.13	TRAFFIC SIGNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND NETWORK SYSTEM	PAED, PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		2,000,000		2,000,000		200,000	1,800,000			
24	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	MM4602.10	ROLLING HILLS ROAD BIKE LANES ***	PAED, PS&E	New	-	229,450	229,450			30,250	182,700	16,500	
25	TORRANCE	MM5508.06	TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	PS&E, CONSTRUCTION		390,000		390,000	30,000	360,000				
26	TORRANCE	MM5508.16	TORRANCE TRANSIT PARK AND RIDE REGIONAL TERMINAL (MR312.23)	CONSTRUCTION	New	-	1,631,000	1,631,000			1,631,000			
27	TORRANCE	MM5508.17	CRENSHAW BLVD IMPROVMENTS FROM DEL AMO TO DOMINGUEZ ST (MR312.60)	CONSTRUCTION	New	-	609,000	609,000			609,000			
<b>TOTAL PROGRAMMING AMOUNT</b>						<b>\$ 52,336,502</b>	<b>\$ 28,498,120</b>	<b>\$ 80,834,622</b>	<b>\$ 7,869,408</b>	<b>\$ 8,478,594</b>	<b>\$ 19,121,520</b>	<b>\$ 21,089,930</b>	<b>\$ 19,756,500</b>	<b>\$ 4,518,670</b>

\*\* Metro may procure services for the project development phases.

\*\*\* Further design details are subject to Metro approval.

South Bay Subregion  
Measure R South Bay Transit Investments Program

Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	
1 CARSON	MRxxxx.02	CARSON CIRCUIT: FASHION OUTLET REGIONAL TRANSIT CENTER	PAED, PS&E ROW, CON	New		\$ 3,525,000	\$ 3,525,000	\$ 1,380,000	\$ 2,145,000							
2 GARDENA	MRxxxx.03	GTRANS: PURCHASE OF UP TO 15 EXPANSION BUSES	Construction Capital	New		12,375,000	12,375,000		4,950,000	7,425,000						
3 GARDENA	MRxxxx.04	GTRANS: SOLAR ENERGY GENERATION/BUS FUELING INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT	PS&E CON	New		2,000,000	2,000,000	345,473	1,654,527							
4 INGLEWOOD	MRxxxx.01	INGLEWOOD TRANSIT CONNECTOR PROJECT	PAED, PS&E ROW, CON		233,700,000	-	233,700,000	65,555,118	137,726,003	10,124,967	20,293,912					
5 REDONDO BEACH	MRxxxx.05	BEACH CITIES TRANSIT: TRANSIT OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE FACILITY	Env, PS&E CON	New		32,090,555	32,090,555					5,150,000	8,838,734	17,677,469	424,352	
6 TORRANCE	MRxxxx.06	TORRANCE TRANSIT: RETURN OF THE RED CAR URBAN CIRCULATOR TROLLEY	Construction Capital	New		4,500,000	4,500,000	2,000,000	2,500,000							
7 TORRANCE	MRxxxx.07	TORRANCE TRANSIT: EXPANSION BUSES	Construction Capital	New		20,000,000	20,000,000	17,100,000	2,900,000							
8 TORRANCE	MRxxxx.08	TORRANCE TRANSIT: REGIONAL TRANSIT CENTER PARKING STRUCTURE	Construction Capital	New		35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000								
9 TORRANCE	MRxxxx.09	MICROTRANSIT EXPANSION OF THE TORRANCE COMMUNITY TRANSIT	Construction Capital	New		240,000	240,000	60,000	180,000							
10 TORRANCE	MRxxxx.10	CONSTRUCTION OF HEAVY-DUTY ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING STATION	Construction Capital	New		3,500,000	3,500,000	3,000,000	500,000							
<b>TOTAL PROGRAMMING AMOUNT</b>						<b>\$233,700,000</b>	<b>\$113,230,555</b>	<b>\$346,930,555</b>	<b>\$124,440,591</b>	<b>\$152,555,530</b>	<b>\$17,549,967</b>	<b>\$20,293,912</b>	<b>\$5,150,000</b>	<b>\$8,838,734</b>	<b>\$17,677,469</b>	<b>\$424,352</b>



**Board Report**

**File #:** 2021-0526, **File Type:** Program

**Agenda Number:** 6.

**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 15, 2021**

**SUBJECT: MEASURE M MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAM UPDATE - ARROYO  
VERDUGO SUBREGION**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**RECOMMENDATION**

CONSIDER:

- A. REPROGRAMMING of projects in the Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) - Modal Connectivity and Complete Streets Program, as shown in Attachment A; and
- B. DELEGATING the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee the authority to:
  - 1. Amend Measure M MSP funding agreements to modify the scope of work of projects and project development phases consistent with eligibility requirements;
  - 2. Administratively extend funding agreement lapse dates for Measure M MSP funding agreements to meet environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction time frames; and
- C. AUTHORIZING the 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. All MSP funds are limited to capital projects. The annual update allows the Arroyo Verdugo Subregion and implementing agencies to revise the schedule. The Subregion will consider adding eligible projects in future updates.

This update includes changes to projects which have received Board approval in 2020. Funds are programmed through Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-24. The Board’s approval is required to update the project list (Attachments A), which serves as the basis for Metro to enter into agreements and/or amendments with the respective implementing agencies.

**BACKGROUND**

---

In May 2019, the Metro Board of Directors approved Arroyo Verdugo Subregion's first MSP Five-Year Plan and programmed funds in: 1) Modal Connectivity/Complete Streets (expenditure line 62); and 2) Transit (expenditure line 65). The Subregion also identified several priority projects that were eligible for the Active Transportation and Highway Efficiency/Noise Mitigation/Arterial Programs (expenditure lines 71 and 83 - funds scheduled to be available in 2033 and 2048, respectively) and elected to borrow from the Modal Connectivity/Complete Streets and Transit Programs to advance those projects.

In November 2020, as part of the annual update, additional funds were programmed in the Modal Connectivity/Complete Streets, Transit, and Active Transportation Programs. All funds previously programmed under the Highway Efficiency/Noise Mitigation/Arterial Program were deobligated at the request of the Arroyo Verdugo Communities Joint Powers Authority (AVCJPA) and the implementing agency.

## **DISCUSSION**

For this update, Metro staff continued working closely with the AVCJPA and the implementing agencies on project schedule changes. The changes in this update include reprogramming of two previously approved projects in the Modal Connectivity/Complete Streets Program. There are no changes in the Transit (Attachment B) and Active Transportation (Attachment C) Programs.

### **Modal Connectivity and Complete Streets (expenditure line 62)**

This update includes funding adjustments to two existing projects as follows:

#### *La Canada Flintridge*

- Reprogram \$953,919 from FY 2018-19 to FY 2021-22 for MM4101.02 - Foothill Blvd. Link Bikeway and Pedestrian Greenbelt Project. The funds will be used to complete the construction phase of the project.

#### *Pasadena*

- Reprogram \$1,800,000 as follows: \$300,000 in FY 2020-21 and \$1,500,000 in FY 2021-22 for MM4101.03 - Avenue 64 Complete Street Project. The funds will be used for Plans Specification and Estimates (PS&E) and construction phases of the project.

## **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

Programming Measure M MSP funds to the Arroyo Verdugo Subregion projects will not have any adverse safety impacts on Metro's employees or patrons.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

In FY 2021-22, \$7.11 million is budgeted in Cost Center 0441 (subsidies budget - Planning) for the Active Transportation Program (Project #474401) and \$3.46 million is budgeted in Cost Center 0441

---

(subsidies budget - Planning) for the Transit Program (Project #474102). Upon approval of this action, staff will reallocate necessary funds to appropriate projects within Cost Centers 0441. Since these are multi-year projects, Cost Center 0441 will be responsible for budgeting the cost in future years.

### Impact to Budget

The source of funds for these projects are Measure M Highway Construction 17% and Measure M Transit Construction 35%. These fund sources are not eligible for Metro bus and rail operating and capital expenditures.

### EQUITY PLATFORM

This report seeks board approval of the reprogramming of funds previously approved for Measure M MSP funds, as proposed by the cities and/or implementing agencies and approved by the Subregion. Cities and/or implementing agencies lead and prioritize all proposed transportation improvements, including procurement, the environmental process, outreach, final design, and construction. Metro will continue to work with the AVCJPA and cities to encourage them to reach out to broader stakeholders to fund projects that improve transportation deficiencies.

The Arroyo Verdugo Subregion consists of member agencies from the cities of Burbank, Glendale, La Canada Flintridge, Pasadena, South Pasadena and the adjacent unincorporated area of Crescenta Valley/Montrose within Los Angeles County. Cities within the defined Arroyo Verdugo subregional boundary of the Measure M programs that are equity-focused cities/communities, including Burbank and Glendale, have and will continue to develop projects that provide benefits and opportunities to their residents, including the underserved groups. Based on the scopes submitted to Metro by the implementing agencies, local improvements are generally within the public right-of-way and are infrastructure upgrades and/or enhancements such as, curb, sidewalk, bike lane and center median improvements.

Future annual subregional reports presented to the Board for approval will identify any project level issues of concerns raised through cities' process.

### 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 Council of Governments and the local jurisdictions to identify the needed improvements and lead the development and implementation of their projects.

### ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED



---

The Board could elect not to approve the reprogramming of funds for the Measure M MSP projects for the Arroyo Verdugo Subregion. This is not recommended as the Subregion developed the proposed changes in accordance with the Measure M Ordinance, Guidelines, and Administrative Procedures.

**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 on an annual basis.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment A - Modal Connectivity and Complete Streets Program Project List
- Attachment B - Transit Program Project List
- Attachment C - Active Transportation Program Project List

Prepared by: Fanny Pan, DEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3433  
Shawn Atlow, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3327  
Laurie Lombardi, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3251

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



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer

## Arroyo Verdugo Subregion

## Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Modal Connectivity and Complete Streets Program (Expenditure Line 62)

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	Prior Year Prog	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24
1	La Canada Flintridge	MM4101.02	Foothill Blvd. Link Bikeway and Pedestrian Greenbelt	Construction	chg	\$ 953,919	\$ -	\$ 953,919			\$ 953,919		
2	Pasadena	MM4101.03	Avenue 64 Complete Street Project	PS&E Construction	chg	1,800,000	-	1,800,000		300,000	1,500,000		
3	Pasadena	MM4101.04	North Hill Complete Street Project	PS&E Construction		1,500,000		1,500,000	300,000	235,020	600,000	364,980	
4	Pasadena	MM4101.06	Pedestrian Crossing Enhancement Program *	Construction		236,148		236,148					236,148
5	Pasadena	MM4101.07	New Traffic Signals for Pedestrian Connectivity *	Construction		683,000		683,000					683,000
<b>Total Programming Amount</b>						<b>\$5,173,067</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$5,173,067</b>	<b>\$ 300,000</b>	<b>\$ 535,020</b>	<b>\$ 3,053,919</b>	<b>\$ 364,980</b>	<b>\$ 919,148</b>

\* Conditional programming approval as only high level scope of work was developed and reviewed. Future annual update process will reconfirm the programming.

**Arroyo Verdugo Subregion  
Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Transit Program (Expenditure Line 65)**

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	Prior Year Prog	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24
1	Burbank	MM4102.01	BurbankBus State of Good Repair - Bus Replacement	Vehicle Purchase		\$ 1,800,000		1,800,000			\$ 1,800,000		
2	Glendale	MM4102.02	Beeline Maintenance Facility	Construction		4,426,000		4,426,000	4,426,000				
3	Glendale	MM4102.03	Beeline Replacement Buses (CFP# F9435)	Vehicle Purchase		832,051		832,051		832,051			
4	Glendale	MM4102.06	Beeline Bus Purchase and Bus-Related Infrastructure *	Vehicle Purchase		2,316,963		2,316,963					2,316,963
5	Pasadena	MM4102.04	Purchase Replacement Buses	Vehicle Purchase		5,370,015		5,370,015	700,000		2,600,000	2,070,015	
<b>Total Programming Amount</b>						<b>\$14,745,029</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$14,745,029</b>	<b>\$5,126,000</b>	<b>\$ 832,051</b>	<b>\$4,400,000</b>	<b>\$2,070,015</b>	<b>\$2,316,963</b>

\* Conditional programming approval as only high level scope of work was developed and reviewed. Future annual update process will reconfirm the programming.

**Arroyo Verdugo Subregion  
Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - Active Transportation Program (Expenditure Line 71)**

	Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	Prior Year Prog	FY2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24
1	Burbank	MM4103.01	Victory Blvd. Connectivity Gap Closure and Transit Enhancements - Between Downtown Burbank Metrolink station and Alameda Ave.	PS&E ROW Construction		\$ 3,000,000	-	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000				
2	Glendale	MM4103.02	Victory Boulevard Project - Burbank City Limit to River Walk bikeway entrance in Glendale	PS&E Construction		5,951,587		5,951,587		250,000	400,000	5,301,587	
<b>Total Programming Amount</b>						<b>\$ 8,951,587</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 8,951,587</b>	<b>\$ 3,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 250,000</b>	<b>\$ 400,000</b>	<b>\$ 5,301,587</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

**Board Report**

---

**File #:** 2021-0449, **File Type:** Agreement**Agenda Number:** 7.

---

**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 15, 2021****SUBJECT: CULVER CITY STATION ADJACENT DEVELOPMENT****ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION****RECOMMENDATION**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer or their designee to execute amendments to a Perpetual Easement Agreement and Perpetual Reciprocal Easement Agreement, accept Grant Deeds and enter into other related documents with Ivy Station LLC and/or its affiliates under common control (Developer) for the mixed-use development adjacent to the Metro E Line (Expo) Culver City Station.

**ISSUE**

In 2017, Metro, the City of Culver City (City) and the Developer entered into a Perpetual Easement Agreement and a Perpetual Reciprocal Easement Agreement (Easement Agreements) related to the development of a mixed-use development (Project) on certain real property, including some Metro-owned property, adjacent to the Metro E Line (Expo) Culver City Station (Station). The Project Site has been subdivided into several airspace lots associated with the Project's various uses such that the property for each development type can be sold or financed separately. However, numerous airspace lots straddle the boundary between property owned in fee by Metro and property owned in fee by the Developer and it has been determined that such straddle lots cannot legally or practically be conveyed or mortgaged. With construction substantially complete, amendments to the Easement Agreements and acceptance by Metro of Grant Deeds are necessary for the Developer to convert from construction financing to permanent financing. These actions will establish Metro as unified fee ownership of ground and airspace lots that straddle property lines (as an interim step and subject to easements and restrictions) and authorize Metro to reconvey such portions once the Developer secures approvals from local jurisdictions for revisions to subdivision maps.

**BACKGROUND**

In 2000, the City commenced planning for the redevelopment of parcels surrounding the planned Station, and subsequently began assembling parcels and working with Metro to incorporate portions of Metro's right-of-way with the intent of developing a transit-oriented development. In 2011, Metro entered into an Option Agreement (Option) with the City and the Culver City Redevelopment Agency to allow portions of the future development to be constructed on Metro-owned property adjacent to the Station (See Attachment A - Site Map). As a condition of allowing development on portions of

Metro property, a park-and-ride facility with 300 parking spaces for Metro transit riders was required to be constructed in the future development, as well as temporary transit rider parking on-site until the development began construction, and off-site during construction of the permanent facility.

In 2012, following a competitive solicitation, the City selected Lowe Real Estate (parent company of Ivy Station LLC) as the site's Developer. Metro did not participate in the scoping of the Project or solicitation of the developer and was not party to the Implementation Agreement between the Developer, the City, and the Successor Agency to the Culver City Redevelopment Agency.

In December 2016, the Metro Board of Directors authorized Metro to enter into the Easement Agreements with the City and Developer per terms substantially consistent with those authorized by the Board and contained in the Option. Upon exercise of the Option by the City, the parties entered into the Easement Agreements in June 2017, and construction commenced.

#### *Site Overview*

The 5.5-acre project site is triangular and bound by Washington Blvd. to the southeast, National Blvd. to the northeast, Venice Blvd. to the northwest, and the Station/Metro E Line (Expo) to the south (Project Site) (see area outlined in red on Attachment A - Site Map). The Project Site includes approximately 1.67 acres of Metro-owned property consisting of the northerly 91 feet of Metro right-of-way (Easement Area) (see blue highlighted area on Attachment A - Site Map). The southerly 59 feet of Metro property consists of the Station and operating right-of-way (Station Parcel) and is not a part of the Project Site (see yellow highlighted area on Attachment A - Site Map). Additionally, the municipal boundary between the City and the City of Los Angeles bisects the Project site.

#### *Project Overview*

The Project, commonly known as Ivy Station, includes a 148-room hotel, an approximately 197,000 square foot office building, 200 market-rate apartments, approximately 58,000 square feet of ground floor retail space, and parking including 300 stalls dedicated for Metro transit-riders (Project). Project amenities include more than two acres of publicly-accessible open space that will be programmed regularly, numerous public art installations, and design features intended to integrate the Project with transit by providing riders with safe, comfortable paths of travel to the Station from the surrounding community. Construction of the Project is substantially complete, except the hotel which is scheduled to open in late 2021. The Metro park-and-ride facility opened to the public in early September.

## **DISCUSSION**

#### *Subdivision Maps*

In fall 2020, final subdivision maps were recorded in the City of Culver City and the City of Los Angeles establishing ground lots and several airspace lots (legally defined, three-dimensional blocks of air). This subdivision technique intends to allow airspace lots at different elevations in the Project to be sold or financed separately. In the Project's case, separate uses (e.g.: office, apartments, hotel, parking) are located in one or more separate airspace lots clustered in distinct development zones intended to be sold or financed separately. The recorded final subdivision maps erroneously contained numerous single airspace lots, which straddled a portion of underlying ground lot owned in fee by Metro and a portion of underlying ground lot owned in fee by the Developer. Because an airspace lot cannot be lawfully conveyed or mortgaged unless the underlying ground lot has a unified

ownership, such “straddle lots” prevent Developer from being able to convey or mortgage each portion of the Project as was intended.

To address the subdivision map issue resulting from the circumstances described above and to facilitate timely refinance of the construction loan for the project, amendments to the Easement Agreements and conveyance of certain Grant Deeds are necessary.

Key terms include the following:

- Developer will convey fee ownership of its portion of each straddle lot (Conveyed Portions) to Metro via Grant Deeds
- Developer will retain ownership of all improvements and retain easements for all airspace lots, subject to easements in favor of Metro, where applicable
- Developer retains all obligations to maintain, repair, insure, indemnify with respect to its ownership and operation of the improvements with the exception that Metro will be responsible for maintaining and operating parking access and revenue control systems and equipment as well as collect parking revenues
- Additional indemnification provisions have been added to minimize any additional liability to Metro as a result of acquiring fee ownership of Conveyed Portions, including hazardous materials risk
- Metro will receive, at Developer’s cost, a title insurance policy to insure its fee interest in the Conveyed Portions
- Developer covenants to use good faith best efforts to obtain, at Developer’s cost, approvals for revised subdivision maps and/or lot line adjustment to establish separate legal lots that can be freely sold and financed
- Upon approval and recordation of revised maps, Metro will reconvey Conveyed Portions to the Developer or its successors, as applicable

Although the parties’ intend to adjust the maps to legally subdivide each straddle lot into two legal airspace lots, such approvals will require discretionary approvals by the cities of Culver City and Los Angeles that may take more than a year. The amendments to the Easement Agreements and conveyance of Grant Deeds will allow for Developer’s timely conversion from construction to permanent financing, which is necessary for the Project’s financial viability. Although acceptance by Metro of fee to Developer portions of the straddle lots (subject to easements and restrictions) is intended to be an interim condition, the terms described above will protect Metro should reconveyance be delayed or the subdivision map adjustments not be approved by one or both of the cities.

### **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

Approval of this item which pertains to conveyance of real estate fee interests will have no impact on safety. However, the Project, which opened to the public earlier this year, activates the station area and improves connections between the Station, adjacent transportation amenities and the surrounding community.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The Reconveyance Lots are subject to easements and restrictions that render the value at zero. Metro will incur no additional costs as a result of the recommended actions.

### **Impact to Budget**

Funding for Project transaction costs are included in the FY22 budget in Cost Center 2210, Project 401041 and will be reimbursed by the Developer per terms of existing agreements. Additionally, the amendments to the Easement Agreements require the Developer cover all costs associated with the documentation and approvals of the revised subdivision maps and reconveyance back of Conveyed Portions to Developer, including reimbursing Metro for its related costs.

## **EQUITY PLATFORM**

The recommended action relates to the conveyance of real estate fee interests for an existing development which was envisioned, solicited and shaped by the City. The key terms of Metro's participation in the Project, namely granting certain development rights in the Easement Area in exchange for 300 Metro park-and-ride spaces, were defined in and limited by the Option executed in 2011, which predate the adoption of Metro's Equity Platform.

More recently, Metro has adopted a Supportive Transit Parking Program Master Plan (2018) and updates to its Joint Development Policy (2015 and 2021) which provide a strategic framework for leveraging Metro-owned property adjacent or proximate to transit. These plans and policies allow an equity-focused lens to guide future approaches to land development and public/private partnerships to maximize public benefits and prioritize transit-supportive uses, including affordable housing and investments in alternative modes of accessing the transit system.

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

This Project supports the Strategic Plan Goal 3 to "enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity" by helping to catalyze a transit-oriented community. The Project's community-oriented amenities such as the transit plaza, event lawn, and mix of uses, including extensive ground floor retail, activate the station area and encourage transit ridership. Additionally, the park and ride facility supports multi-modal access to the transit system.

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board could choose not to authorize amendments to the Easement Agreements. Staff does not recommend this option as construction of the Project is substantially complete. Without the approval of the recommendations, the Developer will be unable to convert from construction financing to permanent financing. An extended delay could jeopardize the Project.

## **NEXT STEPS**




Upon Board approval of the recommended action, Metro and the Developer will execute the amendments to the Easement Agreements and accept Grant Deeds to the Conveyance Portions. Subsequently, Metro will work with the Developer in securing municipal approvals for revisions to the subdivision maps that will allow for the Conveyance Portions to become separate legal lots that will be reconveyed to the Developer.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Site Map

Prepared by: Nick Saponara, EO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-4313  
Holly Rockwell, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-5585







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



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer

# ATTACHMENT A Site Map



-  Project Site
-  Easement Area (Metro-owned)
-  Developer Property
-  Municipal Boundary
-  Station Parcel (Metro-owned)
-  "Straddle" Airspace Lots (representative)



# Next stop: vibrant communities.

**Culver City Station  
Adjacent Development**

**Planning and Programming Committee**

September 15, 2021  
Legistar File 2021-0449



# Recommendation

## CONSIDER:

AUTHORIZING the Chief Executive Officer or her designee to execute amendments to a Perpetual Easement Agreement and Perpetual Reciprocal Easement Agreement, accept Grant Deeds and enter into other related documents with Ivy Station LLC and/or its wholly owned subsidiaries (Developer) for the mixed-use development adjacent to the Metro E Line (Expo) Culver City Station.

# Background

- Early 2000s: Culver City begins planning, assembling parcels for a TOD
- 2011: Metro enters into Option Agreement with Culver City
  - Allows future TOD development on portions of Metro ROW
  - 300 park-and-ride spaces to be constructed/reserved for Metro
- 2012: Culver City selects Lowe Real Estate following competitive solicitation
- 2016: Metro Board approves Easement Agreements
- 2017: City exercises Option; Metro/Culver City/Developer enter into Real Estate Agreements; construction commences
- 2020: Final Subdivision Maps recorded in LA and Culver City establishing numerous ground and airspace lots
- 2021: Construction completion; pending conversion to permanent financing

# Site Overview



- Project Site
- Easement Area (Metro-owned)
- Developer Property
- Municipal Boundary
- Station Parcel (Metro-owned)
- "Straddle" Airspace Lots (representative)

# Issue and Next Steps

- Project includes a hotel, office building, apartment building, ground floor retail and subterranean parking including 300 Metro spaces
- Numerous airspace lots straddle boundary between property owned by Developer and property owned by Metro and is unable to be conveyed or mortgaged as parties intended
- Amendments to Easement Agreements and conveyance of Grant Deeds to “straddle lots” from Developer to Metro is necessary to establish a singular fee ownership and allow conversion from construction to permanent financing
- Developer to pursue approvals from City of Culver City and City of Los Angeles for revised subdivision maps and upon recordation of revised subdivision maps, Metro to reconvey back to Developer



## Board Report

File #: 2021-0485, File Type: Plan

Agenda Number: 8.

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE SEPTEMBER 15, 2021

**SUBJECT: FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN FOR PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT - SECTION 1**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

ADOPT First/Last Mile Plan (Plan) for Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project Section 1 (Attachment A).

#### **ISSUE**

Metro Board authorized the preparation of a first/last mile (FLM) plan for the Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project, Section 1, in January 2020. The Plan was completed and includes FLM improvements around three future D Line stations: Wilshire/La Brea, Wilshire/Fairfax, and Wilshire/La Cienega. Adoption of the Plan by the Metro Board better positions FLM improvements for funding and implementation, including the pursuit of potential grant funding.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Plan includes pedestrian and bicycle projects that improve safety, comfort, and access to the three future D Line stations. Pedestrian projects are identified within the ½-mile radius around each station, and bicycle projects are identified within the 3-mile radius around each station.

The Metro FLM methodology, described in the 2014 First Last Mile Strategic Plan, was used as the basis for plan development. A summary of planning steps are as follows:

- Review and analysis of existing conditions and relevant plans
- Walk audits of station areas
- Community engagement
- Draft and final plans with pathway networks and FLM projects
- Ongoing coordination with local jurisdictions

The consultant team included Los Angeles Walks, a community-based organization dedicated to promoting walking and pedestrian infrastructure in Los Angeles. Its efforts were deployed in the development and implementation of a community engagement strategy. As planning took place



during the COVID-19 pandemic, community outreach and engagement were conducted to accommodate safety mandates and protocol.

The Plan includes the following core planning products:

- Pathway Maps with FLM projects
- Project lists, that correspond to the Pathway Maps
- Cost estimation for FLM projects

The Plan also includes supporting documents that detail the planning process in a series of memos. The full Plan is available in Attachment A.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Plan Summary and Key Findings**

The Plan presents project ideas to improve safety, connectivity, and station accessibility for pedestrians and people who use bicycles (or other modes of non-motorized wheeled transportation). Broadly, improvements include, but are not limited to, new or improved sidewalks and crosswalks, bus stop improvements, pedestrian lighting, landscaping and shade, and various types of bicycle facilities.

At the Wilshire/La Cienega station, the Plan recommends a suite of FLM improvements along the main arterials of Wilshire Blvd and La Cienega Blvd as these provide direct access to the future station entrance. The Plan aligns and coordinates with elements found in the City of Beverly Hills' Connect Beverly Hills streetscape project for these streets. Another major street - San Vicente Blvd - does not connect directly to the future station but is notable as the boundary between the City of Beverly Hills and the City of Los Angeles and its high volume of vehicular traffic. Improved bicycle facilities recommended on this corridor will help bicyclists connect safely to the station.

At the Wilshire/Fairfax station, the Plan recommends a variety of pedestrian amenities along the arterials of Wilshire Ave and Fairfax Ave. Project staff anticipates the need to safely connect future D Line riders to the many popular regional destinations in the area, including the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA), the La Brea Tar Pits, and the Original Farmers Market and the Grove to the north, and Little Ethiopia to the south. The Plan supports the City of Los Angeles' proposed bike lane on Fairfax Ave and seeks to provide east-west connectivity through bike facilities along 6th St and 8th St/Del Valle Dr.

At the Wilshire/La Brea station, the main arterials of Wilshire Blvd and La Brea Ave support commercial activity and are surrounded by predominantly residential streets. Enhanced sidewalks and crosswalks, among other FLM improvements, would improve the experience of future pedestrians getting to and from the station. The Plan supports the City of Los Angeles' proposed bike lane on La Brea Ave along with bike boulevards that provide alternative routes on parallel streets. Bicyclists can take these north-south routes to connect to existing facilities on 4th St and proposed facilities on 8th St.

## Process

The project team developed the Plan between February 2020 and July 2021 based on the methodology in the 2014 First/Last Mile Strategic Plan and experience with past FLM plans. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the project was placed on a temporary pause between May and October 2020. When the project resumed, adjustments were made to the planning process such that community engagement would be conducted to accommodate social-distancing and stay-at-home orders.

## Community Engagement

Community members provided local knowledge and insight about pedestrian and bicyclist needs in the three station areas. Staff aimed to reach a diversity of street users, including residents in the study area and people from elsewhere in the county who may be using, or are likely to use, transit to reach these areas.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, activities were conducted virtually or in an individual, socially-distanced manner to adhere to safety protocol. As part of the consultant team, the community-based organization, Los Angeles Walks, helped develop, review, and implement community engagement activities throughout the planning process.

The project team pursued multiple avenues to collect feedback from community members. Engagement activities included stakeholder interviews (20 participants), an online map-based survey (891 responses), community walk audits (36 individuals trained, approximately 21 audits completed), and a virtual roundtable discussion (10 participants). The online survey was shared through multiple channels, including targeted social media. During these activities, community participants noted observations about the needs and challenges of the station areas for pedestrians and bicyclists. These observations resulted in a rich body of geolocated and descriptive data that informed the final Plan.

In addition to these planned community engagement activities, Metro staff led presentations before the survey launch to demonstrate how to take the online survey. When a draft Plan was ready, Metro staff led presentations to inform communities of its recommended FLM projects.

A community engagement and local coordination memo, in Attachment A, provides greater detail.

## Coordination with Local Jurisdictions

FLM projects require close coordination with the local authorities that control the right-of-way around Metro stations. Metro held meetings with agency staff and elected offices from the City of Beverly Hills and the City of Los Angeles. Metro met with staff at the beginning of FLM planning to introduce activities, learn about FLM needs and challenges, and discuss community engagement approaches. Metro also communicated with them when the planning process was temporarily paused due to COVID-19 pandemic-related agency direction. At a later stage, Metro provided city agencies an opportunity to review and comment on drafts of the Plan.

A community engagement and local coordination memo, in Attachment A, provides greater detail.

### **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

The recommended action has no direct safety impact. This Plan presents project ideas that promote improved safety for people walking or using non-motorized wheeled transportation around future D Line stations.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Adoption of this Plan has no impact to the budget.

Local jurisdictions lead project implementation; Metro support in implementation may come in the form of grant writing assistance and priority in future Metro Active Transportation (MAT) 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. According to Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) data, between 2013-2017, there were 72 pedestrian and 66 bicycle collisions in the Wilshire/La Brea station area, 49 pedestrian and 34 bicycle collisions in the Wilshire/Fairfax station area, and 44 pedestrian and 22 bicycle collisions in the Wilshire/La Cienega station area. The Plan proposes projects that would improve the safety along many of the streets where these collisions happen. This includes improvements on corridors that have been identified as part of the City of Los Angeles' High Injury Network (HIN).

The Plan focuses on pedestrians and bicyclists getting to and from transit stations. By extrapolating from 2019 Metro On-Board Survey data for the existing D (Purple) line, the Plan will improve safety, comfort, and accessibility for a 62% transit dependent population, with 32.2% living below the poverty line and 77.5% identifying as non-white.

The Plan was developed with significant community feedback through the stakeholder interviews (20 participants), walk-audits (36 trainees; 21 audits), community roundtable discussions (10 participants), and map-based survey (891 responses). A partnership with the community-based organization, Los Angeles Walks, was established to help broaden the outreach effort and increase participation from communities that are generally underrepresented in public participation processes. The project team reached out to various institutions, including neighborhood councils, community organizations, religious institutions, businesses and business associations, schools, health centers, and cultural centers. Coordination with and presentations to the Metro Accessibility Advisory Committee were intended to increase participation from people living with disabilities. Materials and activities for community engagement were made available in English, Spanish, and Korean languages.

In the development of the Plan, the project team coordinated closely with the City of Los Angeles and City of Beverly Hills. Implementation of the Plan's recommendations is at their future discretion. As such, adoption of the Plan would not present any immediate burden. Were cities to advance this

---

concept-level Plan, additional research is encouraged during design and engineering, to understand and mitigate potential impacts to businesses and residents in the station area in the medium term (i.e., construction) and long-term. Specifically, cities should conduct additional community engagement and data collection to understand the needs of businesses that may be impacted by the implementation of FLM projects, particularly those that are minority and women-owned. As part of a broader assessment of transit project impact, inclusive of FLM improvements, cities should forecast the magnitude of displacement and consider neighborhood stabilization activities. These recommended activities will help further Metro Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Policy goals, including stabilizing and enhancing communities surrounding transit, engaging organizations, jurisdictions, and the public, and distributing transit benefits to all.

### **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 the Wilshire/La Cienega station for both the City of Beverly Hills and the City of Los Angeles.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

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

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

### **NEXT STEPS**

As described in the Board-approved First/Last Mile Guidelines, the adopted Plan will be provided to the City of Los Angeles and the City of Beverly Hills for implementation. Adoption of the Plan will qualify cities for Metro grant-writing assistance. The Guidelines specify that FLM credit toward the 3% local contribution is not available for this project.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - First/Last Mile Plan for Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project Section 1

Prepared by:


Renee Ho, Principal Transportation Planner, Countywide Planning & Development,  
(213) 922-4068

Jacob Lieb, Senior Director, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-4132

Nick Saponara, EO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-4313

Holly Rockwell, SEO - Real Estate, Transit Oriented Communities and Transportation  
Demand Management, (213) 922-5585

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



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer

# Next stop: a better journey.

## PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN Section 1



**Metro**<sup>®</sup>

FALL 2021

## Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project First/Last Mile Plan Section 1

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Core Documents</b>	<b>8</b>
I. Pathway Maps	I-1
II. Project List	II-1
III. Rough-Order-of-Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimation	III-1
<b>Supporting Documents</b>	<b>56</b>
IV. Existing Conditions	IV-1
V. Community Engagement & Local Coordination	V-1
VI. Walk Audit Summary	VI-1
VII. Project Origins	VII-1
VIII. Cost Assumptions	VIII-1

# Next stop: a better journey.

## PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN Section 1 – Executive Summary





# Executive Summary

The First/Last Mile (FLM) Plan (Plan) for the Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project – Section 1 (PLE 1) analyzed FLM connections for the rail project’s three stations by executing Metro’s FLM planning methodology. The Plan responds to FLM policy directives: Metro Board Motion 14.1 in May 2016 and 14.2 in June 2016.

Section 1 of the Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project will extend the subway west, through the City of Los Angeles and into the City of Beverly Hills, with scheduled completion in 2023. The three stations in PLE 1 include:

- Wilshire/La Brea
- Wilshire/Fairfax
- Wilshire/La Cienega

Figure 1 shows all three sections of the Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project.



Figure 1: Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project

For each station, the Plan identifies pedestrian-focused and bicycle-focused (inclusive of scooters, etc.) projects that improve safety and access to the station along specified routes that collectively are called the “Pathway Network”. The projects are located within the ½-mile radius of the station, otherwise referred to as the “access shed” or “station area”; bicycle projects extend beyond this radius to connect to other existing or proposed facilities.

The core products of FLM planning include the following for each of the stations:

- I. Pathway Maps
- II. Project List
- III. Rough-Order-of-Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimation

Core documents are accompanied by supporting documents that detail additional findings and information regarding process and methodology.

# Executive Summary

## Key Findings

The existing conditions at each station vary in terms of the built environment, existing traffic, land-uses, and populations served. At the same time, there is a physical continuity between the station areas as they share some overlapping areas within their access sheds. The following key findings were determined through the planning process:

### ➤ **Wilshire/La Cienega**

The station study area is located in both the City of Beverly Hills and the City of Los Angeles. The main arterials of Wilshire Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard would benefit from the full suite of FLM improvements to provide safe, direct access to the future station entrance. These streets support mostly commercial activity and are surrounded by other more residential streets. For these streets, the Plan aligns and coordinates with elements found in the City of Beverly Hills' *Connect Beverly Hills* streetscape project. Another major street – San Vicente Boulevard – does not connect directly to the future station but is notable as the boundary between the two cities and for its high volume of vehicular traffic. Improved bicycle facilities on this corridor will help bicyclists connect safely to the station.

### ➤ **Wilshire/Fairfax**

The future station will be located at a busy juncture, connecting visitors and residents to popular regional destinations such as Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA), the La Brea Tar Pits, and the Original Farmers Market and the Grove to the north, and Little Ethiopia to the south. Pedestrian amenities along the arterials of Wilshire Avenue and Fairfax Avenue will help people safely access these destinations. The Plan supports the City of Los Angeles' proposed bike lane on Fairfax Avenue and seeks to provide east-west connectivity through bike facilities along 6<sup>th</sup> Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Street/ Del Valle Drive.

### ➤ **Wilshire/La Brea**

The main arterials of Wilshire Boulevard and La Brea Avenue support commercial activity and are surrounded by predominantly residential streets. Enhanced sidewalks and crosswalks, among other FLM improvements, would improve the experience of future pedestrians getting to and from the station. The Plan supports the City of Los Angeles' proposed bike lane on La Brea Avenue along with bike boulevards that provide alternative routes on parallel streets. Bicyclists can take these north-south routes to connect to proposed facilities on 4<sup>th</sup> Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

# Executive Summary

## First/Last Mile Process

The FLM methodology is documented in Metro’s *First Last Mile Strategic Plan (2014)* and completed FLM plans (<https://www.metro.net/project/first-last>). A brief summary of the steps and timeline specific to the PLE 1 FLM Plan is presented in *Figure 2*.




Figure 2: Summary of Planning Process and Timeline

The planning process for Section 1 took place during the COVID-19 pandemic, resulting in a pause of activities for several months, and changes related to community engagement and outreach. To accommodate safety mandates and protocol, these activities ensured social distancing and provided an option for online participation.

Throughout the process, the planning team worked with the community-based organization *Los Angeles Walks* and coordinated with staff and elected offices from the City of Los Angeles and the City of Beverly Hills.

# Executive Summary

## What's in the Plan

The Plan is composed of the following core and supporting documents.

### ➤ Core Documents:

- I. **Pathway Maps:** A Pathway Map displays the Pathway Network, which consists of key corridors, and the project ideas along them, that will help create safe and comfortable connections to the station. For each of the three stations in PLE 1, two pathway maps were created – one for pedestrian projects and one for bicycle projects.
- II. **Project List:** This document presents project ideas that correspond to those in the Pathway Maps. They are organized in the following order: FLM Pathway arterials (primary routes), FLM Pathway collectors (secondary routes), and FLM Pathway cut-throughs (shortcuts). The lists also separate project ideas as those running along a corridor and those at unique points (spot improvements).
- III. **Rough-Order-of-Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimation:** This document presents Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) cost estimates. Each station has a summary of total costs that are disaggregated into construction costs, soft costs, contingency, and escalation. Each station also has the cost estimates disaggregated by segment of the Pathway Network.

### ➤ Supporting Documents:

- IV. **Existing Conditions:** This document serves as an initial station analysis that includes research on existing conditions and local plans and projects. The research covers characteristics identified in Metro's *First Last Mile Strategic Plan & Planning Guidelines*: street grid, pedestrian shed, vehicular speeds, key access corridors, bicycle and pedestrian collisions, pedestrian facilities, bicycle connections, transit connections, land use, and points of interest. Early opportunities and constraints are identified in this document.
- V. **Community Engagement & Local Coordination:** This document provides information on the different activities conducted to procure community input and feedback for the planning process. Activities include stakeholder interviews, walk-audits, roundtable discussions, and surveys. It also provides information on meetings with local agencies and offices.
- VI. **Walk Audit Summary:** This document summarizes data from walk audits conducted by both community members and technical teams. Observations made by auditors as they walk along station area streets are mapped, aggregated, and analyzed to help inform the types of FLM improvements needed.
- VII. **Project Origins:** This document provides a high-level overview of how FLM Plan improvement ideas were sourced. For each station area and each Pathway Network segment, the document explains whether the origin was from technical or community walk-audits, stakeholder interviews, community roundtables, and/or the map-based survey. Some projects may have also been derived from separate technical team analysis.
- VIII. **Cost Assumptions:** This document summarizes the project elements and unit cost assumptions used in the development of conceptual-level cost estimates. It is divided into pedestrian and bicycle improvements.

# Core Documents

# Next stop: a better journey.

## PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN Section 1 – Pathway Maps



**Metro**<sup>®</sup>

FALL 2021

# First/Last Mile Toolkit


## Proposed Improvements for Pedestrians

Images are for illustrative purposes only.





 **Bus Stop Improvements**  
*Enhanced shelter, bench, real-time signage, and other amenities*





 **Landscaping & Shade**  
*Understory planting and street trees*




 **New or Improved Crosswalks**  
*New or upgraded crosswalks e.g. continental crosswalks*




 **Pedestrian Lighting**  
*Human-scaled lighting for comfort and safety*




 **Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions**  
*New sidewalks, widening, sidewalk extensions at corners, or upgrades to existing sidewalks*




 **Street Furniture**  
*Public benches, trash receptacles, and other sidewalk amenities*



 **Traffic Calming**  
*Measures to reduce traffic speeds, including speed humps, chokers, and other treatments*



 **Wayfinding Signs**  
*Signs that point to local destinations*

# First/Last Mile Toolkit

## Proposed Improvements for Bicyclists

Images are for illustrative purposes only.



Photo Credit: Joe Linton



### Sharrow

Street with lower vehicular speeds and traffic volumes, which are designed for shared use with cyclists via “sharrow” markings



### Bicycle Boulevard

Street with lower vehicular speeds and traffic volumes, which are specially enhanced for cyclists through landscaping, lighting, signage, and other improvements



### Bicycle Lane

On-street bicycle facility identified with striping



### Protected Bicycle Lane

On-street bicycle facility that is physically separated from vehicular traffic




### Shared Use Path (off-street)

Off-street, paved pathway used by cyclists and pedestrians



### Bicycle Friendly Intersection

Intersection improvements that enhance bicycle movement and safety



### Mobility Hub

Enhanced amenities for cyclists and micro-mobility users, such as secure bike parking, repair stations, rideshare, pick up and drop off, wayfinding, and real-time transit information.



# Wilshire/La Cienega Station

## Overview

The Wilshire/La Cienega Station study area is located within both the City of Beverly Hills and the City of Los Angeles. The station will serve dense commercial areas along Wilshire Blvd and La Cienega Blvd, as well as adjacent residential neighborhoods.

The main arterials of Wilshire Blvd and La Cienega Blvd would benefit from the full suite of first/last mile improvements, to provide comfortable, and safe direct pedestrian access to the station. These streets are wide commercial corridors with wide sidewalks that could accommodate new trees, pedestrian lighting, street furniture, wayfinding, enhanced crosswalks, sidewalk/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements. Wilshire Blvd is a bus priority corridor for Metro and recommended improvements will be coordinated with bus operations. Proposed improvements on Wilshire Blvd and La Cienega Blvd will support one of the possible “Expanded” options from the City of Beverly Hills’ Connect Beverly Hills streetscape project, for the length of the corridor.

Community members emphasized the need for pedestrian improvements along San Vicente Blvd. San Vicente Blvd is a wide street, including six lanes and a landscaped median. The street runs diagonally across the eastern half of the station area and poses an access barrier. To enhance access, safety, and comfort, pedestrian and bike improvements are recommended along San Vicente Blvd, including enhanced crosswalks, bus stop improvements, lighting, wayfinding, bike friendly intersections, and


enhanced bike facilities. San Vicente Blvd acts as the dividing line between the City of Beverly Hills and the City of Los Angeles. Beverly Hills proposes a bicycle lane along the western side of the street, while Los Angeles proposes a protected bicycle facility. LA Metro recommends a protected bicycle lane along San Vicente Blvd to protect riders from high speed and high volume vehicular traffic.

Clifton Way, Charleville Blvd, Gregory Way, 6th St, Willaman Dr, Le Doux Rd, Orlando Ave/Gale Dr, and Sweetzer Ave are identified as first/last mile collector pathways. These streets connect residential areas to the first/last mile arterials. Recommendations on collector streets include pedestrian lighting, sidewalk/curb extensions, and enhanced crosswalks.




Due to high traffic volumes and uncomfortable conditions for people riding bikes on Wilshire Blvd and La Cienega Blvd, alternative adjacent streets are recommended for bicycle access, including Le Doux Rd, Charleville Blvd, and Clifton Way. When possible, bike boulevards should include traffic calming measures such as speed humps or mini-roundabouts. Traffic calming improvements are proposed on Clifton Way and Le Doux Rd to make the experience more comfortable for people riding bikes. The first/last mile bike network supports the City of LA’s proposed protected bicycle lane on San Vicente and the City of Beverly Hills’ proposed protected bike lanes on Charleville Blvd and Gregory Way as a potential one way couplet.

# Wilshire/La Cienega Station






## Pedestrian Pathway Network Map



### Legend

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  City Boundary

### Pedestrian Pathway Network

-  FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Public Shortcut)
-  Spot Improvements
-  Corridor Improvements

### Proposed Improvements

-  Bus Stop Enhancements
-  Landscaping and Shade
-  New or Improved Crosswalks
-  Pedestrian Lighting
-  Sidewalk/Curb Extensions
-  Street Furniture
-  Traffic Calming
-  Wayfinding Signs\*

\*This plan identifies key corridors that would benefit from wayfinding signs. A comprehensive wayfinding plan is recommended for the full station area.

# Wilshire/La Cienega Station

## Bicycle Pathway Network Map



Legend	Existing Bicycle Facilities	City/County Plan Proposed Facilities	First/Last Mile Proposed Facilities
Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)	Sharrow	Sharrow	Sharrow
Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)	Bicycle Boulevard	Bicycle Boulevard	Bicycle Boulevard
City Boundary	Bicycle Lane	Bicycle Lane	Bicycle Lane
	Protected Bicycle Lane	Protected Bicycle Lane	Protected Bicycle Lane
	Shared Use Path (off-street)	Shared Use Path (off-street)	Shared Use Path (off-street)
	Bicycle Friendly Intersection		Bicycle Friendly Intersection
	Mobility Hub		Mobility Hub

# Wilshire/Fairfax Station

## Overview

The Wilshire/Fairfax station will be located at the intersection of Ogden Dr and Wilshire Blvd and will serve regional destinations such as LACMA, the La Brea Tar Pits, and the Petersen Automotive Museum. Park La Brea is a high density apartment complex located in the northeast quadrant of the station area. The Farmers Market and the Grove are located north of the station area. Little Ethiopia is located on Fairfax Ave south of Olympic Blvd.


Pedestrian amenities should be focused on Fairfax Ave and Wilshire Blvd to enhance the experience for those walking to and from these destinations. Proposed improvements include street trees, lighting, and street furniture, and wayfinding. Bus stop enhancements and enhanced sidewalks are also proposed on Wilshire Blvd. Wilshire Blvd is a bus priority corridor for Metro and recommended improvements will be coordinated so as not to impede bus operations.

Proposed first/last mile collectors mainly serve residential uses in the station area, including Crescent Heights Blvd, McCarthay Vista, Ogden Dr, Curson Ave, 6th St, 8th St/Del Valle Dr, and San Vicente Blvd. Improvements on these streets include street trees, lighting, and enhanced crosswalks. San Diego Way, and the walkway at LACMA between 6th St and Wilshire Blvd are identified as cut-through pathways. Wayfinding is proposed on these cut-throughs to help direct pedestrians to and from the station.

As an alternative to Wilshire Blvd, bike facilities are proposed along 6th St and 8th St/Del Valle Dr. These streets offer lower vehicular traffic volumes and a more comfortable experience for people riding bikes, as compared to Wilshire Blvd. Traffic calming is proposed on 6th St to further enhance the comfort for bicyclists. The first/last mile bike network supports the City of LA proposed bicycle lane on Fairfax Ave and the protected bike lane on San Vicente Blvd.

# Wilshire/Fairfax Station

## Pedestrian Pathway Network Map



Legend	Pedestrian Pathway Network	Proposed Improvements	
Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)	FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)	Bus Stop Enhancements	Sidewalk/Curb Extensions
Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)	FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)	Landscaping and Shade	Street Furniture
	FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Public Shortcut)	New or Improved Crosswalks	Traffic Calming
	Spot Improvements	Pedestrian Lighting	Wayfinding Signs*
	Corridor Improvements		

\*This plan identifies key corridors that would benefit from wayfinding signs. A comprehensive wayfinding plan is recommended for the full station area.

# Wilshire/Fairfax Station

## Bicycle Pathway Network Map



Legend	Existing Bicycle Facilities	City/County Plan Proposed Facilities	First/Last Mile Proposed Facilities
Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)	Sharrow	Sharrow	Sharrow
Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)	Bicycle Boulevard	Bicycle Boulevard	Bicycle Boulevard
	Bicycle Lane	Bicycle Lane	Bicycle Lane
	Protected Bicycle Lane	Protected Bicycle Lane	Protected Bicycle Lane
	Shared Use Path (off-street)	Shared Use Path (off-street)	Shared Use Path (off-street)
	Bicycle Friendly Intersection		Bicycle Friendly Intersection
	Mobility Hub		Mobility Hub

# Wilshire/La Brea Station

## Overview

The Wilshire/La Brea Station is located at the intersection of Wilshire Blvd and La Brea Ave and will connect transit users to commercial areas along these streets, as well as adjacent residential neighborhoods.


Pedestrian improvements are focused along first/last mile arterials Wilshire Blvd and La Brea Ave. Wilshire Blvd is a major vehicular thoroughfare and bus priority corridor. Landscaping and shade, lighting, enhanced sidewalks, street furniture, and enhanced crossings would improve the experience for people walking along Wilshire Blvd. Recommendations on Wilshire Blvd will be coordinated so as to not impede bus operations. La Brea Blvd has wide sidewalks and would benefit from street trees, lighting, and bus stop enhancements along its length. Wayfinding is also recommended on these streets to help orient people walking to and from the Wilshire/La Brea station.
















Collector streets provide connections to destinations such as Park La Brea, Mansfield Ave Park, and Wilshire Crest Elementary School. Recommended pedestrian amenities that will improve the experience for people walking along these streets include landscaping and shade, lighting, improved sidewalks/curb extensions, traffic calming, and enhanced crosswalks.

The first/last mile bike network supports the City of LA proposed bike lane on La Brea Ave. Cochran Ave and Mansfield Ave are recommended as bike boulevards that provide alternative bike routes to La Brea Ave. 8th St is recommended as a bike boulevard south of Wilshire Blvd. A bicycle facility is proposed along 6th St, ending at La Brea Ave. Bicycle riders will be able to jog north/south along La Brea Blvd to connect to the first/last mile proposed bicycle boulevard on 4th St, creating a continuous east/west connection for bicyclists.

# Wilshire/La Brea Station

## Pedestrian Pathway Network Map



<p><b>Legend</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)</li> <li> Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Pedestrian Pathway Network</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)</li> <li> FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)</li> <li> FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Public Shortcut)</li> <li> Spot Improvements</li> <li> Corridor Improvements</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed Improvements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> Bus Stop Enhancements</li> <li> Landscaping and Shade</li> <li> New or Improved Crosswalks</li> <li> Pedestrian Lighting</li> <li> Sidewalk/Curb Extensions</li> <li> Street Furniture</li> <li> Traffic Calming</li> <li> Wayfinding Signs*</li> </ul>
--	---	---

\*This plan identifies key corridors that would benefit from wayfinding signs. A comprehensive wayfinding plan is recommended for the full station area.



# Wilshire/La Brea Station

## Bicycle Pathway Network Map



Legend	Existing Bicycle Facilities	City/County Plan Proposed Facilities	First/Last Mile Proposed Facilities
Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)	Sharrow	Sharrow	Sharrow
Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)	Bicycle Boulevard	Bicycle Boulevard	Bicycle Boulevard
	Bicycle Lane	Bicycle Lane	Bicycle Lane
	Protected Bicycle Lane	Protected Bicycle Lane	Protected Bicycle Lane
	Shared Use Path (off-street)	Shared Use Path (off-street)	Shared Use Path (off-street)
	Bicycle Friendly Intersection	Bicycle Friendly Intersection	Bicycle Friendly Intersection
	Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub

# Three-Mile Bicycle Network

## Overview

The Three-Mile Bicycle Network denotes existing bicycle facilities, City/County Plan proposed bicycle facilities, and bicycle facilities proposed as part of the Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile (FLM) Plan. The FLM proposed bicycle facilities extend beyond the half-mile pedestrian access shed in numerous locations to expand bicycle connectivity between the Section 1 stations and existing and City/County Plan proposed bicycle facilities.

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) defines the bicycle catchment radius to be three miles from a transit station. This threshold corresponds to a number of funding mechanisms under FTA policy. The three-mile shed is an appropriate limit for other active transportation micro-mobility users as well, such as skateboarders and e-scooter riders.

The FLM proposed bicycle facilities may not extend to the three-mile radius limit in all cases. Instead, these proposed facilities may terminate once they connect with regional bicycle facilities identified City/County Plans or major destinations located within the three-mile radius.

Once implemented, the Three-Mile Bicycle Network would enhance key bicycle connections in both north-south and east-west directions to the Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 stations. Within the half-mile station areas, these key north-south corridors include Robertson Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, La Brea Avenue, Redondo Boulevard, and Highland Avenue. Key east-west corridors include 6th Street, San Vicente Boulevard, Wilshire Boulevard, Charleville Boulevard, Gregory Way, and 8th Street.

# Three-Mile Bicycle Network



## Purple (D Line) Extension

- Metro Station (under construction)
- Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
- 1/2 mile radius
- Existing Metro Rail Lines

## Existing Bicycle Facilities

- Sharrow
- Bicycle Boulevard
- Bicycle Lane
- Protected Bicycle Lane
- Shared Use Path (off-street)


## City/County Plan Proposed Bicycle Facilities

- Sharrow
- Bicycle Boulevard
- Bicycle Lane
- Protected Bicycle Lane
- Shared Use Path (off-street)

## First/Last Mile Proposed Bicycle Facilities

- Sharrow
- Bicycle Boulevard
- Bicycle Lane
- Protected Bicycle Lane
- Shared Use Path (off-street)

\*Existing and City/County Plan proposed bicycle facilities are not shown within 1/2 mile radius of stations where first/last mile bicycle facilities are proposed. Refer to station specific Bicycle Pathway Network Maps for details.



# Next stop: a better journey.

## PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN Section 1 – Project List



**Metro**

FALL 2021

# PROJECT LIST

## WILSHIRE/LA CIENEGA STATION

Project	Description	Extents	Jurisdiction	Proposed Corridor Improvements	Proposed Spot Improvements	Proposed Project Justification
<b>Wilshire Blvd</b>	Arterial	Robertson Blvd to La Jolla Ave	City of LA, City of Beverly Hills	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, sidewalk/curb extensions, street furniture, wayfinding signs	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections, mobility hub	Wilshire Blvd provides connections to the Wilshire/La Cienega station, bus stops, restaurants, hotels, and Saban Theatre. The existing conditions analysis identified 19 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on Wilshire Blvd. Community members mentioned the street 100 times during engagement activities throughout the planning process. In addition, selecting Wilshire Blvd and the proposed pathway improvements will support one of the possible “Expanded” options from the City of Beverly Hills’ streetscape project, for the length of the corridor.
<b>La Cienega Blvd</b>	Arterial	3rd St to Pico Blvd	City of LA, City of Beverly Hills	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, sidewalk/curb extensions, street furniture, wayfinding signs	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	La Cienega Blvd provides connections to the Wilshire/La Cienega station, bus stops, La Cienega Park, Restaurant Row, and hotels. The existing conditions analysis identified 21 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on La Cienega Blvd. New or improved crosswalks were identified by community members as the most needed improvement on this street. La Cienega Ave came up 105 times during community engagement activities.
<b>Clifton Way</b>	Collector	Robertson Blvd to San Vicente Blvd (Ped); Rexford Dr to San Vicente Blvd (Bike)	City of Beverly Hills	Sidewalk/curb extensions, pedestrian lighting, traffic calming, bicycle boulevard	New or improved crosswalks, bike friendly intersections	Clifton Way provides an east-west route for people walking and biking north of Wilshire Blvd. The existing conditions analysis identified 4 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on Clifton Way. Clifton Way came up 16 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bicycle boulevard aligns with the City of LA’s Mobility Plan and City of Beverly Hills’ Complete Streets Plan proposed bike network.
<b>Charleville Blvd</b>	Collector	Swall Dr to Le Doux Rd (Ped); Lasky Dr to Le Doux Rd (Bike)	City of Beverly Hills	Pedestrian lighting, protected bicycle lane	Bike friendly intersections	Charleville Blvd provides an east-west route for people walking and biking south of Wilshire Blvd. The street provides connections to Horace Mann Elementary School. The existing conditions analysis identified 1 pedestrian and bicycle involved collision on this street. Charleville Blvd came up 1 time during community engagement activities. The first/last mile protected bike lane aligns with the City of LA’s Mobility Plan and City of Beverly Hills’ Complete Streets Plan proposed bike network.
<b>Gregory Way</b>	Collector	Le Doux Rd to Schumacher Dr (Ped); Robertson to Schumacher Dr (Bike)	City of LA, City of Beverly Hills	Pedestrian lighting, traffic calming, protected bicycle lane, sharrow	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	Gregory Way provides an east-west route for people walking and biking south of Wilshire Blvd and connections to La Cienega Park. The existing conditions analysis identified 11 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on this street. Gregory Way came up 9 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bike lane aligns with the City of LA’s Mobility Plan and City of Beverly Hills’ Complete Streets Plan proposed bike network.
<b>6th St</b>	Collector	San Vicente Blvd to La Jolla Ave	City of LA	Pedestrian lighting, bicycle boulevard	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	6th St provides an east-west route for people walking and biking east of San Vicente Blvd. 6th St came up 7 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bike lane aligns with the City of LA’s Mobility Plan proposed bike network.
<b>Willaman Dr</b>	Collector	Clifton Way to Charleville Blvd (Ped); Clifton Way to Gregory Way (Bike)	City of Beverly Hills	Pedestrian lighting, sharrow	New or improved crosswalks, bike friendly intersections	Willaman Dr serves as a north-route for residential areas west of La Cienega Blvd. The existing conditions analysis identified 1 bicycle involved collision on this street. Willaman Dr came up 9 time during community engagement activities. The first/last mile sharrow closes the gap in the City of LA’s Mobility Plan proposed bike network between Clifton Way and Gregory Way, within the City of Beverly Hills.

# PROJECT LIST

## WILSHIRE/LA CIENEGA STATION (CONTINUED)

Project	Description	Extents	Jurisdiction	Proposed Corridor Improvements	Proposed Spot Improvements	Proposed Project Justification
<b>Le Doux Rd</b>	Collector	Burton Way to Whitworth Dr (Ped); Burton Way to Pico Blvd (Bike)	City of LA, City of Beverly Hills	Sidewalk/curb extensions, pedestrian lighting, traffic calming, bicycle boulevard	New or improved crosswalks, bike friendly intersections	Le Doux Rd provides connections to La Cienega Park and an alternative north-south route, west of La Cienega Blvd. The existing conditions analysis identified 7 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on Le Doux Rd. Le Doux Rd came up 17 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bicycle boulevard extends the City of Beverly Hills proposed bicycle boulevard through the station area.
<b>San Vicente Blvd</b>	Collector	Burton Way to La Jolla Ave	City of LA, City of Beverly Hills	Pedestrian lighting, wayfinding signage, protected bicycle lane	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	San Vicente Blvd provides connections to bus stops and the Cedars-Sinai Outpatient Rehabilitation Program. The existing conditions analysis identified 6 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on San Vicente Blvd. San Vicente Blvd came up 68 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile protected bike lane aligns with the City of LA's Mobility Plan proposed bike network. The City of Beverly Hills' Complete Streets plan proposes a south bound bike lane.
<b>Gale Dr/ Orlando Ave</b>	Collector	Gregory Way to 3rd St (Ped); Gregory Way to 3rd St (Bike)	City of LA, City of Beverly Hills	Pedestrian lighting, bicycle boulevard, sharrow	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections, mobility hub	Gale Dr/Orlando Ave provides connections to La Cienega Park, Saban Theatre, the City of Beverly Hill's proposed Mobility Hub, and residential areas. The existing conditions analysis identified 2 pedestrian involved collisions on this street. Gale Dr/Orlando Ave came up 4 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bicycle boulevard enhances City of LA's Mobility Plan proposed sharrow on Orlando Ave. The first/last mile proposed sharrow aligns with the City of Beverly Hills' Connect Beverly Hills Plan proposed sharrow on Gale Dr.
<b>Sweetzer Ave</b>	Collector	Wilshire Blvd to 3rd St (Ped); Wilshire Blvd to Beverly Blvd (Bike)	City of LA	Pedestrian lighting, bike boulevard	Bike friendly intersections	Sweetzer Ave provides a north-south route for residential areas east of San Vicente Blvd. Sweetzer came up 5 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bicycle boulevard provides an enhanced alternative to the City of LA's Mobility Plan proposed sharrow on Sweetzer Ave.
<b>Hayes Dr</b>	Collector	Santa Ynez Wy to Foster Dr (Bike)	City of LA	Sharrow	N/A	The Hayes Dr recommended sharrows extend the east/west facility that ends on Gregory Wy. The recommended bicycle sharrow markings aligned with what the City has proposed.
<b>Santa Ynez Way</b>	Cut-through	Hayes Dr to Olympic Blvd	City of LA	Pedestrian lighting	N/A	Santa Ynez Way is a pedestrian walkway that cuts through two residential blocks. Santa Ynez Way was noted 1 time during the community walk audits.

# PROJECT LIST

## WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX STATION

Project	Description	Extents	Proposed Corridor Improvements	Proposed Spot Improvements	Proposed Project Justification
Wilshire Blvd	Arterial	La Jolla Ave to Masselin Ave	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, sidewalk/curb extensions, street furniture, wayfinding signage	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections, mobility hub	Wilshire Blvd provides connections to the Wilshire/Fairfax station, LACMA, La Brea Tar Pits, and the Petersen Automotive Museum. The existing conditions analysis identified 17 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on Wilshire Blvd. Community members mentioned the street 79 times during engagement activities throughout the planning process. In addition, selecting Wilshire Blvd and the proposed pathway improvements will support one of the possible "Expanded" options from the City of Beverly Hill's Connect Beverly Hills project, for the length of the corridor.
Fairfax Ave	Arterial	3rd St to Pico Blvd	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, street furniture, wayfinding signage, bicycle lane	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	Fairfax Ave provides connections to the Wilshire/Fairfax station, bus stops, LACMA, Shalhevet High School, Park La Brea, Farmers Market and The Grove. The existing conditions analysis identified 31 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on Fairfax Ave. Fairfax Ave came up 55 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bicycle lane aligns with the City of LA's proposed bike network.
6th St	Collector	La Jolla Ave to Masselin Ave	Pedestrian lighting, traffic calming, wayfinding signage, bicycle boulevard, protected bicycle lane	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	6th St provides connections to the LACMA, Park La Brea, and the La Brea Tar Pits. The existing conditions analysis identified 14 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on 6th St. 6th St came up 15 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bicycle lane aligns with the City of LA's proposed bike network. The first/last mile protected bicycle lane aligns with the City of LA's proposed bike network east of Fairfax Ave. The first/last mile bicycle boulevard west of Fairfax Ave provides an alternative that preserves on-street parking.
8th St/Del Valle Dr	Collector	McCarthy Vista to Hauser Blvd	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, sidewalk/curb extensions, bicycle lane, bicycle boulevard	New or improved crosswalks, bike friendly intersections	8th St/Del Valle Dr provides an east-west route south of Wilshire Blvd. The existing conditions analysis identified 6 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on 8th St/Del Valle Dr. 8th St/Del Valle Dr came up 35 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bicycle network provides enhanced alternatives to the City of LA's proposed sharrow along 8th St.
San Vicente Blvd	Collector	La Jolla Ave to Hauser Blvd (Ped); La Jolla Ave to Rimpau Blvd (Bike)	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, protected bicycle lane	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	San Vicente Blvd provides connections to bus stops, Shalhevet High, and the Olympia Medical Center. The existing conditions analysis identified 8 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on San Vicente Blvd. San Vicente Blvd came up 13 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile protected bicycle lane aligns with the City of LA's proposed bike network.
Crescent Heights Blvd/McCarthy Vista	Collector	3rd St to San Vicente Blvd	Pedestrian lighting	New or improved crosswalks, bike friendly intersections	Crescent Heights Blvd/McCarthy Vista provides a north-south route west of Fairfax Ave. The existing conditions analysis identified 4 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on Crescent Heights Blvd/McCarthy Vista. Crescent Heights Blvd/McCarthy Vista came up 22 times during community engagement activities.
Ogden Dr	Collector	Olympic Blvd to Wilshire Blvd	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, bicycle boulevard, wayfinding signage	New or improved crosswalks, bike friendly intersections	Ogden Dr provides an north-south route to the Wilshire/Fairfax station, east of Fairfax Ave. Ogden Dr came up 26 times during community engagement activities.
Curson Ave	Collector	San Vicente Blvd to 8th St	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, bicycle boulevard	New or improved crosswalks, bike friendly intersections	Curson Ave provides a north-south route for residential areas in the quadrant of the station area. The existing conditions analysis identified 6 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on Curson Ave. Curson Ave came up 10 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bicycle boulevard provides an enhanced alternative to the City of LA's proposed sharrow.
San Diego Way	Cut-through	Barrows Dr to Wilshire Blvd	Wayfinding signage	N/A	San Diego Way is a pedestrian walkway that cuts through three residential blocks between Wilshire Blvd and Barrows Dr.
LACMA Plaza	Cut-through	6th St to Wilshire Blvd	Wayfinding signage	N/A	LACMA Plaza provides a pedestrian shortcut between 6th St and Wilshire Blvd. The cut-through will connect to the Wilshire/Fairfax Station.

# PROJECT LIST

## WILSHIRE / LA BREA STATION

Project	Description	Extents	Proposed Corridor Improvements	Proposed Spot Improvements	Proposed Project Justification
Wilshire Blvd	Arterial	Masselin Ave to Rimpau Blvd	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, sidewalk/curb extensions, street furniture, wayfinding signage	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	Wilshire Blvd provides connections to the Wilshire/La Brea station, bus stops, restaurants and other commercial uses. The existing conditions analysis identified 43 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on Wilshire Blvd. Community members mentioned the street 28 times during engagement activities throughout the planning process. In addition, selecting Wilshire Blvd and the proposed pathway improvements will support one of the possible options from the City of Beverly Hill's streetscape project, for the length of the corridor.
La Brea Ave	Arterial	San Vicente Blvd to 2nd St (Ped); San Vicente Blvd to 3rd St (Bike)	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, wayfinding signage, bicycle lane	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	La Brea Ave provides connections to the Wilshire/La Brea station and commercial uses along its length. The existing conditions analysis identified 42 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on La Brea Ave. Bus stop enhancements were identified by community members as the most needed improvement on La Brea Ave. La Brea Ave came up 32 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bike lane aligns with the City of LA's Mobility Plan proposed bike network.
6th St	Collector	Masselin Ave to Rimpau Blvd (Ped) Masselin Ave to La Brea Ave (Bike)	Pedestrian lighting, traffic calming, protected bike lane, bicycle lane	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	6th St provides connections to John Borroughs Middle School and Park La Brea. Community members noted bike facilities as the most needed improvement on this street. 6th St came up 26 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bike facilities close the gap in the City of LA's proposed bicycle network between Hauser Blvd and Cochran Ave.
8th St	Collector	Hauser Blvd to Rimpau Blvd (Ped) Hauser Blvd to Muirfield Rd (Bike)	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, sidewalk/curb extensions, bicycle boulevard	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	8th St provides an alternative east-west route, south of Wilshire Blvd. The existing conditions analysis identified 23 pedestrian and bicycle involved collisions on 8th St. Community members noted bike facilities as the most needed improvement on this street. 8th St came up 25 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bicycle boulevard provides an enhanced alternative to the City of LA proposed sharrow.
Cochran Ave	Collector	3rd St to Edgewood Pl (Ped); Beverly Blvd to San Vicente Blvd (Bike)	Landscaping and shade, pedestrian lighting, sidewalk/curb extensions, bicycle boulevard	New or improved crosswalks, bike friendly intersections	Cochran Ave provides connections to Park La Brea and an alternative north-south route, west of La Brea Ave. Community members noted bike facilities as the most needed improvement on this street. Cochran Ave came up 29 times during community engagement activities. The first/last mile bicycle boulevard provides an enhanced alternative to the City of LA proposed sharrow on Cochran Ave and closes the gap between 6th St and 4th St.
Mansfield Ave	Collector	3rd St to Edgewood Pl (Ped); Beverly Blvd to Edgewood Pl (Bike)	Sidewalk/curb extensions, bicycle boulevard	New or improved crosswalks, bus stop enhancements, bike friendly intersections	Mansfield Ave provides connections to Wilshire Crest Elementary School and Mansfield Ave Park. Community members mentioned the street 3 times during engagement activities throughout the planning process. The first/last mile bicycle boulevard extends and provides an enhanced alternative to the City of LA proposed sharrow on Mansfield Ave between 4th St and 8th St.
Redondo Blvd	Bicycle lane	La Brea Blvd to Pico Blvd	Bicycle lane	N/A	The first/last mile bicycle lane aligns with the City of LA proposed bike network, and extends bicycle facilities further south, connecting riders to San Vicente Blvd.
4th St	Bike Boulevard	Cochran Ave to Arden Blvd	Bicycle boulevard	N/A	The first/last mile bicycle boulevard on 4th St provides an enhanced alternative to the existing sharrow. 4th St is a key east-west route north of Wilshire Blvd and connects to Park La Brea.



# Next stop: a better journey.

## PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN Section 1 – Rough-Order-of-Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimation



**Metro**<sup>®</sup>

FALL 2021

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
<b>FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS</b>					
La Cienega Boulevard	1	LS	\$ 5,562,300.00		\$ 5,562,300.00
Wilshire Boulevard	1	LS	\$ 6,110,100.00		\$ 6,110,100.00
Le Doux Road	1	LS	\$ 2,891,750.00		\$ 2,891,750.00
S Orlando Avenue/ N Gale Drive	1	LS	\$ 1,120,500.00		\$ 1,120,500.00
San Vicente Boulevard	1	LS	\$ 1,984,950.00		\$ 1,984,950.00
Clifton Way	1	LS	\$ 1,864,250.00		\$ 1,864,250.00
Charleville Boulevard	1	LS	\$ 1,542,000.00		\$ 1,542,000.00
Sweetzer Avenue	1	LS	\$ 975,550.00		\$ 975,550.00
Willaman Drive	1	LS	\$ 418,500.00		\$ 418,500.00
6th Street	1	LS	\$ 498,550.00		\$ 498,550.00
Gregory Way	1	LS	\$ 583,600.00		\$ 583,600.00
San Ynez Way	1	LS	\$ 141,400.00		\$ 141,400.00
Hayes Drive	1	LS	\$ 2,400.00		\$ 2,400.00
Wayfinding Sign Allowance (\$25K for Wayfinding Sign Allowance and \$5K for Wayfinding Sign Maintenance)	1	LS	\$ 30,000.00		\$ 30,000.00
Metro Factor			\$ 23,725,850.00	5%	\$ 1,186,292.50
<b>Construction Sub-Total</b>					<b>\$ 24,912,142.50</b>
<b>FTA SCC 80 SOFT COSTS</b>					
EIR/EIS Planning			\$ 24,912,142.50	2.0%	\$ 498,242.85
Artwork			\$ 24,912,142.50	0.5%	\$ 124,560.71
Preliminary Engineering			\$ 24,912,142.50	4.8%	\$ 1,195,782.84
Final Design Services			\$ 24,912,142.50	8.1%	\$ 2,017,883.54
Project Management for Design and Construction			\$ 24,912,142.50	9.8%	\$ 2,441,389.97
Construction Administration and Management			\$ 24,912,142.50	4.8%	\$ 1,195,782.84
Professional Liability & Other Non-Construction Insurance			\$ 24,912,142.50	0.003%	\$ 747.36
Legal, Permits, Review Fees by Other Agencies, Cities, and etc.			\$ 24,912,142.50	3.7%	\$ 921,749.27
Startup			\$ 24,912,142.50	1.6%	\$ 398,594.28
<b>Project Cost Sub-Total</b>					<b>\$ 8,794,733.67</b>
<b>FTA SCC 90 PROJECT CONTINGENCY</b>					
Unallocated			\$ 33,706,876.17	10.0%	\$ 3,370,687.62
<b>Project Cost</b>					<b>\$ 37,077,563.78</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates		Location: La Cienega Blvd (3rd St to Pico Blvd)			
					Prepared By: ESS
					Date: 2021-05-21
FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS					
ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners	0	Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements	11	Each	\$ 45,600	\$ 501,600	
Landscaping & Shade	10	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 406,000	
New or Improved Crosswalks	22	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 66,000	
New Sidewalks	26800	Sq. Ft.	\$ 44	\$ 1,179,200	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	148	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 1,494,800	
Street Furniture	37	Each	\$ 3,100	\$ 114,700	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 3,762,300.00</b>
Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates		Location: Wilshire Blvd (Robertson Blvd to S La Jolla Ave)			
					Prepared By: ESS
					Date: 2021-05-21
FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS					
ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners	40	Each	\$ 30,425	\$ 1,217,000	
Bus Stop Improvements	6	Each	\$ 45,600	\$ 273,600	
Landscaping & Shade	13	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 527,800	
New or Improved Crosswalks	24	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 72,000	
New Sidewalks	24800	Sq. Ft.	\$ 44	\$ 1,091,200	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	97	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 979,700	
Street Furniture	48	Each	\$ 3,100	\$ 148,800	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 4,310,100.01</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Le Doux Rd (Burton Wy to W Whitworth Dr)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners	30	Each	\$ 30,425	\$ 912,750	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks	17	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 51,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	110	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 1,111,000	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump	18	Each	\$ 3,000	\$ 54,000	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 2,128,750.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: S Orlando Ave/ N Gale Dr (3rd St to Gregory Wy)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements	2	Each	\$ 45,600	\$ 91,200	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks	4	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 12,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	80	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 808,000	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 911,200.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: San Vicente Blvd (Burton Wy to La Jolla Ave)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks	7	Leg	\$ 1,150	\$ 8,050	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	89	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 898,900	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 906,950.00</b>		

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Clifton Wy (Robertson Blvd to San Vicente Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners	26	Each	\$ 30,425	\$ 791,050	
Bus Stop Improvements	2	Each	\$ 45,600	\$ 91,200	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks	4	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 12,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	50	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 505,000	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump	8	Each	\$ 3,000	\$ 24,000	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 1,423,250.00</b>		

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Charleville Blvd (S Swall Dr to La Doux Rd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks		Leg	\$ -	\$ -	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	50	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 505,000	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 505,000.00</b>		

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Sweetzer Ave (3rd St to Wilshire Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks		Leg	\$ -	\$ -	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	63	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 636,300	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 636,300.00</b>		

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Willaman Dr (Clifton Wy to Charleville Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks		Leg	\$ -	\$ -	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	31	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 313,100	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 313,100.00</b>		

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: 6th St (San Vicente Blvd to S. La Jolla Ave)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements	2	Each	\$ 45,600	\$ 91,200	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks	3	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 9,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	31	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 313,100	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 413,300.00</b>		

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Gregory Wy (Le Doux Blvd to Schumacher Dr)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks		Leg	\$ -	\$ -	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	30	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 303,000	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump	5	Each	\$ 3,000	\$ 15,000	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 318,000.00</b>		

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Santa Ynez Way (Hayes Dr to Olympic Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks		Leg	\$ -	\$ -	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	14	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 141,400	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 141,400.00</b>		



Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates		Location: La Cienega Blvd (3rd St to Pico Blvd)			
					Prepared By: ESS
					Date: 2021-05-21
<b>FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS</b>					
ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub	1	Each	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,800,000	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 1,800,000.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates		Location: Wilshire Blvd (Robertson Blvd to S La Jolla Ave)			
					Prepared By: ESS
					Date: 2021-05-21
<b>FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS</b>					
ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub	1	Each	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,800,000	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 1,800,000.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Le Doux Rd (Burton Wy to Pico Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	4	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd	6600	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 363,000	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 763,000.00</b>

IBI Purple Line Cost Estimates

Location: S Orlando Ave/ N Gale Dr (3rd St to Gregory Wy)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	1	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
Sharrow	8	Each	\$ 600	\$ 4,800	
Bicycle Blvd	1900	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 104,500	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 209,300.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: San Vicente Blvd (Burton Wy to La Jolla Ave)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	7	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 700,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane	0.84	Mile	\$ 450,000	\$ 378,000	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 1,078,000.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Clifton Wy (Rexford Dr to San Vicente Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	1	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd	6200	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 341,000	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 441,000.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Charleville Blvd (Lasky Dr to La Doux Rd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	2	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 200,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane	1.86	Mile	\$ 450,000	\$ 837,000	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 1,037,000.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Sweetzer Ave (Beverly Blvd to Wilshire Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	1	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd	4350	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 239,250	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 339,250.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Willaman Dr (Clifton Wy to Gregory Wy)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	1	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
Sharrow	9	Each	\$ 600	\$ 5,400	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 105,400.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: 6th St (San Vicente Blvd to La Jolla Ave)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd	1550	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 85,250	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 85,250.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Gregory Wy (Robertson Blvd to Schumacher Dr)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	1	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
Sharrow	6	Each	\$ 600	\$ 3,600	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane	0.36	Mile	\$ 450,000	\$ 162,000	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 265,600.00</b>

IBI Purple Line Cost Estimates

Location: Hayes Dr (Santa Ynez Wy to Foster Dr)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Sharrow	4	Each	\$ 600	\$ 2,400	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 2,400.00</b>

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
<b>FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS</b>					
Fairfax Avenue	1	LS	\$ 5,116,709.09		\$ 5,116,709.09
Wilshire Boulevard	1	LS	\$ 2,519,550.00		\$ 2,519,550.00
8th Street/Del Valle Drive	1	LS	\$ 2,916,000.00		\$ 2,916,000.00
6th Street	1	LS	\$ 1,746,600.00		\$ 1,746,600.00
San Vicente Boulevard	1	LS	\$ 2,543,900.00		\$ 2,543,900.00
Curson Avenue	1	LS	\$ 707,500.00		\$ 707,500.00
Ogden Drive	1	LS	\$ 666,200.00		\$ 666,200.00
Crescent Heights Boulevard/McCarthy Vista	1	LS	\$ 850,300.00		\$ 850,300.00
Wayfinding Sign Allowance (\$25K for Wayfinding Sign Allowance and \$5K for Wayfinding Sign Maintenance)	1	LS	\$ 30,000.00		\$ 30,000.00
Metro Factor			\$ 17,096,759.09	\$ 5%	\$ 854,837.95
<b>Construction Sub-Total</b>					<b>\$ 17,951,597.05</b>
<b>FTA SCC 80 SOFT COSTS</b>					
EIR/EIS Planning			\$ 17,951,597.05	\$ 2.0%	\$ 359,031.94
Artwork			\$ 17,951,597.05	\$ 0.5%	\$ 89,757.99
Preliminary Engineering			\$ 17,951,597.05	\$ 4.8%	\$ 861,676.66
Final Design Services			\$ 17,951,597.05	\$ 8.1%	\$ 1,454,079.36
Project Management for Design and Construction			\$ 17,951,597.05	\$ 9.8%	\$ 1,759,256.51
Construction Administration and Management			\$ 17,951,597.05	\$ 4.8%	\$ 861,676.66
Professional Liability & Other Non-Construction Insurance			\$ 17,951,597.05	\$ 0.003%	\$ 538.55
Legal, Permits, Review Fees by Other Agencies, Cities, and etc.			\$ 17,951,597.05	\$ 3.7%	\$ 664,209.09
Startup			\$ 17,951,597.05	\$ 1.6%	\$ 287,225.55
<b>Project Cost Sub-Total</b>					<b>\$ 24,289,049.35</b>
<b>FTA SCC 90 PROJECT CONTINGENCY</b>					
Unallocated			\$ 24,289,049.35	\$ 10.0%	\$ 2,428,904.94
<b>Project Cost</b>					<b>\$ 26,717,954.29</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates		Location: Fairfax Avenue (3rd St to Pico Blvd)			
					Prepared By: ESS
					Date: 2021-05-21
FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS					
ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements	9	Each	\$ 45,600	\$ 410,400	
Landscaping & Shade	14	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 568,400	
New or Improved Crosswalks	23	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 69,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	152	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 1,535,200	
Street Furniture	38	Each	\$ 3,100	\$ 117,800	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 2,700,800.00</b>
Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates		Location: Wilshire Boulevard (La Jolla Ave to Masselin Ave)			
					Prepared By: ESS
					Date: 2021-05-21
FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS					
ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners	30	Each	\$ 30,425	\$ 912,750	
Bus Stop Improvements	4	Each	\$ 45,600	\$ 182,400	
Landscaping & Shade	9	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 365,400	
New or Improved Crosswalks	5	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 15,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	96	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 969,600	
Street Furniture	24	Each	\$ 3,100	\$ 74,400	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 2,519,550.00</b>



Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: 8th St/Del Valle (McCarthy Vista to Hauser Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners	38	Each	\$ 30,425	\$ 1,156,150	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade	11	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 446,600	
New or Improved Crosswalks	10	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 30,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	90	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 909,000	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 2,541,750.00</b>		

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: 6th Street (La Jolla Ave to Masselin Ave)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks	4	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 12,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	94	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 949,400	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump	16	Each	\$ 3,000	\$ 48,000	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 1,009,400.00</b>		

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: San Vicente (La Jolla Dr to Hauser Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade	9	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 365,400	
New or Improved Crosswalks		Leg	\$ -	\$ -	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	110	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 1,111,000	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 1,476,400.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Curson Ave (8th St to San Vicente Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade	2	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 81,200	
New or Improved Crosswalks		Leg	\$ -	\$ -	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	41	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 414,100	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 495,300.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: S. Ogden Dr. (Wilshire Blvd to Olympic Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade	2	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 81,200	
New or Improved Crosswalks		Leg	\$ -	\$ -	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	38	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 383,800	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 465,000.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Crescent Heights Blvd/McCarthy Vista (3rd St to San Vicente)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks	4	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 12,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	83	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 838,300	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 850,300.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates Location: Fairfax Avenue (3rd St to Pico Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub	1	Each	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,800,000	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	4	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes	1.44	Mile	\$ 150,000	\$ 215,909	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 2,415,909.09</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates Location: Wilshire Boulevard (La Jolla Ave to Masselin Ave)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ -</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: 8th St/Del Valle (McCarthy Vista to Hauser Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	2	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 200,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd	1750	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 96,250	
Class II Bike Lanes	0.52	Mile	\$ 150,000	\$ 78,000	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 374,250.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: 6th Street (La Jolla Ave to Masselin Ave)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	4	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd	2040	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 112,200	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane	0.50	Mile	\$ 450,000	\$ 225,000	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 737,200.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates Location: San Vicente (La Jolla Ave to Rimpau Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	1	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane	2.15	Mile	\$ 450,000	\$ 967,500	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 1,067,500.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates Location: Curson Ave. (8th St to San Vicente Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	1	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd	2040	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 112,200	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 212,200.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates Location: S. Ogden Dr. (Wilshire Blvd to Olympic Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	1	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd	1840	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 101,200	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 201,200.00</b>

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
<b>FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS</b>					
La Brea Avenue	1	LS	\$ 4,987,600.00		\$ 4,987,600.00
Wilshire Boulevard	1	LS	\$ 3,739,000.00		\$ 3,739,000.00
8th Street	1	LS	\$ 4,114,720.00		\$ 4,114,720.00
Cochran Avenue	1	LS	\$ 3,259,400.00		\$ 3,259,400.00
Mansfield Avenue	1	LS	\$ 1,879,600.00		\$ 1,879,600.00
6th Street	1	LS	\$ 1,809,900.00		\$ 1,809,900.00
4th Street	1	LS	\$ 360,250.00		\$ 360,250.00
Wayfinding Sign Allowance (\$25K for Wayfinding Sign Allowance and \$5K for Wayfinding Sign Maintenance)	1	LS	\$ 30,000.00		\$ 30,000.00
Metro Factor				5%	\$ 1,009,023.50
<b>Construction Sub-Total</b>					<b>\$ 21,189,493.50</b>
<b>FTA SCC 80 SOFT COSTS</b>					
EIR/EIS Planning	\$ 21,189,493.50		2.0%	\$ 423,789.87	
Artwork	\$ 21,189,493.50		0.5%	\$ 105,947.47	
Preliminary Engineering	\$ 21,189,493.50		4.8%	\$ 1,017,095.69	
Final Design Services	\$ 21,189,493.50		8.1%	\$ 1,716,348.97	
Project Management for Design and Construction	\$ 21,189,493.50		9.8%	\$ 2,076,570.36	
Construction Administration and Management	\$ 21,189,493.50		4.8%	\$ 1,017,095.69	
Professional Liability & Other Non-Construction Insurance	\$ 21,189,493.50		0.003%	\$ 635.68	
Legal, Permits, Review Fees by Other Agencies, Cities, and etc.	\$ 21,189,493.50		3.7%	\$ 784,011.26	
Startup	\$ 21,189,493.50		1.6%	\$ 339,031.90	
<b>Project Cost Sub-Total</b>				<b>35.3%</b>	<b>\$ 7,480,526.89</b>
<b>FTA SCC 90 PROJECT CONTINGENCY</b>					
Unallocated	\$ 28,670,020.39		10.0%	\$ 2,867,002.04	
<b>Project Cost</b>					<b>\$ 31,537,022.43</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates Location: La Brea Ave (San Vicente Blvd to 2nd St)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements	9	Each	\$ 45,600	\$ 410,400	
Landscaping & Shade	10	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 406,000	
New or Improved Crosswalks	4	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 12,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	142	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 1,434,200	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 2,262,600.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates Location: Wilshire Blvd (Masselin Ave to Rimpau Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners	52	Each	\$ 30,425	\$ 1,582,100	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade	18	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 730,800	
New or Improved Crosswalks	8	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 24,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	129	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 1,302,900	
Street Furniture	32	Each	\$ 3,100	\$ 99,200	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 3,739,000.00</b>



Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: 8th St (Hauser Blvd to Rimpau Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners	52	Each	\$ 30,425	\$ 1,582,100	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade	15	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 609,000	
New or Improved Crosswalks	8	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 24,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	121	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 1,222,100	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 3,437,200.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Cochran Ave (3rd St to Edgewood Pl)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners	30	Each	\$ 30,425	\$ 912,750	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade	9	Block	\$ 40,600	\$ 365,400	
New or Improved Crosswalks	12	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 36,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	106	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 1,070,600	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 2,384,750.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Mansfield Ave. (3rd St to Edgewood Pl)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners	28	Each	\$ 30,425	\$ 851,900	
Bus Stop Improvements	2	Each	\$ 45,600	\$ 91,200	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks	8	Leg	\$ 3,000	\$ 24,000	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting		Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ -	\$ -	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 967,100.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: 6th St (Masselin Ave to Rimpau Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bulb-outs at Corners		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bus Stop Improvements		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Landscaping & Shade		Block	\$ -	\$ -	
New or Improved Crosswalks		Leg	\$ -	\$ -	
New Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Improved Sidewalks		Sq. Ft.	\$ -	\$ -	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	129	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	\$ 1,302,900	
Street Furniture		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Traffic Calming - Speed hump	21	Each	\$ 3,000	\$ 63,000	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 1,365,900.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates Location: La Brea Ave (San Vicente Blvd to 3rd St)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycle Hub	1	Each	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,800,000	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	7	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 700,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes	1.50	Mile	\$ 150,000	\$ 225,000	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 2,725,000.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates Location: 8th St (Hauser Blvd to Muirfield Rd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycled Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	3	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 300,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd	6864	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 377,520	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 677,520.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Cochran Ave (Beverly Blvd to San Vicente Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycled Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	-
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	4	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	-
Bicycle Blvd	8630	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 474,650	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	-
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	-
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	-
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 874,650.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Redondo Blvd. (La Brea Blvd to San Vicente Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycled Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	-
Bicycle Friendly Intersection		Each	\$ -	\$ -	-
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	-
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	-
Class II Bike Lanes	0.76	Mile	\$ 150,000	\$ 114,000	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	-
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	-
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 114,000.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: Mansfield Ave. (Beverly Blvd to Edgewood Pl)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycled Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	5	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 500,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd	7500	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 412,500	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 912,500.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: 6th St (Masselin Ave to La Brea Ave)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycled Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	3	Each	\$ 100,000	\$ 300,000	
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	
Bicycle Blvd		Feet	\$ -	\$ -	
Class II Bike Lanes	0.24	Mile	\$ 150,000	\$ 36,000	
Class IV Protected Bike Lane	0.24	Mile	\$ 450,000	\$ 108,000	
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 444,000.00</b>

Purple (D Line) Cost Estimates

Location: 4th St (Cochran Ave to Arden Blvd)

Prepared By: ESS  
Date: 2021-05-21

**FTA SCC-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

ITEM DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	AMOUNT		TOTAL AMOUNT
			Unit Cost	Amount	Amount
Bicycled Hub		Each	\$ -	\$ -	-
Bicycle Friendly Intersection		Each	\$ -	\$ -	-
Sharrow		Each	\$ -	\$ -	-
Bicycle Blvd	6550	Feet	\$ 55	\$ 360,250	
Class II Bike Lanes		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	-
Class II Protected Bike Lane - Raised Median		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	-
Class IV Protected Bike Lane		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	-
Shared Use Path		Mile	\$ -	\$ -	-
<b>PROJECT SUB-TOTAL</b>					<b>\$ 360,250.00</b>

# Supporting Documents

**Next stop: a better journey.**

**PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN**  
Section 1 – Existing Conditions



**Metro**<sup>®</sup>

FALL 2021



## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	IV-3
List of Figures .....	IV-3
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>IV-4</b>
<b>2. Purple Line Section 1 .....</b>	<b>IV-6</b>
2.1. Alignment .....	IV-6
2.2. Station Locations .....	IV-6
<b>3. Station Area Plans and Projects .....</b>	<b>IV-7</b>
3.1. Station Area Plans and Projects.....	IV-7
3.2. Citywide and Area Plans and Projects .....	IV-9
<b>4. Station Area Existing Conditions .....</b>	<b>IV-10</b>
4.1. Wilshire / La Brea Station .....	IV-15
4.2. Wilshire/Fairfax Station.....	IV-25
4.3. Wilshire/La Cienega Station .....	IV-35
<b>5. Analysis.....</b>	<b>IV-46</b>
5.1. Walking Opportunities and Constraints.....	IV-46
5.2. Bicycle Opportunities and Constraints.....	IV-49
5.3. Equity Opportunities and Constraints.....	IV-49
<b>6. Findings and Next Steps .....</b>	<b>IV-53</b>
6.1. FLM Areas of Interest for Walk Audit .....	IV-53
6.2. Corridors Highlighted for Further Analysis .....	IV-56
<b>Appendix A: Points of Interest Matrix .....</b>	<b>IV-56</b>
<b>Appendix B: Bus Transit Routes Matrix .....</b>	<b>IV-57</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Purple Line Extension Section 1 First Last Mile Planning Study Areas.....	IV-5
Figure 4.1: Purple Line Extension Section 1 Equity Focused Communities .....	IV-12
Figure 4.2: Purple Line Extension Section 1 Existing Bicycle Facilities .....	IV-13
Figure 4.3: Purple Line Extension Section 1 Points of Interest .....	IV-14
Figure 4.4: Wilshire / La Brea Station Street Grid .....	IV-17
Figure 4.5: Wilshire / La Brea Station Half-Mile Pedestrian Walk Shed .....	IV-18
Figure 4.6: Wilshire / La Brea Station Streets with High Vehicular Speeds.....	IV-19
Figure 4.7: Wilshire / La Brea Station Key Access Corridors .....	IV-20
Figure 4.8: Wilshire / La Brea Station Pedestrian Facilities.....	IV-21
Figure 4.9: Wilshire / La Brea Station Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions (2013-2017) .....	IV-22
Figure 4.10: Wilshire / La Brea Station Bus Transit Routes .....	IV-23
Figure 4.11: Wilshire / La Brea Station Land Use .....	IV-24
Figure 4.12: Wilshire / Fairfax Station Street Grid .....	IV-27
Figure 4.13: Wilshire / Fairfax Station Half-Mile Pedestrian Walk Shed .....	IV-28
Figure 4.14: Wilshire / Fairfax Station Streets with High Vehicular Speeds.....	IV-29
Figure 4.15: Wilshire / Fairfax Station Key Access Corridors .....	IV-30
Figure 4.16: Wilshire / Fairfax Station Pedestrian Facilities.....	IV-31
Figure 4.17: Wilshire / Fairfax Station Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions (2013-2017) .....	IV-32
Figure 4.18: Wilshire / Fairfax Station Bus Transit Routes.....	IV-33
Figure 4.19: Wilshire / Fairfax Station Land Use .....	IV-34
Figure 4.20: Wilshire / La Cienega Station Street Grid.....	IV-37
Figure 4.21: Wilshire / La Cienega Station Half-Mile Pedestrian Walk Shed.....	IV-38
Figure 4.22: Wilshire / La Cienega Station Streets with High Vehicular Speeds.....	IV-39
Figure 4.23: Wilshire / La Cienega Station Key Access Corridors.....	IV-40
Figure 4.24: Wilshire / La Cienega Station Pedestrian Facilities.....	IV-41
Figure 4.25: Wilshire / La Cienega Station Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions (2013-2017) .....	IV-42
Figure 4.26: Wilshire / La Cienega Station Bus Transit Routes.....	IV-43
Figure 4.27: Wilshire / La Cienega Station Land Use .....	IV-44
Figure 4.28: Wilshire / La Cienega Station School District Boundaries .....	IV-45
Figure 5.1: La Brea Avenue facing south toward Wilshire Boulevard.....	IV-46
Figure 5.2: Olympic Boulevard facing west toward San Vicente Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue .....	IV-47
Figure 5.3: San Vicente Boulevard facing east toward Wilshire Boulevard .....	IV-48
Figure 5.4: La Cienega Boulevard facing north on San Vicente Boulevard.....	IV-48
Figure 5.5: Wilshire / La Brea Station Median Household Income .....	IV-50
Figure 5.6: Wilshire / Fairfax Station Median Household Income.....	IV-51
Figure 5.7: Wilshire / La Cienega Station Median Household Income.....	IV-52
Figure 6.1: Corridors for Analysis .....	IV-55

## List of Tables

Table 4.1: Purple Line Extension Section 1 Existing Bicycle Facilities Matrix .....	IV-11
---	-------

## 1. Introduction

The Purple Line Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Plan is focused on identifying improvements for pedestrian and bicycle access to three new subway stations proposed as part of the extension of the Purple Line subway. The Purple Line is an underground subway line that originates at Union Station in Downtown Los Angeles and currently provides service to the west to its existing terminus at Wilshire Boulevard and Western Avenue. From the current terminus, the Purple Line Section 1 extension will extend the Purple Line nearly four miles westward and add three new stations, providing access to the Miracle Mile, Central Los Angeles, and southeast Beverly Hills. Section 1 is the first of a three-part planned extension, which will extend the Purple Line a total of approximately 9 miles westward while adding seven new stations.

The Purple Line Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Plan aims to increase the mobility, accessibility, safety, and level of comfort for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other active modes of transportation surrounding three proposed rail stations. This report details the existing conditions for the area encompassing the three future stations along the Purple Line Extension Section 1:

- Wilshire / La Brea Station
- Wilshire / Fairfax Station
- Wilshire / La Cienega Station

This existing conditions report focuses on the approximate half-mile radius surrounding each station area. This report details the current built environment, examining and documenting numerous factors related to improving station access for pedestrians and bicyclists. These factors include:


- The street network around each station
- Each station's approximate half-mile pedestrian walk shed, or the area within a pedestrian could comfortably walk to access the station within 15 minutes
- Streets with high vehicular speeds around each station
- Existing bicycle facilities, including bicycle parking, around each station
- Existing pedestrian facilities, including wayfinding, around each station
- Bicycle and pedestrian collisions within a half-mile of each station
- Key access corridors, or the most logical paths a pedestrian or cyclist would take to access the station
- Bus transit routes that serve the approximate half-mile radius of each station
- Land use within an approximate half-mile of each station
- Points of interest, including major transit hubs, within an approximate half-mile of each station
- Equity statistics within an approximate half-mile radius of each station
- School district boundaries within an approximate half-mile of each station

These factors were established in Metro's *First/Last Mile Strategic Plan & Planning Guidelines*, as well as the California Transportation Commission's *2019 Active Transportation Program Guidelines* and form the foundation for technical analysis of existing and future conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists in the station areas.


Figure 1.1 shows the location of the three future Purple Line stations for Section 1, as well as the approximate half-mile planning radius around each station.

# Purple Line Extension Section 1 Study Area

Figure 1.1




 Purple Line Extension Section 1 Station

 Purple Line Extension Section 1 Half-Mile Radii

 Metro





## 2. Purple Line Section 1

The Purple Line Extension Project is being built in three sections. This First/Last Mile Plan focuses on Section 1. For reference, the Purple Line Extension Section 2 and 3 extends from the Wilshire / La Cienega Station and continues through Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood.

### 2.1. Alignment

The Purple Line Extension Section 1 alignment begins at the current Wilshire Boulevard and Western Avenue terminus and extends westward underneath Wilshire Boulevard.

Section 1 of the Purple Line Extension adds 3.92 miles of track to Metro’s Rail system with three new stations at Wilshire/ La Brea, Wilshire/ Fairfax, and Wilshire/ La Cienega. This extension received approval from Metro’s Board in July 2014 for construction and is scheduled for completion in 2023. The remaining two sections of the Purple Line Extension are expected to be completed before the Los Angeles Summer Olympics in 2028.

### 2.2. Station Locations

There are three stations under construction for the Purple Line Extension Section 1. These stations are located at the northwest corner of Wilshire Boulevard and La Brea Avenue, the southeast corner of Wilshire Boulevard and Orange Grove Avenue (just east of Fairfax Avenue), and the northeast corner of Wilshire Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard.

### 3. Station Area Plans and Projects

This section discusses recent plans and programs completed or initiated by the City of Los Angeles and the City of Beverly Hills to plan for land use, transportation, or other improvements in the vicinity of the planned Section 1 stations. Information and recommendations contained in these plans will help to inform the development of the FLM pathway networks for each of the three Section 1 stations.

#### 3.1. Station Area Plans and Projects

The Purple Line Transit Neighborhood Plans (TNP) program, lead by Los Angeles City Planning and partially funded by Metro, aims to:

- establish new regulations and standards that encourage transit ridership
- promote job creation
- enhance the built environment by establishing standards for the design of new buildings
- focus new growth and housing in proximity to the three stations while maintaining the character of existing single-family neighborhoods
- Support walkable commercial corridors

Each station area is distinct and will be planned accordingly with different intensities, land uses, design guidelines, regulatory tools, and other strategies. The Purple Line TNP aims to foster a mix of uses around the transit stations that will encourage transit use and improve mobility for everyone. The goal of the TNP is to provide residents and employees with greater mobility choices and reduce automobile dependence.

The planning effort will develop new zoning for the three neighborhoods along the Purple Line, guide future development through 2040 through regulations on new developments. The Purple Line TNP established a vision for the plan including:

- Regional cultural and office hub along the Wilshire Boulevard corridor and major intersections
  - From the Plan: “Vibrant 24/7 activity and a fine grain of visitor-serving uses throughout the corridor, with high-quality and sustainable building design. Facilitate a compact mix of jobs and housing that complements existing uses and supports transit ridership. Enhance the regional center while promoting walkability and respecting the historic built environment by incorporating Miracle Mile Community Design Overlay regulations.”
- Improved walkability with a mix of uses on urban main streets, including La Brea Avenue, Fairfax Avenue, and San Vicente Boulevard
  - From the Plan: “Pedestrian friendly areas with small shops that serve adjacent neighborhoods and connect them to transit, while allowing some opportunities for more mixed-use development. These areas benefit from increased services and improved mobility and connections to Downtown and the Westside.”
- Compatibility with unique residential areas among the Citrus Avenue (south of Edgewood Place), Cloverdale Avenue (north of Wilshire Boulevard), and 6<sup>th</sup> Street (west of Fairfax Avenue) neighborhoods
  - From the Plan: “Use character and scale regulations to respect historically significant neighborhoods with a high percentage of rent-stabilized apartments. Consider additional density while ensuring compatibility through regulations that require new developments to be consistent with the existing pattern of development, massing, and prominent architectural features.”

The Purple Line TNP program has concluded its initial development, plan development, and concept plan and open house presentations. The Purple Line TNP is currently in the Environmental Review phase and has just concluded a Winter 2019 community engagement effort. Upcoming phases include Draft EIR and Draft Plan, Final EIR and Adoption, and finally plan implementation.

The Wilshire Community Plan is a part of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, which defines the framework by which the City's physical and economic resources are managed and utilized over time. The Wilshire Community Plan synthesizes the prevailing visions and objectives of the area's residents, property owners, and business owners. Policies and programs in the Wilshire Community Plan relate to land use, coordination opportunities, and urban design. The Wilshire Community Plan set forth planning goals and objectives to main the community's distinctive character by:

- Enhancing the positive characteristics of residential neighborhoods while improving a variety of housing opportunities
- Improving the function, design and economic vitality of commercial areas
- Preserving and enhancing the positive characteristics of existing uses while provide the foundation for community identity
- Maximizing development opportunities around existing and future transit systems while minimizing adverse impacts
- Preserving and strengthening commercial developments to provide a diverse job-producing economic base
- Improving the quality of the built environment through design guidelines, streetscape improvements, and other physical improvements which enhance appearance of the community

The Wilshire Community Plan identified public transit opportunities within the plan area to increase the use of public transit. Although the implementation of the Purple Line was not mentioned, this plan presented the following goals, with associated objectives and policies to achieve those goals:

- Develop additional public transit services which improve mobility with efficient, reliable, safe, convenient alternatives to automobile travel
- Encourage a system of safe, efficient, and attractive bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Encourage alternative modes of transportation to reduce single-occupancy vehicular trips
- Provide a well-maintained, safe, efficient freeway and street network

The Miracle Mile Community Design Overlay District (CDO) provides guidelines and standards to enhance the identity and promote the pedestrian environment of the District. One of the goals of the District is to encourage development that adds to a pedestrian friendly environment and contributes to the safety and comfort of both pedestrian and automobile traffic. The Miracle Mile CDO was set upon the principles of consistency, activity, pedestrian orientation, safety, and simplicity. These principles are achieved mainly through the community design, building orientation, and land use planning considerations.

### 3.2. Citywide and Area Plans and Projects

Mobility Plan 2035, an element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, provides the policy foundation for achieving a transportation system that balances the needs of all road users. One of the many key policy initiatives calls for the increased use of multi-modal options such as bus and rail transit, walking, and bicycling. The Purple Line Extension was identified in the Mobility Plan as a ‘Sign of Change’.

The Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles lays the foundation to create healthier communities for all Angelenos. The Plan calls for a balanced, multi-modal, and sustainable transportation system that offers safe and efficient options for all users. Within the outlined Transportation Element Policies, the Plan calls to promote local bus service in corridors served by the rail system, to increase transit ridership and prepare for future rail service.



## 4. Station Area Existing Conditions

It is critical to determine the existing conditions for first/last mile present in the vicinity of the three stations to be constructed in Section 1 of the Purple Line Extension Project. The following existing conditions analyses highlight key transportation features within the approximate half-mile radius for each of the three stations. This analysis serves as a preliminary station analysis, and examines access-related station area characteristics identified in Metro’s *First/Last Mile Strategic Plan & Planning Guidelines* and the California Transportation Commission’s *2019 Active Transportation Program Guidelines*. These access-related station area characteristics are:

- Street Grid
- Half-Mile Pedestrian Walk Shed
- Vehicular Speeds
- Key Access Corridors
- Pedestrian Facilities
- Bicycle Facilities
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions
- Bus Transit Routes
- Land Use
- Points of Interest
- School Districts
- Equity

Equity was determined by using Metro’s Equity Focused Communities (EFC data, which highlights the most equity-impacted communities on Los Angeles County. Three factors were chosen as factors that have the highest statistical correlation to gaps in opportunity. These were low income, non-white, and zero-car households. The top 30% of Los Angeles census tracts that had the highest share of the three factors above were captured to determine the EFC metric. No EFC census tracts were found in any of the three Purple Line Extension Section 1 approximate half-mile station areas. Figure 4.1 shows the extent of EFCs located in proximity to the Purple Line Extension Section 1.

Identifying bicycle connections are important to illustrate access to bicyclists, either by Class I bike paths, Class II bike lanes, or Class III shared bike routes. Bicycle infrastructure is crucial to identify in a 3-mile radius rather than a half-mile radius, as bicyclists understandably have a greater travel range than a pedestrian. There are a limited number of existing bike facilities within a three-mile radius of the station, listed below in Table 4.1. Bicycle facilities that come within approximately a half-mile from any station are listed in italics. Figure 4.2 shows all bicycle facilities in the 3-mile radius of the three station areas.


**Table 4.1: Purple Line Extension Section 1 Existing Bicycle Facilities Matrix**

<b>Bikeway Type</b>	<b>Street Name</b>	<b>Starting Street</b>	<b>Ending Street</b>
<b>Class II: Bicycle Lane</b>	<i>Hauser Blvd</i>	<i>6<sup>th</sup> St</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> St</i>
	<i>Burton Way</i>	<i>Le Doux Rd</i>	<i>S Doheny Dr</i>
	<i>San Vincente Ave</i>	<i>W Pico Blvd</i>	<i>S Redondo Blvd</i>
		<i>Wilshire Blvd</i>	<i>W Beverly Blvd</i>
	<i>Venice Blvd</i>	<i>N Robertson Blvd</i>	<i>N La Cienega Blvd</i>
		<i>Venice Way</i>	<i>Arlington Ave</i>
	<i>4<sup>th</sup> Ave</i>	<i>Bagley Ave</i>	<i>Crenshaw Blvd</i>
	<i>Santa Monica Blvd</i>	<i>Adams Blvd</i>	<i>W Pico Blvd</i>
	<i>Roxbury Dr</i>	<i>Thayer Ave</i>	<i>Avenue of the Stars</i>
	<i>Jefferson Blvd</i>	<i>Cashio St</i>	<i>Beverly Green Dr</i>
	<i>Exposition Blvd</i>	<i>La Cienega Blvd</i>	<i>Harcourt Ave</i>
		<i>Harcourt Ave</i>	<i>9<sup>th</sup> Ave</i>
	<i>Martin Luther King Jr Blvd</i>	<i>Clarrington Ave</i>	<i>Exposition Bl / Palms St</i>
		<i>Coliseum St</i>	<i>Olympic Blvd</i>
	<i>Motor Ave</i>	<i>Northvale Rd</i>	<i>Manning Ave</i>
		<i>Monte Mar Dr</i>	<i>W Pico Blvd</i>
	<i>Wilshire Blvd</i>	<i>S Beverly Glen Blvd</i>	<i>Comstock Ave</i>
	<i>7<sup>th</sup> St</i>	<i>S Catalina St</i>	<i>S Vermont Ave</i>
	<i>Oxford Ave</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> St</i>	<i>Beverly Blvd</i>
	<i>Bronson Ave</i>	<i>Santa Monica Blvd</i>	<i>Fountain Ave</i>
<i>Melrose Ave</i>		<i>Willoughby Ave</i>	
<i>Fairfax Ave</i>	<i>Fountain Ave</i>	<i>Hollywood Blvd</i>	
	<i>Redondo Blvd</i>	<i>Olympic Blvd</i>	<i>Jefferson Blvd</i>
<b>Class III: Sharrowed Bicycle Route</b>	<i>4<sup>th</sup> St</i>	<i>Cochran Ave</i>	<i>New Hampshire Ave</i>
	<i>Jefferson Blvd</i>	<i>La Cienega Pl</i>	<i>La Cienega Blvd</i>
	<i>S Harcourt Ave</i>	<i>Exposition Blvd</i>	<i>W Jefferson Blvd</i>
		<i>Wilshire Blvd</i>	<i>Arden Pl</i>
	<i>Arden Blvd</i>	<i>Arden Pl</i>	<i>Rossmore Ave</i>
		<i>Vine St</i>	<i>Melrose Ave</i>
	<i>Argyle Ave</i>	<i>Selma Ave</i>	<i>Carlos Ave</i>
	<i>Wilcox Ave</i>	<i>Willoughby Ave</i>	<i>Franklin Ave</i>
	<i>Selma Ave</i>	<i>N Highland Ave</i>	<i>Gower St</i>
	<i>Fountain Ave</i>	<i>Sycamore Ave</i>	<i>Western Ave</i>
	<i>Orange Dr</i>	<i>Willoughby Ave</i>	<i>Hollywood BLVD</i>
	<i>La Mirada Ave</i>	<i>N Bronson Ave</i>	<i>Van Ness Ave</i>
	<i>Willoughby Ave</i>	<i>N Vista St</i>	<i>Gower St</i>
	<i>Argyle Ave</i>	<i>Selma Ave</i>	<i>Yucca St</i>
	<i>New Hampshire Ave</i>	<i>6<sup>th</sup> St</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> St</i>
	<i>Lucerne Blvd</i>	<i>8<sup>th</sup> St</i>	<i>4<sup>th</sup> St</i>
	<b>Class III: Bicycle Route</b>	<i>Venice Blvd</i>	<i>Arlington Ave</i>
<i>Motor Ave</i>		<i>Manning Ave</i>	<i>Monte Mar Dr</i>
<b>Bicycle Friendly Street</b>	<i>Yucca St</i>	<i>N Highland Ave</i>	<i>Ivar Ave</i>

Identifying points of interest is crucial in determining what brings transit users to utilize future Purple Line stations. Points of interest include any major art, attractions, education, open space, or shopping facilities surrounding a station. Figure 4.3 shows points of interest within a three-mile radius of each of the three station areas. The specific points of interest identified are found in Appendix A.

# Purple Line Extension Section 1 Equity Focused Communities


Figure 4.1



- Equity Focused Communities
- Purple Line Extension Section 1 Half-Mile Radii




Source: LA Metro, 2019



# Purple Line Extension Section 1 Existing Bikeways

Figure 4.2




— Bicycle Friendly Street     — Class III: Sharrowed Bike Route

— Class II: Bike Lane     — Class III: Bike Route

  Section 1 Stations 3-Mile Radii




Source: LA Metro, 2015



# Purple Line Extension Section 1

## Points of Interest


Figure 4.3



- Art
- Education
- Public
- Section 1 Stations 3-Mile Radii
- Attraction
- Open Space
- Shopping



Source: IBI Group, 2020



## 4.1. Wilshire / La Brea Station

The Wilshire/La Brea Station is the first of the three new stations for the Purple Line Extension. The residential neighborhoods of Park La Brea, Hancock Park, and Miracle Mile surround the station, with corridors of active commercial, retail, and office space located along Wilshire Boulevard and La Brea Avenue.

The Wilshire/La Brea Station will be located on the northwest corner of Wilshire Boulevard and La Brea Avenue, and will serve as the eastern gateway to the Miracle Mile area as well as provide efficient north-south connections to La Brea Avenue.

An approximate half-mile radius around this station location extends north of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, and as far south as the La Brea Avenue/Orange Drive intersection. In addition, the approximate half-mile radius reaches west of Masselin Avenue, and as far east as Tremaine Avenue.

In general, the street network around the station follows a grid-like pattern, except for the area south of Wilshire Boulevard, which rotates the grid pattern approximately 30 degrees. Even though the grid-like pattern shifts slightly to the south of Wilshire Boulevard, many north/south streets line up directly on either side of Wilshire Boulevard, except for Citrus Avenue. The street grid around the station is shown in Figure 4.4.

A pedestrian walk shed is the area encompassed by a half-mile walking distance away from a transit station using the existing pedestrian network. Due to the existing street grid pattern around the Wilshire/La Brea Station, a pedestrian can reach either end of the station approximate half-mile radius, and most destinations are within a half-mile distance away from the station. The pedestrian walk shed is presented in Figure 4.5.

The approximate half-mile radius around the Wilshire/ La Brea Station features many streets with high vehicular speeds. Streets classified as Highway/Freeway, Arterial, or Collector by Caltrans in their Street Hierarchy dataset were determined as streets with high vehicle speeds. High vehicle speeds are those defined as greater than 25 miles per hour. Figure 4.6 shows streets with high vehicle speeds. Streets identified with high vehicular speeds are:

- Wilshire Boulevard
- Olympic Boulevard
- 8<sup>th</sup> Street
- 6<sup>th</sup> Street
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Street
- Hauser Boulevard
- La Brea Avenue
- Highland Avenue
- Redondo Boulevard

Key access corridors were determined by using Metro's Origin/Destination Analysis survey data and determining the locations where those who take active transportation begin or end their trip. The point data was used to determine the most logical route if that user were to access the station, and that pathway would be used to construct the key access corridor network. In summary, Metro's Origin/Destination survey identified origins and destinations a transit user may travel to. The key access corridors identify the most likely routes a pedestrian may take to get to or from the station considering

distance and travel time primarily. Figure 4.7 shows the key access corridors at the Wilshire / La Brea Station area.

Bus stops, sidewalks, and crosswalks were identified as pedestrian facilities. There are 22 bus stops in the Wilshire/La Brea Station area, mainly on Wilshire Boulevard and La Brea Avenue. There was only one section of street in the study area where sidewalks were missing, on Carling Way adjacent to the Wilshire/La Brea Station. In addition, there are 29 instances of missing crosswalks at intersections, either due to traffic flow purposes, the lack of traffic control (signal or stop-sign), or the intersection is located in a low traffic volume residential area. Figure 4.8 identifies the location of pedestrian facilities.

Bicycle and pedestrian collisions were identified from 2013 to 2017 to determine specific areas within a half-mile of the station that see higher rates of active transportation collisions. Data was used from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). Over this 5-year period, the highest rate of collisions were on Wilshire Boulevard, La Brea Avenue, and Olympic Boulevard. There were 66 bicycle and 72 pedestrian collisions within a half-mile of the Wilshire/La Brea Station from 2013 to 2017. Over the 5-year period, the most common causes of collisions occurred when an automobile violated pedestrian right-of-way (34), a pedestrian violated automobile right-of-way (20), and pedestrian violations (17). Most of these collisions occurred on the intersections of La Brea Avenue/ 3<sup>rd</sup> Street (12), Wilshire Avenue/ Highland Avenue (6), and Wilshire Boulevard/ Hauser Boulevard (6). SWITRS data from 2018-2019<sup>1</sup> shows 28 pedestrian and 19 bicycle collisions within the half mile radius. Although there were no more than two collisions at any location, there was a fatal pedestrian collision at Mansfield Avenue and 9<sup>th</sup> Street in 2018. All bicycle and pedestrian collisions within the station's half mile radius from 2013-2017 is presented in Figure 4.9.

Four existing bus transit lines intersect the Wilshire/La Brea Station. Nine bus transit lines currently operate within the approximate half-mile radius. For the start and end locations of each bus route within the approximate half-mile radius, see Appendix B. The bus routes are shown in Figure 4.10.

Identifying land use in the half-mile radius study area is crucial in identifying the type of users of the Purple Line will service. There is an emphasis of commercial along Wilshire Boulevard and La Brea Avenue. There is a mixture of medium and low-density residential throughout the study area. Figure 4.11 details the land use surrounding the station. Land use categories are defined as follows:

- Low-density residential: 2 or fewer dwelling units per acre
- Medium-density residential: 3 to 8 dwelling units per acre
- General Commercial: Commercial that mainly generates demand within the neighborhood
- Office Commercial: Commercial that mainly is for office use
- Community Commercial: Commercial that can generate demand throughout Central LA
- Regional Commercial: Commercial that can generate demand throughout the larger LA region
- Public Facilities: Schools, public departments, and some museums
- Open Space: Parks and medians
- Mixed-Use: Residential/commercial-oriented mixed use


The approximate half mile radius of the Wilshire/La Brea Station is entirely within the Los Angeles Unified School District.

---


<sup>1</sup> SWITRS data from 2018-2019 is provisional and subject to change.

# Wilshire / La Brea Station Street Grid

Figure 4.4




--- Wilshire / La Brea Station Half-Mile Radius





# Wilshire / La Brea Station Half-Mile Pedestrian Walk Shed

Figure 4.5




- La Brea Pedestrian Shed
- Wilshire / La Brea Station Half-Mile Radius




Source: IBI Group, 2020




IV-18



# Wilshire / La Brea Station Streets with High Vehicular Speeds

Figure 4.6




-  Streets with High Vehicular Speeds
-  La Brea Pedestrian Shed
-  Wilshire / La Brea Station Half-Mile Radius



Source: Caltrans, 2017


IV-19





# Wilshire / La Brea Station Pedestrian Facilities

Figure 4.8



▲ Missing Crosswalk

● Bus Stop


— Missing Sidewalk

⋮ Wilshire / La Brea Station Half-Mile Radius




Source: IBI Group, 2020

IV-21



# Wilshire / La Brea Station Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions

Figure 4.9




- Pedestrian Collision
- ▲ Bicycle Collision
- La Brea Pedestrian Shed
- Wilshire / La Brea Station Half-Mile Radius




Source: IBI Group, 2020

IV-22



# Wilshire / La Brea Station Bus Transit Routes

Figure 4.10



## Metro Local

— Routes 16, 17, 20, 28, 212, 312, 316

## Metro Rapid


— Route 728 (Service Not Offered Daily)

— Route 720 (7 Day Service)



Source: LA Metro, 2018


IV-23










# Wilshire / La Brea Station

## Land Use

Figure 4.11




- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|  Low-Density Residential    |  General Commercial |  Community Commercial |
|  Medium-Density Residential |  Office Commercial  |  Regional Commercial  |
|   |  Public Facilities  |  |



Source: SCAG Land Use, 2016

IV-24



## 4.2. Wilshire/Fairfax Station

The Wilshire/Fairfax station is located in the Miracle Mile neighborhood, adjacent to several major city landmarks including the La Brea Tar Pits and the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA). The proposed station is located at the intersection of the main commercial corridor on Wilshire Boulevard, which has several medium- and high-rise commercial and office buildings, and smaller-scale Fairfax Avenue, which has several single-story restaurants and stores. There are also several multiple-family and single-family residential neighborhoods near the station, including Park La Brea and Carthay Circle.

The Wilshire/Fairfax Station is proposed to be located at the southeast corner of Wilshire Boulevard and Orange Grove Avenue. This station is situated in the center of one of the biggest hubs for museums in Los Angeles, and it is anticipated it will attract thousands of riders to the Purple Line for a variety of reasons.

An approximate half-mile radius around this station location extends north to Hancock Park Elementary School, and as far south as the San Vicente Boulevard/ Stanley Avenue intersection. In addition, the approximate half-mile radius reaches west of La Jolla Avenue, and as far east as Hauser Boulevard.

In general, the street network around the station is irregular, with Park La Brea apartment community to the northeast, and San Vicente Boulevard cutting diagonal through the southern portion of the study area. The residential areas, however, follow an elongated grid block pattern. The street grid around the station is shown in Figure 4.12.

A pedestrian walk shed is the area encompassed by a half-mile walking distance away from a transit station using the existing pedestrian network. Even though the existing street grid pattern around the Wilshire/ Fairfax Station is irregular, a pedestrian can reach either end of the station approximate half-mile radius, and most destinations are within a half-mile distance away from the station. The pedestrian walk shed is presented in Figure 4.13.

The approximate half-mile radius around the Wilshire/ Fairfax Station features many streets with high vehicular speeds. Streets classified as Highway/Freeway, Arterial, or Collector by Caltrans in their Street Hierarchy dataset were determined as streets with high vehicle speeds. High vehicle speeds are those defined as greater than 25 miles per hour. Figure 4.14 shows streets with high vehicle speeds. Streets identified with high vehicular speeds are:

- Wilshire Boulevard
- Olympic Boulevard
- 8<sup>th</sup> Street / Del Valle Drive
- 6<sup>th</sup> Street
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Street
- Hauser Boulevard
- Fairfax Avenue
- San Vicente Boulevard
- Crescent Heights Boulevard/ McCarthy Vista
- Carillo Drive

Key access corridors were determined by using Metro's Origin/Destination Analysis survey data and determining the locations where those who take active transportation begin or end their trip. The point data was used to determine the most logical route if that user were to access the station, and that pathway would be used to construct the key access corridor network. In summary, Metro's



Origin/Destination survey identified origins and destinations a transit user may travel to. The key access corridors identify the most likely routes a pedestrian may take to get to or from the station considering distance and travel time primarily. Figure 4.15 shows the key access corridors within the Station area.

Bus stops, sidewalks, and crosswalks were identified as pedestrian facilities. There are 24 bus stops in the Wilshire/Fairfax Station area, mainly on Wilshire Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue. There were no missing sidewalks in the station area. However, there are 17 instances of missing crosswalks at intersections, either due to traffic flow purposes, the lack of traffic control (signal or stop-sign), or the intersection is located in a low traffic volume residential area. Figure 4.16 identifies the location of pedestrian facilities.

Bicycle and pedestrian collisions were identified from 2013 to 2017 to determine specific areas within a half-mile of the station that see higher rates of active transportation collisions. Data was used from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). Over this 5-year period, the highest rate of collisions were on Wilshire Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, and Olympic Boulevard. There were 34 bicycle and 49 pedestrian collisions within a half-mile of the Wilshire/Fairfax Station from 2013 to 2017. Over the 5-year period, the most common causes of collisions occurred when an automobile violated pedestrian right-of-way (18), pedestrian violations (18), and a pedestrian violated automobile right-of-way (9). Notably, all improper turning violations (5) took place on Olympic Boulevard between Fairfax Avenue and Stanley Avenue. There were many traffic sign and signal violations (7) on Wilshire Boulevard east of Fairfax Avenue, and at the Olympic Boulevard / Fairfax Avenue intersection. SWITRS data from 2018-2019<sup>2</sup> shows 14 pedestrian and 17 bicycle collisions within the half-mile radius. In 2018, there were three bicycle collisions at the Wilshire Boulevard/ Crescent Heights Boulevard intersection for three separate causes. All bicycle and pedestrian collisions within the station's half mile radius from 2013-2017 is presented in Figure 4.17.

Four existing bus transit lines intersect the Wilshire/Fairfax Station. Six bus transit lines currently operate within the half-mile radius. For the start and end locations of each bus route within the approximate half-mile radius, see Appendix B. The bus routes are shown in Figure 4.18.

Identifying land use in the half-mile radius study area is crucial in identifying the type of users of the Purple Line will serve. There is an emphasis of commercial along Wilshire Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue. There is a mixture of medium and low-density residential to the south and northwest of the station. Medium-density Park La Brea and the LA County Museum of Art are to the north and northeast. Figure 4.19 details the land use surrounding the station. Land use categories are defined as follows:

- Low-density residential: 2 or fewer dwelling units per acre
- Medium-density residential: 3 to 8 dwelling units per acre
- General Commercial: Commercial that mainly generates demand within the neighborhood
- Office Commercial: Commercial that mainly is for office use
- Community Commercial: Commercial that can generate demand throughout Central LA
- Regional Commercial: Commercial that can generate demand throughout the larger LA region
- Public Facilities: Schools, public departments, and some museums
- Open Space: Parks and medians
- Mixed-Use: Residential/commercial-oriented mixed use


The approximate half mile radius of the Wilshire /Fairfax Station is entirely within the Los Angeles Unified School District.

---

<sup>2</sup> SWITRS data from 2018-2019 is provisional and subject to change.

# Wilshire / Fairfax Station Street Grid

Figure 4.12




[- - -] Fairfax Station Half-Mile Radius



# Wilshire / Fairfax Station Half Mile Pedestrian Walk Shed

Figure 4.13




Fairfax Pedestrian Shed  
 Wilshire / Fairfax Station Half-Mile Radius

# Wilshire / Fairfax Station

## Streets with High Vehicular Speeds

Figure 4.14




- Streets with High Vehicular Speeds
- Fairfax Pedestrian Shed
- Wilshire / Fairfax Station Half-Mile Radius




Source: Caltrans, 2017

IV-29



# Wilshire / Fairfax Station Key Access Corridors

Figure 4.15




- Key Access Corridors
- Fairfax Pedestrian Shed
- Wilshire / Fairfax Station Half-Mile Radius




Source: LA Metro, 2012

IV-30



# Wilshire / Fairfax Station Pedestrian Facilities


Figure 4.16



- ▲ Missing Crosswalk
- Bus Stop
- Wilshire / Fairfax Station Half-Mile Radius




Source: IBI Group, 2020



# Wilshire / Fairfax Station Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions


Figure 4.17



- Pedestrian Collision
- ▲ Bicycle Collision
- Fairfax Pedestrian Shed
- Wilshire / Fairfax Station Half-Mile Radius




Source: IBI Group, 2020



# Wilshire / Fairfax Station Bus Transit Routes

Figure 4.18



## Metro Local

Routes 20, 28, 217


## Metro Rapid

Routes 728, 780 (Service Not Offered Daily)

Route 720 (7 Day Service)




Source: LA Metro, 2018











# Wilshire / Fairfax Station Land Use

Figure 4.19




- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|  Low-Density Residential    |  Office Commercial    |  Public Facilities |
|  Medium-Density Residential |  Community Commercial |  Open Space        |
|  General Commercial         |  Regional Commercial  |  |



Source: SCAG Land Use, 2016

IV-34



### 4.3. Wilshire/La Cienega Station

The Wilshire/La Cienega station is located at the intersection of Wilshire and La Cienega Boulevards in the City of Beverly Hills and just west of the City limit for the City of Los Angeles. The surrounding land uses are predominantly single-family residential, with vibrant commercial corridors along Wilshire and La Cienega Boulevards. Within the City of Los Angeles, the station area is largely multiple-family and single-family residential, with commercial buildings along Wilshire Boulevard and portions of San Vicente and La Cienega Boulevards.

The station portal for the Wilshire/La Cienega Station is located at the northeast corner of Wilshire Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard. This station, located in southeast Beverly Hills, will provide patrons with access to numerous destinations, including Cedars-Sinai Medical Center and La Cienega Park.

An approximate half-mile radius around this station location extends north of Blackburn Avenue, and south beyond Olympic Boulevard. In addition, the approximate half-mile radius reaches west of Robertson Boulevard, and as far east as La Jolla Avenue.

In general, the street network around the station follows elongated vertical blocks to the west of La Cienega Boulevard. However, San Vicente Boulevard cuts diagonal through the northeast portion of the study area, while Schumacher Drive cuts diagonal through the southeast portion of the study area. The residential areas east of these streets follow a horizontal elongated grid pattern. The street grid around the station is shown in Figure 4.20.

A pedestrian walk shed is the area encompassed by a half-mile walking distance from a transit station using the existing pedestrian network. Due to the existing street grid pattern around the Wilshire/La Cienega Station, a pedestrian can reach either end of the station's approximate half-mile radius, and most destinations are within a half-mile distance away from the station. The pedestrian walk shed is presented in Figure 4.21.

The approximate half-mile radius around the Wilshire/ La Cienega Station features many streets with high vehicular speeds. Streets classified as Highway/Freeway, Arterial, or Collector by Caltrans in their Street Hierarchy dataset were determined as streets with high vehicle speeds. High vehicle speeds are those defined as greater than 25 miles per hour. Figure 4.22 shows streets with high vehicle speeds. Streets identified with high vehicular speeds are:

- Wilshire Boulevard
- Olympic Boulevard
- 6<sup>th</sup> Street
- La Cienega Boulevard
- San Vicente Boulevard
- Robertson Boulevard

Key access corridors were determined by using Metro's Origin/Destination Analysis survey data and determining the locations where those who take active transportation begin or end their trip. The point data was used to determine the most logical route if that user were to access the station, and that pathway would be used to construct the key access corridor network. In summary, Metro's Origin/Destination survey identified origins and destinations a transit user may travel to. The key access corridors identify the most likely routes a pedestrian may take to get to or from the station considering distance and travel time primarily. Figure 4.23 shows the key access corridors within the Station area.

Bus stops, sidewalks, and crosswalks were identified as pedestrian facilities. There are 22 bus stops in the Wilshire/La Cienega Station area, mainly on Wilshire Boulevard and San Vicente Boulevard. There were no missing sidewalks in the station area. However, there are 51 instances of missing crosswalks at intersections, either due to traffic flow purposes, the lack of traffic control (signal or stop-sign), or the intersection is located in a low traffic volume residential area. Figure 4.24 identifies the location of pedestrian facilities.

Bicycle and pedestrian collisions were identified from 2013 to 2017 to determine specific areas within a half-mile of the station that see higher rates of active transportation collisions. Data was used from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). Over this 5-year period, the highest rate of collisions were observed on Wilshire Boulevard, La Cienega Boulevard, and San Vicente Boulevard. There were 22 bicycle and 44 pedestrian collisions within a half-mile of the Wilshire/La Cienega Station from 2013 to 2017. Over the 5-year period, the most common causes of collisions occurred when an automobile violated pedestrian right-of-way (20), pedestrian violations (10), and improper turning (5). Notably, all biking on wrong side of road violations (3) took place on Wilshire Boulevard. Most collisions that occurred when an automobile violated pedestrian right-of-way took place on Olympic Boulevard west of La Cienega Boulevard, Gregory Way, and La Cienega Boulevard on and north of Clifton Boulevard. SWITRS data from 2018-2019<sup>3</sup> shows 21 pedestrian and 13 bicycle collisions within the half-mile radius. In 2018, there were three pedestrian collisions on Robertson Boulevard between Charleville Boulevard and Gregory Way, all of which were caused by automobile driver error. All bicycle and pedestrian collisions within the station's half mile radius from 2013-2017 is presented in Figure 4.25.

Four existing bus transit lines intersect with the Wilshire/La Cienega Station location. Nine bus transit lines currently operate within the half-mile radius. For the start and end locations of each bus route within the approximate half-mile radius, see Appendix B. The bus routes are shown in Figure 4.26.

Identifying land use in the half-mile radius study area is crucial in identifying the type of users of the Purple Line will serve. There is a substantial amount of commercial development along Wilshire Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard. There is a mixture of medium and low-density residential in all areas around the station. Horace Mann School is located to the east and La Cienega Park is located to the south. Figure 4.27 details the land use surrounding the station. Land use categories are as follows:

- Low-density residential: 2 or fewer dwelling units per acre
- Medium-density residential: 3 to 8 dwelling units per acre
- General Commercial: Commercial that mainly generates demand within the neighborhood
- Office Commercial: Commercial that mainly is for office use
- Community Commercial: Commercial that can generate demand throughout Central LA
- Regional Commercial: Commercial that can generate demand throughout the larger LA region
- Public Facilities: Schools, public departments, and some museums
- Open Space: Parks and medians
- Mixed-Use: Residential/commercial-oriented mixed use

The Wilshire/La Cienega Station is located within the Beverly Hills Unified School District. The school district boundary follows the city's limits. That approximate half mile radius around the station also includes a portion of the Los Angeles Unified School District, mainly to the east. Figure 4.28 details the two school district boundaries.


---

<sup>3</sup> SWITRS data from 2018-2019 is provisional and subject to change.



# Wilshire / La Cienega Station Half Mile Pedestrian Walk Shed

Figure 4.21




- La Cienega Pedestrian Shed
- Wilshire / La Cienega Station Half-Mile Radius




Source: IBI Group, 2020

IV-38



# Wilshire / La Cienega Station Streets with High Vehicular Speeds

Figure 4.22




- Streets with High Vehicular Speeds
- La Cienega Pedestrian Shed
- Wilshire / La Cienega Station Half-Mile Radius




Source: Caltrans, 2017

IV-39



# Wilshire / La Cienega Station Key Access Corridors


Figure 4.23



- Key Access Corridors
- La Cienega Pedestrian Shed
- Wilshire / La Cienega Station Half-Mile Radius

# Wilshire / La Cienega Station Pedestrian Facilities

Figure 4.24



▲ Missing Crosswalk


● Bus Stop

⋯ Wilshire / La Cienega Station Half-Mile Radius



Source: IBI Group, 2020


IV-41





# Wilshire / La Cienega Station Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions

Figure 4.25




- ▲ Bicycle Collision
- Pedestrian Collision
- Wilshire / La Cienega Station Half-Mile Radius
- La Cienega Pedestrian Shed




Source: IBI Group, 2020

IV-42



# Wilshire / La Cienega Station Bus Transit Routes

Figure 4.26



## Metro Local

Routes 17, 20, 28, 30, 105, 330

## Metro Rapid


Routes 705, 728 (Service Not Offered Daily)

Routes 720 (7 Day Service)




Source: LA Metro, 2018






IV-43



# Wilshire / La Cienega Station Land Use

Figure 4.27




- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|  Low-Density Residential    |  Office Commercial    |  Public Facilities |
|  Medium-Density Residential |  Community Commercial |  Mixed Use         |
|  General Commercial         |  Regional Commercial  |  Open Space        |



Source: SCAG Land Use, 2016

IV-44





## 5. Analysis

This section highlights the opportunities and constraints for walking and bicycling within a half mile radius of the three station areas. This analysis is based on the existing conditions data collected for each of the three stations and presented on the previous pages. This section also highlights equity opportunities and constraints based upon median household income per census tract as an equity metric. As noted earlier in this report, the three station areas do not currently house any Metro-identified EFCs, so median household income was utilized as a stand-in metric for this equity analysis.

### 5.1. Walking Opportunities and Constraints

The area around the future Wilshire/La Brea Station presents numerous opportunities for pedestrians. Many buildings along Wilshire Boulevard and La Brea Avenue have street facing retail and residences, increasing the pedestrian-orientation of these streets and encouraging walking. There are small blocks when walking east and west further encouraging pedestrian travel and allowing for connectivity to the surrounding neighborhoods. However, the blocks are quite long for pedestrians walking north and south. This condition may create a need for mid-block crossings, such as on La Brea Avenue. There are numerous destinations within the half-mile walking shed, including a middle school to the east, and elementary school to the south, the El Rey Theater to the west, and numerous shops and residences to the north. The difficulty of long blocks on La Brea Avenue is highlighted by a jaywalker in Figure 5.1 below.

**Figure 5.1: La Brea Avenue facing south toward Wilshire Boulevard**

The future station at Wilshire Boulevard and Fairfax is well situated for pedestrians. The station is located within one block of four museums, and is in walking distance of numerous retail, commercial, and residential developments. Block lengths begin to extend on Wilshire Boulevard west of Fairfax Avenue, but there is a mid-block crossing between Fairfax Avenue and Crescent Heights Boulevard. There are numerous destinations in the approximate half-mile shed, including The Grove to the north, a popular shopping/dining destination on Fairfax Avenue south of Olympic Boulevard, and numerous museums central to the station. The most difficult intersection for pedestrians in this study area is the confluence of Fairfax Avenue, Olympic Boulevards, and San Vicente Boulevard, which is shown in Figure 5.2 below.

**Figure 5.2: Olympic Boulevard facing west toward San Vicente Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue**

Many shops, offices, and residential areas are located within walking distance from the future Wilshire/La Cienega Station. The station is situated close to a community park, recreation complex, and library to the south, a school to the west, and numerous fine-dining restaurants to the north. There are also two theatres on either side of the station along Wilshire Boulevard. Similar to the Wilshire/La Brea Station, pedestrians on La Cienega Boulevard may face challenges related to long blocks. Even though there are short blocks on Wilshire Boulevard west of La Cienega Boulevard in Beverly Hills, there are few opportunities to cross the street. San Vicente Boulevard creates numerous challenges for pedestrians as it cuts diagonally through multiple major streets in this study area, including Wilshire Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard. Those intersections are highlighted below.

**Figure 5.3: San Vicente Boulevard facing east toward Wilshire Boulevard**

**Figure 5.4: La Cienega Boulevard facing north on San Vicente Boulevard**

Most streets in all three study areas have sidewalks, except for Carling Way adjacent to the Wilshire / La Brea Station. The sidewalks along Wilshire Boulevard and La Brea Avenue, Fairfax Avenue, and La Cienega Boulevard are wide, well maintained, and accommodating for street furniture, landscaping, patio space, and potentially microtransit. Most residential areas have a five-foot sidewalk, offset a few feet from the street curb. Further evaluation may need to be administered to determined pedestrian and bicyclist lighting quality throughout the study areas.

## 5.2. Bicycle Opportunities and Constraints

There is ample opportunity for bicycling within the three Purple Line Extension Section 1 study areas. However, existing bicycle facilities are a constraint in the Miracle Mile area. There is a Class II bike lane on for a brief portion of Hauser Boulevard east of Park La Brea, as well as on San Vicente Boulevard extending east until the Wilshire Boulevard connection. There is also a Class III shared bike route on 4<sup>th</sup> Street which extends west to Cochran Avenue.

According to the *Metro Active Transportation Improvement Plan Volume I*, many streets have been designated for bicycle facilities. This includes a Class II bike lane on Wilshire Boulevard, through all three station areas and connecting to the existing facility on northbound San Vicente Boulevard. Many north/south streets have been planned for Class II bike facilities, including Highland Avenue, La Brea Avenue, Fairfax Avenue, and southbound San Vicente Boulevard. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street is also planned for a Class II facility.

Although there are no Class IV bike facilities in the study areas, San Vicente Boulevard, Charleville Boulevard, and 6<sup>th</sup> Street from San Vicente Boulevard to Hauser Boulevard have been planned to provide protected on-street bike access.

Many streets within the study are have been designated by the City of Los Angeles and the City of Beverly Hills as future Class III bike routes, including Mansfield Avenue, Cochran Avenue, the remainder of Hauser Boulevard, La Jolla Avenue, 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Drexel Avenue, McCarthy Vista, Le Doux Road, and Gregory Way. The implementation of all planned Class II, III, and IV bike facilities in the Section 1 study area would enhance connections to and from the three future Purple Line Stations.

## 5.3. Equity Opportunities and Constraints



There are no Equity Focused Communities (EFC) within the three study areas for Purple Line Extension Section 1, as shown in Figure 4.1. As such, it remains important to connect the Purple Line to as many residents, workers, and visitors as possible, which should include EFC's in the vicinity of these future Purple Line stations. For instance, finding pathways via public transit or micro-mobility from the Mid-City region to the Purple Line stations would be beneficial for this EFC.

Because there are no EFC's in the three study areas, median household income was used a basic equity factor. The area with the lowest median household income is located south of 6<sup>th</sup> Street, north of Wilshire Boulevard, east of Curson Avenue, and west of Cochran Avenue, to the south and southeast of Park La Brea. Figures 5.5 to 5.7 show the median household income by census tract within the three study areas.





# Wilshire / La Brea Station Median Household Income

Figure 5.5




# Wilshire / Fairfax Station Median Household Income

Figure 5.6





Source: US Census Bureau, 2010



# Wilshire / La Cienega Station Median Household Income

Figure 5.7




Wilshire / La Cienega Station Half-Mile Radius



Source: US Census Bureau, 2010

IV-52



## 6. Findings and Next Steps

### 6.1. FLM Areas of Interest for Walk Audit

The Purple Line Extension Section 1 Walk Audits are one of the first opportunities for the public, stakeholders, and local jurisdictions to be involved in this first/last mile study. During each walk audit, it is crucial to identify all areas that could benefit from pedestrian and bicycle improvements within each station area to make a successful first/last mile plan. Prior to the walk audits, areas of interest have been identified that note specific places of interest that should be assessed during each station’s walk audit in addition to the main station intersections. These include, but are not limited to:

- Wilshire/La Brea Station-Area Walk Audit:
  - McCadden Place adjacent to John Burroughs Middle School
    - Chosen to provide a special focus to students
  - The La Brea Avenue/Olympic Boulevard intersection
    - Chosen due to its high vehicular traffic volumes
  - Cochran Avenue adjacent to Cathedral Chapel School
    - Chosen to provide a special focus to students
  - The Wilshire Boulevard/Hauser Boulevard intersection
    - Chosen due to its high vehicular traffic volumes
  - Sycamore Avenue and 9<sup>th</sup> Street adjacent to Wilshire Crest Elementary School
    - Chosen to provide a special focus to students
  - Detroit Street and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street adjacent to Ohr Eliyahu Academy
    - Chosen to provide a special focus to students
- Wilshire/Fairfax Station-Area Walk Audit:
  - The San Vicente Boulevard/Olympic Boulevard/Fairfax Avenue intersection
    - Chosen due to the confluence of three major corridors
  - The San Vicente Boulevard/Carrillo Drive intersection
    - Chosen due to two pedestrians islands to cross
  - Park La Brea
    - Chosen for its higher-density housing; spans much of the northeast quadrant
  - McCarthy Vista
    - Chosen due to its wide right of way; cut-through possibilities
  - Colgate Avenue and Fairfax Avenue adjacent to Hancock Park Elementary School
    - Chosen to provide a special focus to students
  - 6<sup>th</sup> Street
    - Chosen for its potential Class IV bike facility
- Wilshire/La Cienega Station-Area Walk Audit:
  - The Wilshire Boulevard/San Vicente Boulevard intersection
    - Chosen due to its high vehicular traffic volumes
  - Hamel Drive and Charleville Boulevard adjacent to Horace Mann Elementary School
    - Chosen to provide a special focus to students
  - The San Vicente Boulevard/La Cienega Intersection including Le Doux Road
    - Chosen due to the confluence of three major corridors
  - All intersections adjacent to La Cienega Park
    - Chosen due to their relation to pedestrians/ recreation
  - The Wilshire Boulevard/Robertson Boulevard intersection
    - Chosen due to its high vehicular traffic volumes

## 6.2. Corridors Highlighted for Further Analysis

Roadways such as Wilshire Boulevard, La Brea Avenue, Fairfax Avenue, and La Cienega Boulevard, will likely be identified as primary pathways arterials. This existing conditions report has highlighted other corridors of note that may be candidates for evaluation as primary pathways/arterials, secondary pathways/collectors, or cut-throughs for this study. Corridors in the following list have been chosen as they:

- May be a corridor with a high vehicular, pedestrian, or bicyclist traffic volume
- May be a corridor with or between numerous origins and destinations
- May be a corridor that is planned or has the potential to be a corridor with a bike facility
- May be a corridor in close proximity to the station


These corridors include, but are not limited to:


- Wilshire/La Brea Station-Area:
  - Olympic Boulevard
  - 8<sup>th</sup> Street
  - 6<sup>th</sup> Street
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> Street
  - Highland Avenue
  - Mansfield Avenue
  - Sycamore Avenue
  - Detroit Street
  - Cochran Avenue
  - Hauser Boulevard
- Wilshire/Fairfax Station-Area:
  - Olympic Avenue
  - 8<sup>th</sup> Street/Del Valle Drive
  - 6<sup>th</sup> Street
  - Colgate Ave
  - Hauser Boulevard
  - Curson Avenue
  - Ogden Drive
  - Orange Grove Avenue
  - Crescent Heights Boulevard/McCarthy Vista/Carrillo Drive
  - San Vicente Boulevard
- Wilshire/La Cienega Station-Area:
  - Olympic Boulevard
  - Gregory Way
  - Charleville Boulevard
  - Clifton Way
  - Sweetzer Avenue/Schumacher Drive
  - Hamilton Drive
  - Le Doux Road
  - Willaman Drive
  - Robertson Boulevard


Figure 6.1 depicts each identified corridor within the three station areas below.

# Purple Line Extension Section 1 Corridors for Analysis

Figure 6.1




 Highlighted Corridors for Further Analysis (Not Exclusive)

 Purple Line Extension Section 1 Half-Mile Radii



Source: IBI Group, 2020



## Appendix A: Points of Interest Matrix

This matrix includes all points of interest within the three-mile radius, categorized by points of interest type. Points of interest that are italicized are within the approximate half-mile radius of the station areas.

<b>Education</b>		<b>Public</b>
<i>Wilshire Crest Elementary School</i>	Fairfax High School	<i>Westside Jewish Community Center</i>
<i>Ohr Eliyahu Academy</i>	Bancroft Middle School	<i>Cedar Sinai Medical Center</i>
<i>John Burroughs Middle School</i>	Melrose Ave Elementary School	Kaiser Permanente – West Los Angeles Medical Center
<i>Wilshire Private School</i>	Castle Heights Elementary School	Beverly Hills City Hall
<i>Third Street Elementary School</i>	Beverly Hills High School	West Hollywood City Hall
<i>Shalhevet High School</i>	El Rodeo Elementary School	<b>Shopping</b>
<i>Hancock Park Elementary School</i>	Hawthorne Elementary School	<i>Beverly Center</i>
<i>Cathedral Chapel School</i>	<b>Art</b>	<i>The Original Farmer’s Market</i>
<i>Horace Mann School</i>	<i>Los Angeles County Museum of Art</i>	<i>The Grove</i>
<i>Carthay School of Environmental Studies Magnet</i>	<i>Park La Brea Art Center</i>	Westfield Century City
Robert F Kennedy Community Schools	Wallis Annenberg Center for the Performing Arts	Rodeo Drive
Hobart Blvd Elementary School	Paramount Studios	Melrose Trading Post
Los Angeles High School	Hollywood Pantages Theatre	Wilshire Gramercy Plaza Shopping Center
Los Angeles Elementary School	Dolby Theatre	<b>Open Space</b>
Berendo Middle School	The Wiltern	<i>Hancock Park</i>
Loyola High School of Los Angeles	Largo at the Coronet	<i>Pan Pacific Park</i>
24 <sup>th</sup> Elementary School	Roxy Theatre	<i>Mansfield Ave Park</i>
Pio Pico Elementary School	The Mint	<i>Wilshire Green Park</i>
Sixth Ave Elementary School	The Comedy Store	<i>Alendale Park</i>
Cahuenga Elementary School	Laugh Factory	<i>Carthay Circle Park</i>
Dorsey High School	The Groundlings	<i>Lower Carthay Circle Park</i>
Cienega Elementary School	The Sayers Club	<i>La Cienega Park</i>
Arlington Heights Elementary School	TCL Chinese Theatre	<i>Frank Fenton Field at La Cienega Park</i>
Alta Loma Elementary School	Dolby Theatre	Hillcrest Country Club
Virginia Road Elementary School	El Rey Theatre	Rancho Park Golf Club
Crescent Heights Boulevard Elementary School	<b>Attraction</b>	Cheviot Hills Park and Recreation Center
Charles Kim Elementary School	<i>Los Angeles Museum of the Holocaust</i>	Pointsettia Recreation Center
Shenandoah St Elementary School	<i>The La Brea Tar Pits and Museum</i>	Wilshire Country Club
Canfield Elementary School	<i>Petersen Museum</i>	Harold A Henry Park
Beverly Vista Middle School	Hollywood Wax Museum	Queen Anne Recreation Center
Wilshire Park Elementary School	Hollywood Forever Cemetery	Syd Kronenthal Park
Rosewood Ave Elementary School	Hollywood Walk of Fame	Los Angeles Country Club
Laurel Elementary School	20 <sup>th</sup> Century Fox Studios	Baldwin Hills Recreation Center
Gardner St Elementary School	Raleigh Studios	Roxbury Park
Hollywood High School	Capitol Records Building	
Selma Ave Elementary School	Greystone Mansion	
Le Conte Middle School	Museum of Tolerance	
Berstein High School		
Santa Monica Blvd Community Charter School		
Van Ness Ave Elementary School		
Alexandria Ave Elementary School		
Saturn St Elementary School		
Echo Horizon School		
Hamilton High School		
Malborough Private School		
Marvin Avenue Elementary School		
New Open World Academy		

## Appendix B: Bus Transit Routes Matrix

This matrix includes all bus routes that come within a half-mile of any of the three station areas, categorized bus service type and bus route number. This matrix present the general starting and ending point of each bus route to provide an approximation of the possible destinations a transit user could travel if they utilized the Purple Line.

Service Type	Bus Route #	Street when in half-mile of Station Area	Start	End
Metro Local	16	W 3 <sup>rd</sup> St	Pershing Square Area	Westfield Century City
	17	N Robertson Blvd	Pershing Square Area	Culver City Expo Station
		W 3 <sup>rd</sup> St		
	20	Wilshire Blvd	7 <sup>th</sup> & Maple	Downtown Santa Monica Expo Station
	28	W Olympic Blvd	Eagle Rock Plaza	Westfield Century City
	30	San Vicente Blvd	Indiana Station	San Vicente & Sunset
	105	N La Cienega Blvd	San Vicente & Santa Monica	Pacific & Santa Fe
	212	N La Brea Blvd	Hawthorne/ Lennox Station	Hollywood/ Vine Station
	217	Fairfax Ave	Howard Hughes Center	Vermont/ Sunset Station
	312	N La Brea Blvd	Hawthorne/ Lennox Station	Hollywood/ Vine Station
316	W 3 <sup>rd</sup> St	Pershing Square Area	S Mansfield Ave	
Metro Rapid (service not offered daily)	330	San Vicente Blvd	Indiana Station	San Vicente & Sunset
	705	N La Cienega Blvd	San Vicente & Santa Monica	Pacific & Santa Fe
	728	W Olympic Blvd	Patsaouras Bus Plaza at LA Union Station	Westfield Century City
Metro rapid (7-Day service)	780	Fairfax Ave	Pasadena City College	Washington/ Fairfax Transit Hub
	720	Wilshire Blvd	East LA Commerce Center	Downtown Santa Monica



# Next stop: a better journey.

## PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN Section 1 – Community Engagement & Local Coordination



**Metro**<sup>®</sup>

FALL 2021

# Community Engagement Summary

---

## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Plan



Prepared for Metro  
by IBI Group  
With The Robert Group, HereLA, MottMacDonald, and LA Walks

# Table of Contents

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>V-4</b>
1.1	Project Team.....	V-4
1.2	Engagement Approach.....	V-4
<b>2</b>	<b>Stakeholder Interviews</b> .....	<b>V-6</b>
2.1	Participation.....	V-6
2.2	Key Findings.....	V-7
<b>3</b>	<b>Community Walk Audits and Roundtables</b> .....	<b>V-8</b>
3.1	Format.....	V-8
3.2	Participant Recruitment.....	V-8
3.3	Online Training Webinar.....	V-9
3.4	Individual Walk Audits.....	V-9
3.5	Online Roundtables.....	V-9
<b>4</b>	<b>Online Survey</b> .....	<b>V-10</b>
4.1	Survey Format and Layout.....	V-10
4.2	Key Survey Takeaways.....	V-12
4.3	Application of Survey Results.....	V-13
<b>5</b>	<b>Other Community Presentations and Info-Sessions</b> .....	<b>V-14</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Local Agency Coordination</b> .....	<b>V-15</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Lessons Learned</b> .....	<b>V-16</b>
	<b>Appendix A: Stakeholder Interviews</b> .....	<b>V-22</b>
	<b>Appendix B: Community Roundtable Summary</b> .....	<b>V-56</b>
	<b>Appendix C: Online Survey Summary</b> .....	<b>V-76</b>

# 1 Introduction

The Metro Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile (FLM) Plan identifies improvements to pedestrian and bicycle access for three proposed Metro rail transit stations:

- Wilshire Boulevard/La Brea Avenue
- Wilshire Boulevard/Fairfax Avenue
- Wilshire Boulevard/La Cienega Boulevard

This summary report provides an overview of the community engagement activities conducted to support the development of the FLM plan. Community engagement and the resulting inputs are integral to the preparation of FLM plans, as the perspectives and viewpoints of local residents, transit riders, commuters, and stakeholders can help to expand the project team's understanding of current challenges and constraints related to walking and bicycling in the station areas. These perspectives and viewpoints help in the identification of proposed FLM projects and improvements to enhance station access and safety for people walking and bicycling to the stations. Community input is also a key component of the project scoring and prioritization effort, which is described in more detail elsewhere in this plan.

## 1.1 Project Team

The community engagement efforts conducted in support of the plan were led by IBI Group and supported by two subconsultants: The Robert Group and HereLA, as well as a non-profit community based organization (CBO): Los Angeles (LA) Walks.

Metro's FLM planning efforts are enhanced through the inclusion of one or more CBOs as part of the project team to assist in supporting elements of the community engagement effort. CBO participation in the FLM planning process can also extend to elements of the technical planning and analysis work effort to enhance the inclusion of community perspectives and viewpoints in the development of the FLM recommendations. LA Walks was selected as the CBO for the Metro Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 Plan due to the organization's extensive work in the City of Los Angeles to promote and encourage walking as a safe, fun, and viable mode of transportation.

## 1.2 Engagement Approach

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, in-person meetings, workshops, and events were not able to be conducted during the development of the FLM plan. Community engagement efforts took place between November 2020 and March 2021, which coincided with a period of peak case rates for the pandemic and stay-at-home orders issued by the County of Los Angeles and the State of California.

In response to the pandemic and restrictions on in-person meetings and events, alternative outreach methods were developed to ensure that the plan development effort remained on schedule and that the community would have a range of opportunities to participate and provide input into the development of the plan.

Community engagement opportunities included the following:

- Stakeholder Interviews
- Community Walk Audits and Roundtables

- Online Community Survey
- Other community presentations and info-sessions

This summary memo documents the engagement activities and tactics that were used to encourage community participation and gather input for the plan. Each section provides a brief overview of the engagement process associated with each activity. More detailed reports, results, and information for the various engagement activities are provided in the Appendix of this memo.

## 2 Stakeholder Interviews

As part of the Metro Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 FLM planning efforts, members of the consultant team, including Bill Delo (IBI) and Marina Kay from The Robert Group (TRG), conducted a series of interviews with a variety of individuals and organizations that have a stake or interest in the future of Section 1 of the Metro Purple (D Line) Extension. The purpose of these interviews was to talk with representatives of institutions, businesses, and neighborhood groups about the FLM planning effort and to receive input about potential challenges and opportunities related to transit station access from the perspective of these stakeholders. These interviews are also a useful pathway to expand the potential pool of participants in subsequent community engagement efforts, as the stakeholders who participate can encourage participation from other residents, employees, and affiliates of the institutions, business, and neighborhood groups located in the station areas.

A total of 10 interviews were conducted in November 2020 and December 2020. Participating stakeholders included representatives from community organizations, residential neighborhoods, healthcare centers, the business community, and museum institutions. All 10 interviews (with a total of 20 participants) were conducted via video call/screen-sharing using the Microsoft Teams application.

### 2.1 Participation

The participating stakeholders were as follows:

#### Wilshire/La Cienega

- Todd Johnson & Blair Schlecter, *Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce*
- Gabriela Flores, *Cedars Sinai Medical Center*
- Cyndie Ayala, *Jewish Federation of Los Angeles*

#### Wilshire/Fairfax

- LJ Hartman, *Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA)*
- Museum Group
  - Peter Knezovich, Mariko Yoshimura-Rank, Lauren Girard, Andrew Werner - *Academy Museum of Motion Pictures (Oscars)*
  - Suzanne Isken - *Craft Contemporary Museum (CCM)*
  - Beth Keane, Lisa Barnett, Wendy Villalta - *Holocaust Museum LA*
  - Richard Hayden, *La Brea Tar Pits (NHM)*
- Meg McComb, *Greater Miracle Mile Chamber of Commerce*
- Chris Robertson, *The Grove/Caruso Development*

#### Wilshire/La Brea

- Conrad Starr & Philip Farha, *Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council*
- Ileana Firchau, *Park La Brea*
- Liana Lassleben, *Mid City Neighborhood Council*

The stakeholder interviews helped to identify needs and priorities related to FLM in the three station areas, including specific improvements to walking and bicycling infrastructure that stakeholders felt are needed to help improve station access. Each interview participant was asked a similar set of questions, which were formulated to provide participants with an opportunity to share their opinions and insights. The interviews were conducted with the help of a Google Map of the stakeholder's corresponding station area. As the stakeholder analyzed the map and provided commentary on specific areas of concern, the planning team simultaneously populated the map with localized notes. This method allowed for a real-time visual discussion of the station

area. Inputs received from the interviews will be used in the development of the draft Pathway Network maps for each station area.

## 2.2 Key Findings

The most consistent themes heard from the stakeholders included:

### **Wilshire/La Cienega**

- Improve access to bike and scooter facilities on most major streets and intersections
- Stakeholders are currently working together with nearby city governments to plan and implement transportation programs such as bike-share, mobility hubs, and streetscape plans
- Need for safety enhancements at street crossings and improved markings for crosswalks
- Improve traffic conditions on major streets in the station area
- Important to study the impact of current and future development projects planned around station area on pedestrian and bicycle demand
- Need for improved signage and lighting to ensure pedestrian safety

### **Wilshire/Fairfax**

- Need for crossing and traffic improvements on major street intersections, especially along Fairfax Avenue, San Vicente Boulevard, and Olympic Boulevard
- 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Fairfax Avenue – Traffic signal timing and traffic calming improvements needed
- Street and sidewalk repairs on major and minor streets
- Pedestrian safety improvements on station adjacent secondary access streets including Ogden Drive and Orange Grove Avenue
- Address pedestrian safety concerns associated with homeless encampments, especially near Museum Row
- Importance of knowing parking arrangements of major venues and institutions along the corridor
- Importance of creating an inviting environment near museums and other recreational centers with spaces for food amenities such as food trucks and stands

### **Wilshire/La Brea**

- Major street pavement, sidewalk and lighting improvements needed on Fairfax Avenue
- Improve east-west connectivity for bicycles and pedestrians
- Add bike and scooter amenities in busier areas, especially near shops and restaurants
- Add bike lanes on major streets and some side streets in station area

### **Overlapping themes**

- Various station areas have narrow sidewalks that cause pedestrian congestion
- Connections to residential areas in station area are important
- Need for bike facility improvements in most station areas
- Need for wayfinding signage throughout station areas
- Bottleneck traffic conditions on major streets in station areas
- Importance of having pedestrian connections to major commercial centers, office buildings, hospitals, hotels, landmarks and other major destinations

Notes and summaries from each of the stakeholder interviews are provided in the Appendix.

## 3 Community Walk Audits and Roundtables

Walk Audits are collaborative, field-based research activities wherein participants are asked to walk around station areas (within the typical 1/2-mile radius representing a 10-minute walk to the station), observe the street environment for pedestrians and bicyclists, and provide observations and insights related to transit access, safety, comfort, and connectivity.

Community walk audits are an integral part of the FLM planning effort. The input and perspectives of people who walk, ride, and roll around the station areas on a day-to-day basis are foundational components in the development of the improvement recommendations and FLM Pathway Network maps.

### 3.1 Format

As part of previous Metro FLM planning efforts, walk audits were conducted in a group setting, with participants attending one of multiple sessions offered at each station to participate in a walk audit on a designated date and time. Due to the restrictions and precautions in place as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the approach to conducting the community walk audits for this plan was modified to comply with local health guidelines and provide adequate opportunity for social distancing for community participants. Instead of group meetings and walk audits, participants were provided with training online related to how to perform a walk audit, and then given a definite period time (three weeks) to conduct their audit individually using a mobile app that was accessible from Android and Apple iOS devices.

The community walk audit effort involved three primary elements, and was conducted between January 2021 and March 2021. These elements were:

- Online Training Webinar – This webinar was led by the project team and provided an introduction into the objectives behind the walk audit and instructions on how participants were to complete their audit using the mobile app.
- Individual Walk Audits – Participants were assigned to audit a specific quadrant at one station and given three weeks to conduct their audit.
- Online Roundtables – Following completion of the audits and preparation of the draft FLM Pathway Network maps, walk audit participants were invited to attend an online roundtable session to review the draft maps and provide their input on the draft recommendations.

Brief overviews of each of three activities are provided in the following subsections. More detailed information regarding the data and information collected during the walk audits is provided in the separate Community Walk Audit memo elsewhere in this FLM Plan.

### 3.2 Participant Recruitment

Recruitment of participants for the community walk audits began in December 2020. This recruitment effort involved reaching out via phone calls and sending invitations via email to community members and stakeholders located in all three station areas. The direct recipients of the invitations were encouraged to participate in the walk audits and to share the invitation within their network (i.e. employees, follow residents/neighbors, etc.). Invitations were sent to a variety of organizations, institutions, and businesses. These included neighborhood councils, community organizations and groups, businesses, museums, schools, and chambers of commerce. Interested participants were asked to complete an online form, identify their preferred station to audit, and to select a preferred time to participate in the online training webinar. The invitations also highlighted that participants who completed all three elements of



the walk audit effort (online training, walk audit, and roundtable) would be eligible to receive a \$50 gift card as a thank you for their dedication of time and effort.

### 3.3 Online Training Webinar

Online training webinars were conducted on Thursday, January 14, 2021 and Saturday, January 16, 2021. Webinars were conducted using the Zoom videoconference platform. Simultaneous English and Spanish-language webinars were offered during both time periods. A total of 36 people attended the online training webinars.

The purpose of the online training webinars was to inform walk audit participants about the process, the schedule for the activity, and how the information collected through the audit would be incorporated into the FLM planning effort.

The format of the webinar included an introductory presentation that covered the following topics:

- Definition of First/Last Mile
- Overview and purpose of walk audits
- Overview of the types of conditions auditors would be asked to record
- Training on how to use the walk audit app and record conditions
- Review of safety guidelines and who to contact in case of questions

### 3.4 Individual Walk Audits

Following completion of the online training webinars, participants were initially given a two week period between January 17, 2021 and January 31, 2021 to complete their individual walk audit. The deadline for completing the walk audit was subsequently extended by one week to February 5, 2021 as a result of poor weather conditions and walk audit app performance issues on selected days within the initial two week window.

Because walk audit participants were issued a generic login user id and password, it is not possible to specifically identify an exact number of unique participants who completed an audit. Through a review of time stamp differences in input data received from the walk audits, it is estimated that approximately 21 people completed walk audits. This represents about 55%-60% of the number of participants who attended the online training webinars.

### 3.5 Online Roundtables

Online roundtable sessions were added to the walk audit process as part of this FLM planning effort to respond to restrictions for in-person engagement activities as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. In previous Metro FLM planning efforts, in-person pop-up activities and events were typically scheduled after the community walk audits were completed to share the draft FLM Pathway Networks and receive input from the community at-large on these materials. As part of the Metro Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 FLM planning efforts, these online roundtables were envisioned as an alternative approach to provide walk audit participants with an opportunity to review and comment on the draft Pathway Networks since events and activities with the community at-large were not possible.

Roundtable sessions were conducted on Wednesday, March 24, 2021, Thursday, March 25, 2021, and Saturday, March 27, 2021. The Wednesday session included a simultaneous Spanish-language session. A total of 10 people attended the four Roundtable sessions. A detailed description of the Roundtable session approach and inputs received from participants is provided in the Appendix.

## 4 Online Survey

The third primary outreach activity conducted to support the development of the plan was an online public survey used to gather input and feedback on ways to improve the walking and bicycling environment around the three planned stations. The target audience for the survey was Los Angeles County residents and stakeholders who live, work, or spend time in three station areas.

This online survey was live for a period of 33 days, between March 1, 2021 and April 2, 2021. During this time, the survey received 891 responses from 863 unique computer IDs, with greater than 6,000 total comments or data points recorded. The survey was promoted through the following channels:

- Metro email blasts using the existing database of contacts for the Purple (D Line) Extension project
- Social media notices and ads distributed through Metro's existing social media channels, including Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram
- Encouragement to participants in the stakeholder interviews and community walk audits to have others in their networks (neighbors, co-workers, employees, etc.) participate in the survey

This section provides a brief overview of the survey format and results. A more detailed analysis of the survey results is provided in the Appendix.

### 4.1 Survey Format and Layout

Metro selected an interactive, map-based online survey application, Maptionnaire, as the method for soliciting input from the community online to inform the development of FLM project types and locations. Maptionnaire utilizes map-based tools to design questionnaires, collect location-specific data, and convey information. In addition to familiar question types, Maptionnaire provides respondents with an interactive, "gamified" experience with questions to identify their FLM challenges or ideas on a map. On the backend, Maptionnaire provides an automatic analysis of questionnaire data with detailed charts, maps, and GIS data for further analysis. The survey was available in English, Spanish, and Korean.

Participants in the survey received an introduction to the project, an overview of the FLM planning process, and instructions on how to provide input. The survey guided participants through each category of input, provided additional instructions for each category, and finished with a demographic survey.

Maptionnaire experienced a technical issue approximately two weeks after the survey was live and that continued through the end of the survey respondent period. The technical issue included the mapping feature showing a blank grey screen for respondents attempting to complete the survey on an iOS smartphone. To resolve the issue, respondents were advised to complete the survey on a laptop. The technical issue was reported to Maptionnaire after the first incident and was resolved after the close of the survey.




Figure 1: Maptionnaire Survey Welcome Screen




Figure 2: Maptionnaire Survey Input Screen

## 4.2 Key Survey Takeaways

Selected inputs and results from the online survey are noted below. As identified above, a more detailed summary report on the survey questions and results is provided in the Appendix.

### Station Use

Survey participants were asked about which station of the three study stations they would most likely utilize.

- Wilshire/La Cienega – 23%
- Wilshire/Fairfax – 44%
- Wilshire/La Brea – 33%

### Station Access Routes

The following streets were most often identified as the streets that riders would use most often to access the stations:

#### Wilshire/La Cienega Station

- La Cienega Boulevard
- Wilshire Boulevard
- San Vicente Boulevard

#### Wilshire/Fairfax Station

- Wilshire Boulevard
- Fairfax Avenue
- Crescent Heights Boulevard

#### Wilshire/La Brea Station

- Wilshire Boulevard
- La Brea Avenue
- Olympic Boulevard

### Types of Improvements

The survey asked respondents to identify needs in 14 different categories covering a range of factors related to FLM planning, including accessibility, bicycle and walking infrastructure, and perceptions of comfort and safety. The categories and number of responses for each are illustrated in the chart below.




Figure 33: Needs Identification by Category

### 4.3 Application of Survey Results

Survey results were used to inform the development of the Pathway Network maps, providing support for the identification of specific pathways in each of the three station areas and for the identification of specific FLM access improvements along the designated pathways. Survey results are also incorporated into the project scoring and prioritization methodology, as described elsewhere in this Plan.

## 5 Other Community Presentations and Info-Sessions

The Metro First/Last Mile team organized several presentations to keep communities informed about the overall status of the project and specific opportunities to provide feedback.

In February 2021, the Metro FLM team met virtually with local residents (Carthay Circle and Miracle Mile Residential Association, among others) to explain the upcoming online survey and to demonstrate how individuals could log comments and feedback through the map-based survey platform. This presentation was recorded and the recording was subsequently shared with community members.

In March 2021, the team also met with the Metro Accessibility Advisory Committee, comprised of Los Angeles County residents living with disabilities, to present a similar status update and demonstration of how to complete the online survey. It had met previously with this group to recruit walk-audit participants.

In August 2021, the team organized virtual presentations to showcase the draft plan documents. The intention of these information sessions was to provide members of the public an opportunity to see and understand the plan before it went to the Metro Board for consideration in September 2021. The Metro FLM team also posted draft plan documents to the project webpage, along with information about how to participate and provide public comment at the Metro Board meetings.

In addition to these aforementioned sessions, the Metro FLM team met throughout the project with elected Los Angeles city council district offices (CD4 and 5) to keep representatives informed about the project and opportunities for constituents to provide input into the planning process. It also regularly coordinated with local agencies in both the City of Los Angeles and City of Beverly Hills; in May 2021, it presented a status update at the City of Beverly Hills Traffic and Parking Commission Meeting.

## 6 Local Agency Coordination

The development of the Metro Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 FLM Plan included coordination with the cities of Los Angeles and Beverly Hills. This coordination process is important in the development of the FLM Plan, as local agencies will ultimately be responsible for the implementation and maintenance of FLM improvements located within their right-of-way.

To facilitate coordination with staff members from both cities, separate online video conference meetings were conducted in March 2021. The objectives of these meetings were to provide an update on the project process, present the draft Pathway Network maps for review by City staff, and to review proposed pathways and improvements with City staff prior to presentation of the draft concepts during the Community Roundtables. Meetings were conducted on March 18, 2021 with Beverly Hills and on March 22, 2021 with Los Angeles. The draft Pathway Network maps and project lists were shared with staff during these meetings. Both cities were provided with a review period following these meetings to review the draft materials and submit comments to Metro.

Following completion of these meetings and the subsequent review period, the project team updated the Pathway Network maps and project lists to incorporate comments received from city staff. Both cities received a second opportunity to review draft materials for the FLM Plan during May and June 2021. This second review cycle included the opportunity to review the draft final Pathway Network Maps and Project Lists, as well as portions of the plan related to Project Origins, Project Scoring and Prioritization, and Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimates. Comments received from City staff during this review period were integrated as appropriate into the final Plan.

## 7 Lessons Learned

As highlighted throughout this summary, the community engagement effort conducted in support of the development of the Metro Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 FLM Plan included the following primary elements:

- Stakeholder Interviews
- Community Walk Audits and Roundtables
- Online Survey
- Local Agency Coordination
- Other Community Presentations and Info-sessions

The primary elements of community engagement process were different than those typically employed by Metro as part of the development of FLM plans. Social distancing guidelines and stay-at-home regulations instituted by the County of Los Angeles and State of California as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic precluded the project team's ability to conduct in-person community engagement efforts during the development of the plan. These guidelines and regulations also limited the team's ability to go out into the community and get the word out about the project and opportunities for engagement.

Despite these challenges, the project team was able to execute a broad community engagement effort and many of the engagement activities received detailed and enthusiastic participation from community members and stakeholders. This input provided valuable contributions to the development of the FLM Plan.

With the different approaches to community engagement employed as part of this FLM planning effort, it can be valuable to review the lessons learned from each engagement activity. This review can help to inform future community engagement efforts conducted for FLM planning projects, as well as community engagement efforts conducted for other non-FLM Metro projects. Many of the online-based and virtual engagement activities utilized on this project would be appropriate for use on future projects in combination with in-person engagement activities. The lessons learned presented in this section begin with a discussion of demographics, and follows with an analysis of each engagement activity.

### **Demographic Comparison**

Metro regularly conducts on-board ridership surveys on its bus and rail lines. The demographic categories used for the on-board ridership surveys informed the Purple (D Line) FLM online survey, and the responses are therefore able to be compared. When compared with the most recent on-board survey results (Fall 2019), respondents to the FLM online survey were significantly more affluent, older, more male, and less ethnically diverse than Metro transit riders as a whole.

Among the 891 responses received for the survey, 605 provided a zip code, and 388 of those responses (64%) identified that they lived within a zip code that has a portion within at least one of the station areas. The zip codes that have a portion of its area within one of the three station areas include: 90005, 90010, 90019, 90020, 90035, 90036, 90048, and 90211.

To help address some of these differences in demographics, it is recommended that future online surveys be paired with in-person surveys and engagement as allowed by public health guidelines. According to the on-board survey, 40% of patrons survey do not own a smart phone that would make online engagement easier, 13% do not have internet access within their household, and less than half have access to a high-speed internet connection. The following strategies may help future online surveys to better reflect Metro's patrons:



- Identify and partner with CBOs that may be able to help bridge the “digital divide” for those who do not have the means or technical ability to participate in online surveys, and support those organizations with equipment, funding, or staff support.
- Identify new ways to promote and attract input from groups that are underrepresented in online engagement.
- Tailor public outreach strategies so that feedback received in-person or online engagement is similar and directly comparable.
- Continue to educate the public about the planning process and how input from mapping exercises can be of value to participants.
- In the future, consider collecting demographic data of walk audit participants to inform comparative analysis.

### **Stakeholder Interviews**

The stakeholder interview process conducted for the Metro Purple (D Line) Section 1 FLM Plan was very similar to the process used for the Metro Purple (D Line) Extension Section 2 & 3 FLM Plan. Interviews were conducted via online video conference, with the ability for facilitators to share their computer screens. This approach allowed for the discussion to be facilitated with the use of a Google Map of the station area, and participants could see in real time their inputs being marked and recorded on the maps. The approach of recording stakeholder inputs on an electronic Google Map also allowed for convenient integration of inputs into the Pathway Network map development process.

Key lessons learned from the Stakeholder Interviews include:

- For this FLM plan development, the interview process was initiated with the objective of conducting a similar number of interviews for each station (3 interviews per station). With the unique conditions present at the Wilshire/Fairfax Station with numerous museums located in close proximity to the station and each other, a single group interview was conducted with representatives from multiple museums. This unique opportunity allowed for additional input for the project. Opportunities to receive additional input from stakeholders are a positive, but the project team should be careful to not limit these opportunities to only one station.

### **Community Walk Audits and Roundtables**

The individual walk audit approach utilized for the Metro Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 FLM Plan differed from previous FLM planning efforts and walk audits in that the training was completed online and walk audit participants conducted the audits by themselves on a date and time of their choosing. During past planning efforts, walk audits were conducted as a group activity with 8-12 auditors per station participating in-person on a designated day and meeting at a designated location. Training for the walk audit occurred in the field prior to participants being sent out to conduct their audits.

Observations and lessons learned from the consultant team include the following:

#### Recruitment

- Build in time for community engagement and participant recruitment, to include multiple waves of outreach (i.e.: initial touch, follow-up, second follow-up, etc.) in order to build trust and secure input and participation. The recruitment window for these walk audits was approximately six weeks in length, but occurred over the Christmas and New Year’s

Day holiday period, which impacted the team's ability to follow-up with potential participants.

- Retention – The initial recruitment effort obtained 48 sign-ups (43 English and five Spanish). Webinar attendance for the English language was 31 attendees over the two days and five Spanish attendees. Reminder follow-ups were sent to all signed-up participants prior to the webinar dates.
- Explain the recruitment process and its challenges to participants, be transparent about the process, timelines, and time commitments.

#### Training Webinar

- Schedule a dry test run of the webinar to iron out any issues and make sure the flow works.
- Allocate time during the webinars to have participants actually log in to the app, use it and be able to ask questions.
- Do not include a Web App Video on YouTube during the webinar. It would have been better to run through the instructions manually as a presenter. The video could be available after the webinar as a reference for attendees.
- Provide more opportunities of cohesion with the participants (i.e.: ice breakers, chat group to share best practice, experience of walk audit).
- Include time to build camaraderie between participants. It seemed they wanted to know who else was on the call. (E.g. "Please introduce yourself in the chat".)
- Provide the login and password information for the walk audit mobile app in multiple outlets (emails, presentation, cheat sheet).

At the end of the webinar, have the participants test log-in and add a condition in the mobile app. This would allow the team to address any technical issues before participants are in the field.

#### Walk Audit App

- The FLM app should be monitored for technical issues daily.
- Improve the FLM app functionality for iOS and Apple devices.
- If quadrants for future stations are not shown in the map in the app, having one login per station could simplify log-ins. We would tell participants which quadrant they are responsible for.

#### During Walk Audit Time Window

- Send a reminder email during audit week with a snapshot of how many people have completed their audits, how many points were logged and to encourage people who haven't already audited to go out.
- Allow flexibility with the walk audit completion deadline in case of weather-related issues (rain, heat, etc.) that may prevent auditors from conducting their audits in a timely fashion.

Overall, the individual walk audits would appear to be a viable alternative to the traditional in-person group walk audits that were previously conducted during first/last mile planning efforts. Additional benefits of this approach include the following:

- Flexibility in schedule for walk audit participants – Allowing two-three weeks to complete the audit instead of one specific day.
- Flexibility with weather events – Previous walk audits have been impacted by rain or hot days. Allowing participants a multi-week time window to conduct their audit allows them to avoid less than ideal weather conditions.

- Additional participants – Flexibility in the timing to conduct the audits allows for the recruitment of a wider variety of people, including those with work or school schedules that would have precluded participation in an event with a defined time and day.

The observed drawbacks to the individual walk audits include the following:

- The events are not community or group oriented – Performing the audit individually prevents participants from interacting with other participants and discussing/sharing observations. This could be addressed by allowing interaction in the webinar and the update emails sent to participants during the walk audit period.
- Participant retention – Through the process, we observed that about 75% of people who were originally recruited for participation attended the training webinars. Of these 36 participants, an estimated 55-60% completed a walk audit (approximately 21 people). However, only 10 people attended the March Roundtable sessions. The duration between events should be minimized to support retention of participants.

Overall, the individual walk audits are a viable alternative approach for inclusion in the FLM community engagement effort, and there is merit in continuing this approach on future FLM planning efforts even after the conclusion of the COVID-19 gathering restrictions. Individual walk audits could be conducted either in place of the traditional group walk audits or as a supplement to the group audits to further increase community participation. Key changes or improvements would be to reduce the amount of time between the walk audit data collection period and the follow-up roundtables to reduce attrition and to conduct the roundtable session on different weeks to allow for flexibility in attendance by participants. Consideration could also be given to increasing the incentive payment for participants who complete all three components (training, walk audit, and roundtable).

### **Online Survey**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and limitations on in-person engagement activities, the online survey assumed a greater role in gathering broad participation from the community during the development of this FLM plan. The use of the Maptionnaire online survey platform and its map-based format allowed the survey questions to be oriented around having participants identify and mark specific locations for needs and improvements on maps of each station area. This approach provides significant benefits for respondents, allowing them to visualize their station area and zoom in to identify specific locations on the maps. The survey platform also allows the project team to collect and process the data into GIS form, allowing for efficient consolidation with inputs from the community walk audits and other engagement activities.

Prior to the roll out of the survey, the project team and Metro evaluated two online map-based survey platforms for use on this project. The two programs were Maptionnaire and ArcGIS Survey123. Metro has been making greater use of the ArcGIS Survey123 platform for other planning projects being conducted by the agency. Both platforms offered the benefit of the surveys being map-based, allowing survey respondents to mark their inputs directly on maps of the station areas. Both platforms also allowed for the transfer of response data to GIS for use in the analysis efforts for the project.

A key difference in the two platforms was the user interface and the ability to incorporate multiple maps into the survey. ArcGIS Survey123 was limited to a single map for a survey. This format is more conducive to a single corridor-level project. With the need for inputs on a station-by-station basis across three separate station areas, the capability within the Maptionnaire platform to create and display multiple maps within a single survey allowed for an easier user experience for the survey. Another key limitation of the ArcGIS Survey123 was the need for the survey respondent to create a new map for each input that they submitted. In cases where respondents may provide numerous inputs for one station, this approach could make it difficult for the

respondent to recall their previous submittals and could lead to duplications in inputs. In the Maptionnaire platform, respondents can see their previous submittals and how each submittal relates to the others, allowing for more intuitive use and reducing the potential for duplicate inputs.

In terms of the performance of the survey and respondent demographics, there are several key takeaways:

- The survey received a high number of responses – over 860 unique responses, which was a very positive outcome.
- As highlighted in Section 4, the survey respondent demographics do not generally align with the demographics of typical Metro transit riders. Several factors play a role in these results including:
  - The availability of the survey only online, with no in-person surveys capable of being administered during the pandemic
  - The demographics of the station areas
  - The distribution of the survey, not only through Metro channels, but how the survey link may be distributed by individual people in their networks and by different organizations in theirs

For future FLM planning projects, it would be helpful to better leverage the ability of the participating CBOs to get out into the communities and gather input and completed surveys in person from transit riders and a more diverse audience of community members. This approach would help also in gathering input from people who do not have access to high quality internet services. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the project team was unable to employ these approaches for this project.

### **Community Based Organization (CBO) Participation**

CBO participation is an important and integral part of the development of FLM plans. CBOs provide unique perspectives and connections to the communities that would benefit from FLM improvements. These connections can help to provide more robust and broader community participation in the FLM planning process. For this project, LA Walks was selected as the CBO to support the community engagement effort due to the organization's extensive work to promote safe walking environments within the City of Los Angeles.

Participation by LA Walks staff helped to enhance the recruitment efforts for the community walk audits and roundtables. The CBO had extensive contacts and relationships with community organizations and community groups in the study area. Some of the potential benefits of LA Walks' connections and grass-roots engagement approaches were limited by the COVID-19 pandemic, which precluded getting out into the community in-person to talk to transit riders, commuters, and service employees. As part of future FLM planning efforts, assuming no long-term impacts from the pandemic, these approaches and tactics could be helpful to encourage additional participation from transit riders and underserved populations in the walk audits, surveys, and other engagement activities.

### **Additional CBO Observations**

LA Walks was also asked to provide inputs and thoughts regarding lessons learned for the community engagement process. The perspective of the participating CBO is a valuable element in assessing lessons learned and improving the process for community engagement in subsequent FLM planning efforts. Observations from LA Walks included the following:

- **Keep the digital format as a complementary aspect of outreach.** The online format for the community roundtables should be maintained, even coming out of the pandemic.

Providing both digital and in-person engagement, makes FLM projects even more accessible. It is recommended that Metro incorporate both approaches into the engagement and not take the online option away. This recommendation carries over to allowing the walk audits to be completed in groups and individually.

- **Need more time to develop interest and trust within the community.** It is recommended to provide more time and follow-up when trying to get interested parties to participate in the walk audits and other community engagement activities. Typically, to get people more actively involved, the project team and CBO need to have multiple touches with them. We see this is especially true for the employees of local groceries and fast food/restaurants. Access at these places often has to go through management and so an opportunity to build relations and initial trust is important.
- **Not all groups are equal when it comes to being willing to engage.** While groups like home owners associations or neighborhood councils are naturally built to give public feedback, other places and groups are not built in such a way, like churches, stores, and/or restaurants. A distinct approach and strategy should be made for these groups, instead of lumping them together with the aforementioned groups.
- **Continue to provide options for different language access.** The offering of content in Spanish and other languages as appropriate is very valuable for the process.
- **Canvassing on the ground.** LA Walks noted the value of being on the ground to encourage participation. They noted this goes beyond setting up a table near bus stations (which is still a good strategy), but also going door-to-door and knocking. Had this strategy been possible for this project, this approach would have been used to share the link to the online survey for those residents and people if they could not participate in the stakeholder meetings. Another potential strategy would involve making phone calls to area residents. This could be accomplished by buying call lists for the local community and make calls asking people to fill out the survey. Even without canvassing, the online survey was able to reach 388 respondents who lived in a zip code that was within or adjacent to at least one of the station areas (64% of all respondents who provided zip code data).

## Appendix A - Stakeholder Interviews

# Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan Stakeholder Interview Summaries



Prepared for **Metro**  
By **IBI Group**, in association with **Mott MacDonald**, **HereLA**, **The Robert Group**,  
**Engineering Solutions Services**, and **LA Walks**  
February 2021



## Executive Summary

As part of the Metro Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile planning efforts, members of the consultant team including Bill Delo (IBI) and Marina Kay from The Robert Group (TRG), conducted a series of interviews with a variety of individuals and organizations that have a stake or interest in the future of Section 1 of the Metro Purple (D Line) Extension. This planning effort includes the following planned stations: Wilshire/La Cienega, Wilshire/Fairfax and Wilshire/La Brea.

A total of 10 interviews were conducted between November 2020 and December 2020. Stakeholders included representatives from community organizations, residential neighborhoods, healthcare centers, the business community and museum institutions. All 10 interviews were conducted via video call/screen-sharing using the Microsoft Teams application.

The participating stakeholders are as follows:

### Wilshire/La Cienega

- Todd Johnson & Blair Schlecter, *Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce*
- Gabriela Flores, *Cedars Sinai Medical Center*
- Cyndie Ayala, *Jewish Federation of Los Angeles*

### Wilshire/Fairfax

- LJ Hartman, *Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA)*
- Museum Group
  - Peter Knezovich, Mariko Yoshimura-Rank, Lauren Girard, Andrew Werner - *Academy Museum of Motion Pictures (Oscars)*
  - Suzanne Isken - *Craft Contemporary Museum (CCM)*
  - Beth Keane, Lisa Barnett, Wendy Villalta - *Holocaust Museum LA*
  - Richard Hayden, *La Brea Tar Pits (NHM)*
- Meg McComb, *Greater Miracle Mile Chamber of Commerce*
- Chris Robertson, *The Grove/Caruso Development*

### Wilshire/La Brea

- Conrad Starr & Philip Farha, *Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council*
- Ileana Firchau, *Park La Brea*
- Liana Lassleben, *Mid City Neighborhood Council*

The purpose of these stakeholder interviews was to understand and identify first/last mile needs and priorities, including specific station area investments that people felt are currently needed or could help improve station access. Each interview participant was asked a similar set of questions, which were formulated to provide participants with an opportunity to share their opinions and insights. The interviews were conducted with the help of a Google Map of the stakeholder's corresponding station area. As the stakeholder analyzed the map and provided commentary on specific areas of concern, the planning team simultaneously populated the map with localized notes. This method allowed for a real-time visual discussion of the station area. Inputs received from the interviews will be used in the development of the draft Pathway Network maps for each station area.



## Key Findings

The most consistent themes heard from the stakeholders included:

### Wilshire/La Cienega

- Improve access to bike and scooter facilities on most major streets and intersections
- Stakeholders are currently working together with nearby city governments to plan and implement transportation programs such as bike-share, mobility hubs, and streetscape plans
- Need for safety enhancements at street crossings and improved markings for crosswalks
- Improve traffic conditions on major streets in the station area
- Important to study the impact of current and future development projects planned around station area on pedestrian and bicycle demand
- Need for improved signage and lighting to ensure pedestrian safety

### Wilshire/Fairfax

- Need for crossing and traffic improvements on major street intersections, especially along Fairfax Blvd, San Vicente Blvd, and Olympic Blvd
- 6<sup>th</sup> and Fairfax – Traffic signal timing and traffic calming improvements needed
- Street and sidewalk repairs on major and minor streets
- Pedestrian safety improvements on station adjacent secondary access streets including Ogden Dr and Orange Grove Ave
- Address pedestrian safety concerns associated with homeless encampments, especially near Museum Row
- Importance of knowing parking arrangements of major venues and institutions along the corridor
- Importance of creating an inviting environment near museums and other recreational centers with spaces for food amenities such as food trucks and stands

### Wilshire/La Brea

- Major street pavement, sidewalk and lighting improvements needed on Fairfax Blvd
- Improve east-west connectivity for bicycles and pedestrians
- Add bike and scooter amenities in busier areas, especially near shops and restaurants
- Add bike lanes on major streets and some side streets in station area

### Overlapping themes

- Various station areas have narrow sidewalks that cause pedestrian congestion
- Connections to residential areas in station area are important
- Need for bike facility improvements in most station areas
- Need for wayfinding signage throughout station areas
- Bottleneck traffic conditions on major streets in station areas
- Importance of having pedestrian connections to major commercial centers, office buildings, hospitals, hotels, landmarks and other major destinations

## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Stakeholder Interview

---

**Stakeholder:** Todd Johnson & Blair Schlecter, *Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce*

**Station:** Wilshire/La Cienega Station

**Date|Time:** November 5, 2020 | 4:00pm

**Facilitated by:** Bill DeLo, *IBI*

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p><b>Do you or do employees/members/residents of your organization use transit often (pre-COVID-19)? Do you anticipate that you/they would use transit more often once the Purple Line Extension is completed?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• La Cienega Station will attract workers (adjacent commercial/employment uses)</li> <li>• Restaurants (day and night) and hospital (Cedars Sinai Medical building on San Vicente Blvd) employees and visitors would likely use the station</li> <li>• Employees of offices along Wilshire Corridor toward Fairfax Ave are another demographic that would use transit</li> </ul>
<p><b>What do you see are the opportunities available to improve walking access to this station? What do you see are the opportunities available to improve wheeled access (via bicycle and scooter) to this station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Beverly Hills is working on a Streetscape plan</li> <li>• Wilshire Blvd/Gale Dr - City planned Mobility Hub</li> <li>• Robertson Blvd/Olympic Blvd - Scooter or bike access routes needed to get to and from the station as well as safely cross this intersection</li> <li>• Connections to Robertson Blvd corridor for bicycles and scooters</li> </ul>
<p><b>What specific locations in the station area present challenges to pedestrian and bicycle travel?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beverly Center/Robertson Blvd/3<sup>rd</sup> St - Could benefit from mobility options such as shuttles, scooters and bicycles since they are not exactly walking distance from station</li> </ul>
<p><b>What types of improvements would you suggest for these locations? (bicycle, sidewalk, shade, lighting, etc.) Are there other locations in the station area that present opportunities for improvement?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various wide sidewalks but not many bike lanes in on La Cienega Blvd</li> <li>• La Cienega Blvd/Wilshire Blvd – No bike lanes and not pleasant streets to walk</li> <li>• Walkable distance-wise to Cedars Sinai but not pleasant</li> <li>• La Cienega Blvd - General high traffic volume and very noisy</li> <li>• Suggest putting an inviting entrance/exit environment and lighting amenities on Wilshire Blvd</li> <li>• City of Beverly Hills is looking at putting a mixed-use residence on Robertson Blvd which could lead to increased ridership</li> <li>• City of Beverly Hills may pass mixed-use zoning for Wilshire Blvd</li> <li>• Now that Proposition 22 passed, Uber and Lyft will continue to be in demand</li> <li>• Wilshire Blvd/La Cienega Blvd - Possible curb cut out on loading zone</li> </ul>

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6<sup>th</sup> St/San Vicente Blvd - Crosswalk commonly used but not very inviting</li> <li>• La Cienega Park - Median fencing on La Cienega Blvd, no access between parks except at cross-street</li> <li>• Traffic congestion just north of La Cienega Park on La Cienega Blvd</li> <li>• City has planned park upgrades including planned pedestrian bridge over La Cienega Blvd</li> </ul>
<p><b>Where are key destinations near your location or the station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Vicente Blvd/Colgate Ave - Cedars-Sinai Outpatient Rehabilitation Program</li> <li>• La Cienega Blvd/San Vicente Blvd - Planned 15-story Caruso development</li> <li>• Beverly Center</li> <li>• Restaurants and hotels in station area</li> </ul>
<p><b>Are there specific neighborhoods or uses that would benefit from improved access to the station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<p><b>How else do you see people getting around this neighborhood? How else do you imagine people reaching the station when it's completed?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>

**Summary by:** Marina Kay, TRG

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries

**Wilshire/La Cienega**

33 views

SHARE

**BH Chamber 11-5-2020**

- 1 Key destinations include restaurants and...
- 2 Offices along Wilshire Corridor towards ...
- 3 City Planned Mobility Hub - Wilshire/Gale
- 4 Connections to Robertson corridor for bl...
- 5 Beverly Center connections
- 6 Wide sidewalk, but no bike lanes currentl...
- 7 La Cienega oriented towards drivers/tra...
- 8 Traffic volumes and noise concerns along...
- 9 Have a good entrance/Exit environment
- 10 MFR - likely good ridership source
- 11 MFR - another ridership area
- 12 City may pass mixed-use zoning for Wils...
- 13 Uber/Lyft access and PU/DO
- 14 Existing crosswalk
- 15 Cedars Building
- 16 Planned 15-story development
- 17 Pedestrian Crossing
- 18 La Cienega - high traffic
- 19 High traffic volumes
- 20 City has planned park upgrades

The map shows a dense urban area in Beverly Hills, California. Major streets include Wilshire Blvd, La Cienega Blvd, and Robertson Blvd. Numerous businesses and landmarks are labeled, such as T.J. Maxx, PetSmart, Trader Joe's, SLS Hotel, Fogo de Chão, Cadillac of Beverly Hills, and Cedars-Sinai. Twenty purple circular markers with white numbers (1-20) are placed across the map, corresponding to the list on the left. The map interface includes a search bar at the top left with the text 'Wilshire/La Cienega', a 'Sign in' button at the top right, and a scale bar at the bottom.

## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Stakeholder Interview

---

**Stakeholder:** Conrad Starr, *Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council*  
Philip Farha, *Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council, Area 8 - Melrose*

**Station:** Wilshire/La Brea Station

**Date|Time:** November 17, 2020 | 2:45 pm

**Facilitated by:** Bill Delo, *IBI*, Renee Ho, *Metro*

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>Do you or do employees/members/residents of your organization use transit often (pre-COVID-19)? Do you anticipate that you/they would use transit more often once the Purple Line Extension is completed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<p>What do you see are the opportunities available to improve walking access to this station? What do you see are the opportunities available to improve wheeled access (via bicycle and scooter) to this station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian signalization improvement on Wilshire Blvd, understand that it depends on bus stop placement, etc.</li> <li>• The streets around the station area are in great disrepair, need major pavement improvement</li> <li>• Curious if there has been any discussion of diagonal crossing at Wilshire Blvd and La Brea Ave</li> </ul>
<p>What specific locations in the station area present challenges to pedestrian and bicycle travel?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> St – Competitive/dangerous</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup> St – Obvious choice for east-west biking access, Philip and Conrad part of discussions for biking mitigation, but there is significant pushback from adjacent residents</li> <li>• La Brea Ave has significant pedestrian activity, shopping, and dining up to Melrose Ave</li> <li>• 6<sup>th</sup> St – Provides access to John Burroughs School and Park La Brea, concern for cycling safety</li> <li>• Will not ride on 6<sup>th</sup> St north of La Brea because it's narrow and competition with vehicles</li> <li>• 8<sup>th</sup> St – heavily used for bikes and pedestrians, numerous stop signs and lights but very safe</li> <li>• 9<sup>th</sup> St/La Brea Ave – also provides good access</li> <li>• Detroit St/Cloverdale Ave – Both are one-way streets, Cochran Ave is preferred for bike lane</li> </ul>

<p><b>What types of improvements would you suggest for these locations? (bicycle, sidewalk, shade, lighting, etc.) Are there other locations in the station area that present opportunities for improvement?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend significant investment in bike racks in busier area south of Wilshire Blvd</li> <li>• Create hub for electric scooters and bikes so they are not just thrown around</li> <li>• Electric bikes on the rise; not sure what concerns and consideration around them, but believe it is an important topic to research, especially regarding how to keep them safe as they are quite expensive</li> </ul>
<p><b>Where are key destinations near your location or the station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various galleries along La Brea Ave all the way up to Melrose Ave</li> <li>• Synergy tapped into considering hotel being built on Wilshire Blvd/La Brea Ave and proximity to LACMA and other museums as source of tourism</li> <li>• Significant activity south of Wilshire Blvd</li> <li>• 8<sup>th</sup> St and La Brea Ave – Brewery opening soon</li> <li>• Various popular restaurants on that intersection</li> <li>• 9<sup>th</sup> St/La Brea Ave - More of a school zone</li> <li>• Miracle Mile is a key location but has been struggling, especially now with COVID-19 restrictions</li> <li>• El Rey Theatre is a large regional draw</li> <li>• Redondo Blvd starts just south of Olympic Blvd (or San Vicente Blvd), bike lane starts there and connects to Jefferson Blvd/Ballona Wetlands</li> </ul>
<p><b>Are there specific neighborhoods or uses that would benefit from improved access to the station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend focusing on improving access on La Brea Ave between 9<sup>th</sup> St and 3<sup>rd</sup> St; stretch south of 9<sup>th</sup> is quieter</li> <li>• From east to west, right turn only from 3-7pm restriction on Sycamore Ave or Orange St, could potentially be a location for signal on 6<sup>th</sup> St between La Brea Ave and Highland Ave</li> <li>• Potential bike lane on Cochran Ave (Michael Schneider, MCWCC), connect NS and EW infrastructure</li> <li>• Cul-de-sac near Mansfield Ave and Carling Way could be a good ped/bike pass through</li> </ul>
<p><b>How else do you see people getting around this neighborhood? How else do you imagine people reaching the station when it's completed?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>

**Summary by:** Marina Kay, TRG

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries

**Wilshire/La Brea**

- 1 Supermarkets - key destinations
- 2 3rd Street has limited space for bikes
- 3 Possible traffic signal - Auto RT only
- 4 4th Street good for bikes, needs more fa...
- 5 Shuttle on La Brea linking Melrose to Wil...
- 6 Cloverdale/Detroit one-way couplet
- 7 6th Street - Cyclist safety - narrow
- 8 Access point to Park La Brea
- 9 High ped activity on La Brea to Melrose
- 10 Traffic signal to cross 6th Street
- 11 Access to JB Middle School
- 12 6th Street unsafe for cyclists e/o La Brea
- 13 Opportunity for cut-through cul-de-sac
- 14 Long wait time for signals on Wilshire
- 15 Diagonal crossing Wilshire/La Brea
- 16 Bike Hub at station
- 17 Bike racks and storage on La Brea
- 18 Regional destination for dining
- 19 8th Street is key bike and ped corridor
- 20 Sycamore narrow and slow street
- 21 Explore bike lane on cochran
- 22 Good bike/ped access on 9th Street
- 23 School Zone
- 24 Streets and sidewalks need rehab in this...
- 25 Fewer destinations on La Brea
- 26 Need for bike connection to PLE from Ol...

The map shows the Wilshire/La Brea neighborhood in Los Angeles, California. It features a grid of streets including Wilshire Blvd, La Brea Ave, and various cross streets like 3rd St through 9th St. Numbered purple markers (1-26) are placed across the map to indicate specific points of interest or concerns. For example, markers 1-5 are clustered near the top of the map (around 3rd-5th St), while markers 22-26 are located near the bottom (around 8th-9th St). The map also shows various businesses like Target, CVS, and Ralphs, as well as schools like John Burroughs Middle School and Wilshire Crest Elementary School.

## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Stakeholder Interview

**Stakeholder:** Gabriela Flores, *Cedars Sinai Medical Center*

**Station:** Wilshire/La Cienega Station

**Date|Time:** December 1, 2020 | 10:00 am

**Facilitated by:** Bill Delo, *IBI*

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>Do you or do employees/members/residents of your organization use transit often (pre-COVID-19)? Do you anticipate that you/they would use transit more often once the Purple Line Extension is completed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cedars Sinai works to promote ride share/ not taking car</li> <li>• Employees come from all over, 14,000 employees, 2,000 volunteers, 22,000 ppl on-site daily</li> <li>• Vanpools come in from valley and desert areas</li> <li>• Open to any and every avenue to ensure that anyone that needs to come to campus can do so easily</li> <li>• Incentivize use of alternative transportation methods</li> </ul>
<p>What do you see are the opportunities available to improve walking access to this station? What do you see are the opportunities available to improve wheeled access (via bicycle and scooter) to this station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential benefit if there was a facility near station where shuttles could stop on a schedule</li> <li>• Rideshare/scooters specifically for employees</li> <li>• Crenshaw Extension timeline is unknown, but that connection would be a plus</li> <li>• Limited bicycle access/facilities</li> <li>• City of West Hollywood worked with us to get bike-share in front of Beverly Center</li> <li>• Patient education regarding transportation methods will be crucial</li> </ul>
<p>What specific locations in the station area present challenges to pedestrian and bicycle travel?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wilshire Blvd/La Cienega Blvd – Need for safety enhancements such as pedestrian lead times for crossing, improved markings for drivers/vehicles</li> <li>• La Cienega Blvd – Bike safety concerns for connections from PLE station to Cedars Sinai campus</li> <li>• San Vicente Blvd/3<sup>rd</sup> St – Limited bicycle access/facilities, pedestrian facilities for access to Cedars Sinai and Beverly Center</li> </ul>
<p>What types of improvements would you suggest for these locations? (bicycle, sidewalk, shade, lighting, etc.) Are there other locations in the station area that present opportunities for improvement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety conditions for bikes getting from station to hospital with traffic congestion; not sure about comfort levels</li> <li>• Cedars Sinai may be interested in collaboration with rideshare companies to facilitate access but not aware of extent of conversations with City of LA</li> <li>• Not aware of existing bike pathways nearby</li> <li>• Need for further conversations about bike access, lack of bike facilities or pedestrian access</li> </ul>




Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Future investments will likely not be in parking structures or parking spaces, instead multi-modal transportation</li><li>• Cedars Sinai has invested in wayfinding for pedestrians and drivers</li><li>• There is directional signage to find various buildings</li><li>• Campus is well-lit on-site, should continue to off-site</li></ul>
<p><b>Where are key destinations near your location or the station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Urgent and primary care right across from station</li><li>• Cedars Sinai satellite offices located at 99 La Cienega Blvd, north of Wilshire Blvd/La Cienega Blvd</li><li>• Large number of people walking to station from satellite facilities</li><li>• Cedars Sinai has a robust shuttle system</li><li>• Cedars Sinai recently purchased 6500 Wilshire where bulk of non-clinical staff work but are now working remotely due to COVID-19</li></ul>

**Summary by:** Marina Kay, TRG

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries



## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Stakeholder Interview

---

**Stakeholder:** Cyndie Ayala, *Jewish Federation of Los Angeles*

**Station:** Wilshire/La Cienega Station

**Date|Time:** December 3, 2020 | 1:00 pm

**Facilitated by:** Bill Delo, *IBI*

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>Do you or do employees/members/residents of your organization use transit often (pre-COVID-19)? Do you anticipate that you/they would use transit more often once the Purple Line Extension is completed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most employees who use buses are coming from the east side</li> <li>• Would assume that more people will use the train once available</li> </ul>
<p>What do you see are the opportunities available to improve walking access to this station? What do you see are the opportunities available to improve wheeled access (via bicycle and scooter) to this station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wilshire Corridor - There have been many recent changes to the area in terms of traffic and an increase in homeless encampments; lighting and other measures needed for safety</li> <li>• Improve lighting for pedestrian safety considering encampments and safety concerns</li> <li>• About half a dozen employees that bike to work regularly, maybe half a dozen more that would if it were easier</li> <li>• Bicycle commuters say drivers are aggressive</li> </ul>
<p>What specific locations in the station area present challenges to pedestrian and bicycle travel?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• La Jolla Ave and Wilshire Blvd – Open lot there currently being developed in last 8 months</li> <li>• Assume encampments and traffic congestion will improve upon completion</li> <li>• Wilshire Blvd/La Cienega Blvd - Intersection needs crosswalk improvements including time to cross and reduced street width; DOT often there to control traffic</li> <li>• Wilshire Blvd/McCarthy Vista - Food opportunities are a destination in the area so pedestrian activity is high</li> <li>• Wilshire Blvd/San Vicente Blvd – Short crossing time for walking, very wide intersection, safety concerns</li> </ul>
<p>What types of improvements would you suggest for these locations? (bicycle, sidewalk, shade, lighting, etc.) Are there other locations in the station area that present opportunities for improvement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evening lighting for pedestrian safety along Wilshire Blvd</li> </ul>
<p>Where are key destinations near your location or the station?</p>	

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Saban Theatre</li><li>• Wilshire Blvd/San Vicente Blvd - 6500 office building is a Cedars Sinai satellite location; would think employees would benefit from PLE</li></ul>
<b>Are there specific neighborhoods or uses that would benefit from improved access to the station?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• N/A</li></ul>
<b>How else do you see people getting around this neighborhood? How else do you imagine people reaching the station when it's completed?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• N/A</li></ul>

**Summary by:** Marina Kay, TRG



## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Stakeholder Interview

---

**Stakeholder:** LJ Hartman, LACMA

**Station:** Wilshire/Fairfax Station

**Date|Time:** December 4, 2020 | 1:00 PM

**Facilitated by:** Bill Delo, IBI

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>Do you or do employees/members/residents of your organization use transit often (pre-COVID-19)? Do you anticipate that you/they would use transit more often once the Purple Line Extension is completed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<p>What do you see are the opportunities available to improve walking access to this station? What do you see are the opportunities available to improve wheeled access (via bicycle and scooter) to this station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wilshire Blvd/Orange St - Lighting and safety important for pedestrians</li> <li>Wilshire Blvd/Ogden Dr - LACMA offices at 5900 Wilshire; requires staff to cross Wilshire Blvd, need for safe crossing both for staff and visitors</li> </ul>
<p>What specific locations in the station area present challenges to pedestrian and bicycle travel?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fairfax Ave/6<sup>th</sup> St – Bus stop lighting and safety improvements needed</li> <li>Lighting for pedestrian safety is needed throughout the station area</li> </ul>
<p>What types of improvements would you suggest for these locations? (bicycle, sidewalk, shade, lighting, etc.) Are there other locations in the station area that present opportunities for improvement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wayfinding improvements; direction to museums on north side of Wilshire; directions on how/where to cross</li> <li>Wilshire Blvd and Fairfax Blvd on LACMA side - Bus stop improvements; shelter and lighting on stop</li> <li>Wilshire Blvd and Spaulding Ave on LACMA side - Bus stop improvements; shelter and lighting on stop</li> </ul>
<p>Where are key destinations near your location or the station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LACMA provides bike parking on property off 6<sup>th</sup> St, near Ogden Dr and Fairfax Ave; 248 covered parking stalls split between both areas; however probably temporary location due to construction; partial offset for parking</li> <li>Future LACMA parking structure on corner of Ogden Dr and Wilshire</li> <li>Ogden Dr/Wilshire Blvd an important crossing to LACMA from station</li> </ul>

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fairfax Ave/Wilshire Blvd an important crossing to LACMA from station</li> <li>• LACMA construction – will create entrance to new museum on the south side of Wilshire Blvd, bridges across Wilshire Blvd</li> <li>• Key pedestrian access on south side of Wilshire Blvd</li> <li>• Key pedestrian access to north entrance of LACMA near Orange Grove Ave and Wilshire Blvd</li> <li>• 20 space bike parking next to Urban Light public art structure at Wilshire Blvd/Ogden Dr</li> <li>• Planned parking garage anticipated to be vehicle-focused, include EV stations between Orange Grove Ave and Ogden Dr off of Wilshire Blvd</li> <li>• Access to current underground parking structure on 6<sup>th</sup> St and Ogden Dr; hours of operation are 5am-11pm</li> <li>• Wilshire Blvd/Curson Ave — Key crossing to La Brea Tar Pits on Wilshire Blvd</li> <li>• La Brea Tar Pits Kiosk for tickets off 6<sup>th</sup> Street on west side of Hancock Park</li> </ul>
<p><b>Are there specific neighborhoods or uses that would benefit from improved access to the station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<p><b>How else do you see people getting around this neighborhood? How else do you imagine people reaching the station when it's completed?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>

**Summary by:** Marina Kay, TRG

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries

☰ Wilshire/Fairfax

🔍

📍 LACMA

- 1 Bike parking provided
- 2 Bike parking provided
- 3 LACMA Parking structure
- 4 Important pedestrian crossing
- 5 Important pedestrian crossing
- 6 LACMA Construction
- 7 Key Pedestrian Access
- 8 Key Pedestrian Access
- 9 Bike Parking
- 10 Planned Parking garage
- 11 Access to current parking structure
- 12 Park Closes
- 13 Wayfinding
- 14 Tour Bus
- 15 Need Bus Stop Improvements
- 16 Need Bus Stop Improvements
- 17 Improve Wilshire/Ogden crossing
- 18 New LACMA Building
- 19 Lighting and Safety
- 20 Key Crossing
- 21 Tar Pits Kiosk
- 22 Lighting/Safety



## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Stakeholder Interview

---

**Stakeholder:** Peter Knezovich, Mariko Yoshimura-Rank, Lauren Girard, Andrew Werner -  
*Academy Museum of Motion Pictures (Oscars)*  
Suzanne Isken - *Craft Contemporary Museum (CCM)*  
Beth Keane, Lisa Barnet, Wendy Villalta - *Holocaust Museum LA*  
Richard Hayden, *La Brea Tar Pits (NHM)*

**Station:** Wilshire/Fairfax Station

**Date|Time:** December 4, 2020 | 9:00 am

**Facilitated by:** Bill Delo, *IBI*

### **Academy Museum of Motion Pictures (Oscars)**

- Staff has grown over 5 years from 20 to 120 employees; last employees to come on board are frontline staff and have lower income so more likely to ride transit
- AMMP will lease parking at Peterson museum and other locations to use all entitlements
- Very supportive of multimodal transportation; want it to be accessible and hospitable to residents and not just for visitors
- Would abolish all parking minimums
- North of 6<sup>th</sup> St - Condition of sidewalks is extremely poor and there are high traffic speeds; recent collision destroyed protective wall on Wilshire Blvd and Fairfax Ave so traffic calming is incredibly important
- 6<sup>th</sup> St - Dangerous for bicycles
- 6<sup>th</sup> St and Fairfax Ave - Traffic calming improvements, more trees, covered bike parking, public restrooms, raised continuous sidewalks (cars slow to pass over ped zone), protected, bi-directional lanes for bikes, scooters etc.
- General station area and adjacent streets - Dedicated bus lanes with enforcement; space for shops (cafes, florists, sandwiches), remove street parking, create 'slow street'- replace parking with public amenities, sun/rain coverings
- San Vicente Blvd/Fairfax Ave - Lighting and crossing improvements
- 8<sup>th</sup> St - Improve pedestrian crossings
- Food trucks additional draw to the area for people; there are hotels west on Wilshire Blvd and luxury residential spaces

### **Craft Contemporary Museum**

- CCM has a much smaller staff and no parking
- Has staff that takes public transportation and others that would like to
- Number of transfers is very burdensome
- Think signage coming out of station is crucial for visitors
- Recommend more crosswalks in station area

- Farmers Market at The Grove and local market just east of The Grove are key local destinations

#### **Holocaust Museum of Los Angeles**


- 20 employees
- Pre COVID-19, 1 person took the bus every day
- Parking for staff in building underground
- Some park in the adjacent park and at The Grove right across the street
- Before COVID-19, many employees were taking Uber and scooters
- HMLA is very supportive of public transportation
- Believe that safe and pleasant path from station to museum might incentivize people to visit
- School bus transportation is expensive so LAUSD might be really excited about using Metro as an alternative but it's important to ensure that access is safe
- Planned improvements for major destination at TV studio property southeast of Fairfax Ave/Beverly Blvd

#### **La Brea Tar Pits**

- Guest relation folks would likely ride PLE
- Did not see increase in visitors when Expo Line was built
- LTP Master Plan design underway and are anticipating increases in visitation with expansion
- Way finding signage important
- Crosswalks on Wilshire Blvd from station to destinations on the north side of the street are important
- Interest in 24 hour access pathway connection to Park La Brea

**Summary by:** Marina Kay, TRG

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries



## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Stakeholder Interview

---

**Stakeholder:** Chris Robertson – *The Grove/Caruso*

**Station:** Wilshire/Fairfax Station

**Date|Time:** December 11, 2020 | 10:00am

**Facilitated by:** Bill Delo, *IBI*


QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>Do you or do employees/members/residents of your organization use transit often (pre-COVID-19)? Do you anticipate that you/they would use transit more often once the Purple Line Extension is completed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anticipate that a good percentage of retail employees used transit prior to COVID-19</li> <li>• Many Grove corporate employees live close enough to walk to work</li> <li>• Consider shuttle system from Grove to Fairfax station given the distance to walk and fact that shoppers will be carrying bags and packages</li> </ul>
<p>What do you see are the opportunities available to improve walking access to this station? What do you see are the opportunities available to improve wheeled access (via bicycle and scooter) to this station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> Street has many long blocks and limited locations to cross the street</li> <li>• Sidewalks along Fairfax are narrow and lighting for pedestrians needs to be improved</li> <li>• Fairfax corridor does not seem safe as a pedestrian</li> <li>• There are limited bicycle facilities in the area, which does not encourage bicycle use</li> </ul>
<p>What specific locations in the station area present challenges to pedestrian and bicycle travel?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fairfax corridor due to the narrow sidewalks, limited pedestrian lighting and safety concerns</li> </ul>
<p>What types of improvements would you suggest for these locations? (bicycle, sidewalk, shade, lighting, etc.) Are there other locations in the station area that present opportunities for improvement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fairfax – improved lighting and wider sidewalks</li> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> Street – shade, it can be a hot walk, especially if wearing dress clothes/suits or uniforms for work</li> <li>• Diagonal crosswalk at Fairfax/3<sup>rd</sup> so people can access the various retail uses on all corners</li> </ul>
<p>Where are key destinations near your location or the station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Grove, Farmers Market and other retail along 3<sup>rd</sup> Street</li> <li>• LACMA</li> <li>• New residential developments along Wilshire</li> </ul>
<p>Are there specific neighborhoods or uses that would benefit from improved access to the station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park La Brea</li> <li>• Employees at the Grove will likely benefit</li> </ul>

**How else do you see people getting around this neighborhood? How else do you imagine people reaching the station when it's completed?**

- There is limited use of bicycles due to the lack of bike lanes

**Summary by:** Bill Delo, *IBI*

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries



## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Stakeholder Interview

---

**Stakeholder:** Meg McComb, *Greater Miracle Mile Chamber of Commerce*

**Station:** Wilshire/Fairfax Station

**Date|Time:** December 17, 2020 | 1:00pm

**Facilitated by:** Bill Delo, *IBI*


QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>Do you or do employees/members/residents of your organization use transit often (pre-COVID-19)? Do you anticipate that you/they would use transit more often once the Purple Line Extension is completed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<p>What do you see are the opportunities available to improve walking access to this station? What do you see are the opportunities available to improve wheeled access (via bicycle and scooter) to this station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crossing and traffic improvements - Congestion, walking, bicycling crossings, and access; avoid many of the large streets in the area due to traffic safety concerns</li> <li>Long term/aging residents in area avoid major street crossings due to pedestrian safety concerns</li> </ul>
<p>What specific locations in the station area present challenges to pedestrian and bicycle travel?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fairfax Ave, San Vicente Blvd and Olympic Blvd intersection crossing – previous comments from PICO NC, walkers and bicyclists find it grim, try to avoid it</li> <li>San Vicente Blvd and Hauser Blvd – Cut through traffic corridor, highly congested very narrow street creates safety concerns, potential for better traffic control</li> <li>6<sup>th</sup> St – Traffic cut-through; parallel to Wilshire Blvd, high traffic volumes</li> <li>6<sup>th</sup> St and Fairfax Blvd – Traffic signal timing; high congestion</li> <li>8<sup>th</sup> St and Fairfax Blvd – 8<sup>th</sup> St is another parallel to Wilshire Blvd; but traffic diversion reduces some of the impact from through traffic</li> <li>LACMA reconstruction related traffic in area</li> <li>Station side streets Ogden Dr and Orange Grove Ave – Pedestrian safety needed along this street</li> <li>Ogden Dr and Wilshire Blvd – Crosswalk is key for station visitors; consider pedestrian only crossing cycle given the number of people visiting LACMA and other museums</li> <li>Wilshire Blvd and Fairfax Ave – High pedestrian crossings; need safety enhancements</li> </ul>

<p><b>What types of improvements would you suggest for these locations? (bicycle, sidewalk, shade, lighting, etc.) Are there other locations in the station area that present opportunities for improvement?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bike lane on San Vicente Blvd to improve bike safety</li> <li>• Make Wilshire Blvd a walking street; create a plaza; will be seeing landscaping improvements through various construction initiatives/improvements but will need good wayfinding and public seating; broadening and evening walkways</li> <li>• More open and inviting space – Bars/fence around Tar Pits was not engaging; consider installing more inviting fencing and plants</li> <li>• LA City Great Streets Project – Pico got a new bike lane; Pico used to be collision center of LA; not an enjoyable walking/biking space; now there are more eateries, minority owned shops, etc.</li> <li>• Whitworth Dr – Example where traffic calming worked</li> <li>• Saturn St – Also got slow street designation, near Saturn Elementary</li> <li>• Adding more humps to slow down traffic has helped on other slow street designated streets</li> </ul>
<p><b>Where are key destinations near your location or the station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Academy Museum of Motion Pictures will be a popular destination once open but LACMA will be closed for a while due to reconstruction</li> <li>• Park La Brea is a safe zone; easy to get around, managed traffic</li> <li>• Miracle Mile Residential Association – Key neighborhood for this section of corridor</li> <li>• Many new apartment complexes south of 8<sup>th</sup> Street; high residential density</li> <li>• Wilshire Blvd lacks vibrant retail; not keeping up with increase in residential complexes so people have to take car elsewhere; increases traffic</li> <li>• Beverlywood area – Single family dwellings – high income; may or may not be PLE riders; good to connect with them and understand their concerns</li> </ul>
<p><b>Are there specific neighborhoods or uses that would benefit from improved access to the station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<p><b>How else do you see people getting around this neighborhood? How else do you imagine people reaching the station when it's completed?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>

**Summary by:** Marina Kay, TRG



Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries



## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Stakeholder Interview

---

**Stakeholder:** Liana Lassleben, *Mid City Neighborhood Council*

**Station:** Wilshire/La Brea Station

**Date|Time:** December 16, 2020 | 4:00pm

**Facilitated by:** Bill Delo, *IBI*


QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>Do you or do employees/members/residents of your organization use transit often (pre-COVID-19)? Do you anticipate that you/they would use transit more often once the Purple Line Extension is completed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<p>What do you see are the opportunities available to improve walking access to this station? What do you see are the opportunities available to improve wheeled access (via bicycle and scooter) to this station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More east-west connectivity</li> <li>• Council has talked about how to make accessible north-south corridors, bike paths, etc.</li> <li>• Would be good to see more bikes and peds in our area; not too many city bikes and scooters now</li> </ul>
<p>What specific locations in the station area present challenges to pedestrian and bicycle travel?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Olympic Blvd/San Vicente Blvd crosswalk is problematic</li> <li>• Some sidewalks on La Brea Ave in poor condition</li> <li>• Most other side street sidewalks are generally good</li> <li>• Sidewalks south of San Vicente Blvd are in poorer condition</li> <li>• Edgewood Place – common street vehicles turn on; common on GPS to get through Mid-City to northern areas</li> </ul>
<p>What types of improvements would you suggest for these locations? (bicycle, sidewalk, shade, lighting, etc.) Are there other locations in the station area that present opportunities for improvement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More signage needed on La Brea Ave</li> <li>• More green space; not enough landscaping and shade</li> <li>• Council working on beautification project for Washington Blvd between Fairfax Ave and Crenshaw Blvd</li> </ul>
<p>Where are key destinations near your location or the station?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stretch of Pico Blvd that is a restaurant row is a key destination</li> <li>• Target and Sprouts</li> <li>• Nate Holden Performing Arts Center</li> <li>• Farmers Market on Sundays – Wellington Square Farmers Market</li> <li>• New Charter on Washington Blvd</li> </ul>

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
 Stakeholder Interview Summaries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marvin Elementary School/Polling Center</li> </ul>
<p><b>Are there specific neighborhoods or uses that would benefit from improved access to the station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents located between West Blvd and Fairfax Ave might benefit significantly</li> <li>• Areas east of West Blvd are higher income and might be more likely to take personal transportation</li> </ul>
<p><b>How else do you see people getting around this neighborhood? How else do you imagine people reaching the station when it's completed?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might use Purple Line to get to Koreatown</li> <li>• Buses are widely used</li> <li>• Uber/Lyft are widely used</li> </ul>

**Summary by:** Marina Kay, TRG

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries



## Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Stakeholder Interview

---

**Stakeholder:** Ileana Firchau, *Park La Brea*

**Station:** Wilshire/La Brea Station

**Date|Time:** December 3, 2020 | 3:30 pm

**Facilitated by:** Bill Delo, *IBI*


QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p><b>Do you or do employees/members/residents of your organization use transit often (pre-COVID-19)? Do you anticipate that you/they would use transit more often once the Purple Line Extension is completed?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<p><b>What do you see are the opportunities available to improve walking access to this station? What do you see are the opportunities available to improve wheeled access (via bicycle and scooter) to this station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sidewalks on Fairfax Blvd need improvements</li> <li>• Lighting improvements needed on Fairfax Ave</li> <li>• 6<sup>th</sup> St/Curson Ave – New traffic signal recently installed</li> <li>• Mid-block crosswalk needed between Maryland Dr and W 5<sup>th</sup> Street</li> <li>• Bike lanes within Park La Brea and maybe on 6<sup>th</sup> Street</li> <li>• Fairfax Ave possible route for bike access</li> <li>• Curson Ave and Hauser Blvd are access points for Park La Brea</li> </ul>
<p><b>What specific locations in the station area present challenges to pedestrian and bicycle travel?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6<sup>th</sup> St and Cochran Ave – Good for walking, multiple crossings</li> <li>• Cochran Ave is an access route, possible alternative to La Brea for walking to station</li> <li>• Burnside Ave in need of maintenance and sidewalk repairs</li> <li>• A lot of the small streets need sidewalk improvements/maintenance</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup> St - Nice wide street potential for bikes and pedestrians as well as lighting improvements</li> <li>• San Vicente Blvd/Fairfax Ave - Safety concerns; pedestrians and bicyclists find it grim and try to avoid</li> </ul>
<p><b>What types of improvements would you suggest for these locations? (bicycle, sidewalk, shade, lighting, etc.) Are there other locations in the station area that present opportunities for improvement?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<p><b>Where are key destinations near your location or the station?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curson Ave and 6<sup>th</sup> St – Main guard gate/access point</li> <li>• Burnside and 3<sup>rd</sup> St – Main guard gate/access point</li> <li>• There are various pedestrian and bike access points around Park La Brea perimeter</li> </ul>

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Hauser Blvd between Drexel Ave and Maryland Dr – Main guard gate/access point</li><li>• Fairfax Ave and Wilshire Blvd - Key crossing point</li><li>• Bike lanes are provided throughout Park La Brea</li><li>• The Grove</li></ul>
<b>Are there specific neighborhoods or uses that would benefit from improved access to the station?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• N/A</li></ul>
<b>How else do you see people getting around this neighborhood? How else do you imagine people reaching the station when it's completed?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• N/A</li></ul>

**Summary by:** Marina Kay, TRG

Purple (D Line) Extension - Section 1 First / Last Mile Plan  
Stakeholder Interview Summaries



## Appendix B - Community Roundtable Summary



# Roundtable #2 Summary

## Purple (D Line) Extension First/Last Mile

### Overview

The purpose of the Purple (D Line) Extension First/Last Mile Roundtable was to have community members review and comment on the draft Pathway Network maps. Community roundtables were conducted virtually and consisted of a presentation of community walk audit findings and draft pathway networks for each station. A series of prompts followed each station presentation to solicit feedback on the draft pathway networks. Participants responded to the prompts by using annotation tools to mark up a station map. The feedback prompts are listed below, followed by key takeaways for each station.

The community roundtables were held on March 23, 24, and 27, 2021 and included a total of two English and two Spanish sessions. A total of 10 community members attended the roundtables.

### Pathway Network Feedback Prompts

- > What are the top three most important streets for station access in the station area?
- > Are there streets for transit access that are not showing up in the draft pathways?
- > What are the top five improvements you would like to see?
- > What improvements are not showing up that you'd like to see?
- > What are the top three streets for people rolling to and from the station?
- > Open discussion with facilitator annotation.

### Key Takeaways

#### Wilshire/La Cienega

- > Wilshire Blvd, La Cienega Blvd, and San Vicente Blvd were the top 3 streets selected for station access.
- > Community members requested that San Vicente Blvd, Chalmers Dr, Schumaker Dr, Olympic Blvd, and Santa Ynez Way were included in the pathway network.
- > The proposed improvements were generally supported throughout the study area. The top improvement that people wanted to see in the station area was landscaping and shade on Wilshire Blvd.

- > Community members did not note any missing improvements in the study area.
- > San Vicente Blvd and Wilshire Blvd were the top streets supported for bike facilities.

#### Wilshire/Fairfax

- > Wilshire Blvd, Fairfax Ave, and 8th St were the top 3 streets selected for station access.
- > Community members requested that Crescent Heights Blvd, San Vicente Blvd, and Olympic Blvd were included in the pathway network.
- > Proposed improvements were generally supported throughout the study area. The top improvement that people wanted to see in the station area was landscaping and shade on Fairfax Ave.
- > Streets that would benefit from new sidewalks/curb-extensions included Colgate Ave, Crescent Heights Blvd, 6th St, and Olympic Blvd. Traffic Calming was requested on San Vicente Blvd. A new or improvement crossing was requested at McCarthy Vista and Warner Dr.
- > Bike facilities were supported on Wilshire Blvd, Fairfax Ave, 6th St, and 8th St.


#### Wilshire/La Brea

- > Wilshire Blvd, 8th St, and 6th St were the top 3 streets for station access.
- > Community members requested that 3rd St, Olympic Blvd, Hauser Blvd, Sycamore Ave, and Highland Ave were included in the pathway network.
- > Proposed improvements were generally supported throughout the study area. The top improvement that people wanted to see in the station area was landscaping and shade on Wilshire Blvd.
- > Traffic calming was requested on 8th St and Olympic Blvd. New or improved crosswalks were requested along 6th St, 9th St, and at the intersections of 3rd St and Mansfield Ave, and Highland Ave and 8th St.
- > 6th St and 8th St were the top streets supported for bike facilities.





# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Cienega Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

What are the top three most important streets for station access in the station area?

 Each heart indicates one "vote" from the community. Participants could select up to three.

## Purple (D Line) Extension


-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  10 minute walk from station
-  City Boundary










# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Cienega Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

Are there streets for transit access that are not showing up? If so, put a heart stamp on that street.

 Each heart indicates one "vote" from the community. Participants could select up to one street.

## Purple (D Line) Extension

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)
-  10 minute walk from station
-  City Boundary



# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Cienega Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

## What are the top five improvements you would like to see?


Each heart indicates the number of "votes" for the identified improvement. Participants could select up to five improvements.

### Purple (D Line) Extension

- Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
- Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
- FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
- FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
- FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)
- 10 minute walk from station
- City Boundary

### Proposed Improvements

- Landscaping and Shade
- Pedestrian Lighting
- Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions
- Street Furniture
- Traffic Calming
- Bus Stop Enhancements
- New or Improved Crosswalks
- Wayfinding Signs










# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Cienega Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)









## What improvements are not showing up that you'd like to see?


(No comments received)

### Purple (D Line) Extension

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)
-  10 minute walk from station
-  City Boundary

### Proposed Improvements


-  Landscaping and Shade
-  Pedestrian Lighting
-  Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions
-  Street Furniture
-  Traffic Calming
-  Bus Stop Enhancements
-  New or Improved Crosswalks
-  Wayfinding Signs





# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Cienega Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)






## What are the top three most important streets for people rolling to and from the station?

 Each heart indicates one "vote" from the community. Participants could select up to three.






### Purple (D Line) Extension

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)






### Existing Bicycle Facilities



-  Sharrow
-  Bicycle Boulevard
-  Bicycle Lane
-  Protected Bicycle Lane
-  Shared Use Path (off-street)

### City/County Plan Proposed Facilities

-  Sharrow
-  Bicycle Boulevard
-  Bicycle Lane
-  Protected Bicycle Lane
-  Shared Use Path (off-street)

### First/Last Mile Proposed Facilities

-  Sharrow
-  Bicycle Boulevard
-  Bicycle Lane
-  Protected Bicycle Lane
-  Shared Use Path (off-street)



-  Bicycle Friendly Intersection
-  Mobility Hub









# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Cienega Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)









## Open Discussion

-  Community comment along corridors
-  Community comment at spot locations

### Purple (D Line) Extension

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)
-  10 minute walk from station

### Proposed Improvements


-  Landscaping and Shade
-  Pedestrian Lighting
-  Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions
-  Street Furniture
-  Traffic Calming
-  Bus Stop Enhancements
-  New or Improved Crosswalks
-  Wayfinding Signs




# Breakout Room: Wilshire/Fairfax Station


(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

What are the top three most important streets for station access in the station area?

 Each heart indicates one "vote" from the community. Participants could select up to three.

## Purple (D Line) Extension

 Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)

 Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)

 10 minute walk from station












# Breakout Room: Wilshire/Fairfax Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

Are there streets for transit access that are not showing up? If so, put a heart stamp on that street.

 Each heart indicates one "vote" from the community. Participants could select up to one street.

## Purple (D Line) Extension

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)
-  10 minute walk from station



# Breakout Room: Wilshire/Fairfax Station








(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

## What are the top five improvements you would like to see?












Each heart indicates the number of "votes" for the identified improvement. Participants could select up to five improvements.

### Purple (D Line) Extension

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)
-  10 minute walk from station
-  City Boundary

### Proposed Improvements



-  Landscaping and Shade
-  Pedestrian Lighting
-  Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions
-  Street Furniture
-  Traffic Calming
-  Bus Stop Enhancements
-  New or Improved Crosswalks
-  Wayfinding Signs


















# Breakout Room: Wilshire/Fairfax Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

## What improvements are not showing up that you'd like to see?

-  Corridor improvement added the community
-  Spot improvement added the community


Purple (D Line) Extension	Proposed Improvements
 Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)	 Landscaping and Shade
 Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)	 Pedestrian Lighting
 FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)	 Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions
 FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)	 Street Furniture
 FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)	 Traffic Calming
 10 minute walk from station	 Bus Stop Enhancements
	 New or Improved Crosswalks
	 Wayfinding Signs




# Breakout Room: Wilshire/Fairfax Station


(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

What are the top three most important streets for people rolling to and from the station?






 Each heart indicates one "vote" from the community. Participants could select up to three.

## Purple (D Line) Extension






 Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)

 Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)






## Existing Bicycle Facilities



-  Sharrow
-  Bicycle Boulevard
-  Bicycle Lane
-  Protected Bicycle Lane
-  Shared Use Path (off-street)


## City/County Plan Proposed Facilities

-  Sharrow
-  Bicycle Boulevard
-  Bicycle Lane
-  Protected Bicycle Lane
-  Shared Use Path (off-street)

## First/Last Mile Proposed Facilities

-  Sharrow
-  Bicycle Boulevard
-  Bicycle Lane
-  Protected Bicycle Lane
-  Shared Use Path (off-street)



-  Bicycle Friendly Intersection
-  Mobility Hub









# Breakout Room: Wilshire/Fairfax Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)









## Open Discussion

-  Community comment along corridors
-  Community comment at spot locations

### Purple (D Line) Extension

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)
-  10 minute walk from station

### Proposed Improvements


-  Landscaping and Shade
-  Pedestrian Lighting
-  Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions
-  Street Furniture
-  Traffic Calming
-  Bus Stop Enhancements
-  New or Improved Crosswalks
-  Wayfinding Signs







# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Brea Station


(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

**What are the top three most important streets for station access in the station area?**

 Each heart indicates one "vote" from the community. Participants could select up to three.

## Purple (D Line) Extension


-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  10 minute walk from station
-  City Boundary









# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Brea Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

Are there streets for transit access that are not showing up? If so, put a heart stamp on that street.

 Each heart indicates one "vote" from the community. Participants could select up to one street.

## Purple (D Line) Extension

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)
-  10 minute walk from station



# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Brea Station








(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

## What are the top five improvements you would like to see?












Each heart indicates the number of "votes" for the identified improvement. Participants could select up to five improvements.

### Purple (D Line) Extension

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)
-  10 minute walk from station
-  City Boundary

### Proposed Improvements

-  Landscaping and Shade
-  Pedestrian Lighting
-  Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions
-  Street Furniture
-  Traffic Calming
-  Bus Stop Enhancements
-  New or Improved Crosswalks
-  Wayfinding Signs






# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Brea Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)

## What improvements are not showing up that you'd like to see?

- Corridor improvement added the community
- Spot improvement added the community

Purple (D Line) Extension	Proposed Improvements
Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)	Landscaping and Shade
Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)	Pedestrian Lighting
FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)	Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions
FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)	Street Furniture
FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)	Traffic Calming
10 minute walk from station	Bus Stop Enhancements
	New or Improved Crosswalks
	Wayfinding Signs













# Breakout Room: Wilshire/La Brea Station

(Consolidated results from all community roundtables)









## Open Discussion

-  Community comment along corridors
-  Community comment at spot locations

### Purple (D Line) Extension

-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  FLM Pathway Arterial (Primary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Collector (Secondary Route)
-  FLM Pathway Cut-Through (Shortcut)
-  10 minute walk from station

### Proposed Improvements

-  Landscaping and Shade
-  Pedestrian Lighting
-  Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions
-  Street Furniture
-  Traffic Calming
-  Bus Stop Enhancements
-  New or Improved Crosswalks
-  Wayfinding Signs



## Appendix C - Online Survey Summary

# Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Plan

---

Online Survey Summary Report



Prepared for Metro  
by IBI Group

# Table of Contents

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Online Survey Background and Overview</b> .....	<b>V-79</b>
1.1	Survey Format and Layout .....	V-79
1.2	Survey Respondents and Demographics .....	V-80
1.3	Demographics Comparison .....	V-82
<b>2</b>	<b>Survey Results</b> .....	<b>V-85</b>
2.1	Access Route Questions .....	V-85
2.2	Category Questions .....	V-87
2.3	Bicycle Improvements .....	V-89
2.3.1	Bicycle-friendly intersection needed .....	V-89
2.3.2	New bicycle lane, route, or facility .....	V-90
2.3.3	More bicycle parking .....	V-91
2.3.4	Existing bicycle lanes need maintenance .....	V-92
2.4	Walking Improvements .....	V-93
2.4.1	Missing, broken, or narrow sidewalks .....	V-93
2.4.2	Crossings are spaced too far apart / long blocks .....	V-94
2.4.3	Lack of curb ramps or accessible crossings .....	V-95
2.5	Safety Improvements .....	V-96
2.5.1	Speeding .....	V-96
2.5.2	Not enough time to cross street / too many lanes / wide streets to cross .....	V-97
2.5.3	Not enough lighting .....	V-98
2.6	Comfort Improvements .....	V-99
2.6.1	Not enough shade .....	V-99
2.6.2	Inadequate bus stops .....	V-99
2.7	Other Improvements .....	V-101
2.7.1	Something that is not listed here .....	V-101
2.7.2	My improvement idea .....	V-102

# 1 Online Survey Background and Overview

The Metro Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Plan is focused on identifying walking and bicycling improvements to enhance access to three planned transit stations: Wilshire/La Brea, Wilshire/Fairfax, and Wilshire/La Cienega. To support the development of the First/Last Mile (FLM) Plan, an online public survey was created to gather input and feedback on ways to improve the walking and bicycling environment around these three future transit stations. The target audience for the survey was Los Angeles County residents and stakeholders who live, work, or spend time in the station areas.

## 1.1 Survey Format and Layout

Metro selected an interactive, map-based online survey application, Maptionnaire, as the method for soliciting input from the community online to inform the development of FLM project types and locations. Maptionnaire utilizes map-based tools to design questionnaires, collect data, and convey information. In addition to familiar question types, Maptionnaire provides respondents with an interactive, “gamified” experience with questions to identify their mobility challenges or ideas on a map. On the backend, Maptionnaire provides an automatic analysis of questionnaire data with detailed charts, maps, and GIS data for further analysis.

Participants in the survey received an introduction to the project, an overview of the FLM planning process, and instructions on how to provide input. The survey guided participants through each category of input, provided additional instructions for each category, and finished with a demographic survey. Screenshots from the survey are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 below.




Figure 1: Maptionnaire Survey Welcome Screen




Figure 2: Maptionnaire Survey Input Screen

## 1.2 Survey Respondents and Demographics

The survey was open for comment for 33 days, from March 1, 2021 to April 2, 2021. The survey received 891 responses from 863 unique computer IDs, with greater than 6,000 total comments or data points recorded. The survey was promoted through the following channels:

- Metro email blasts using the existing database of contacts for the Purple (D Line) Extension project
- Social media notices and ads distributed through Metro’s existing social media channels, including Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram
- Encouragement to participants in the stakeholder interviews and community walk audits to have others in their networks (neighbors, co-workers, employees, etc.) participate in the survey

This online survey was one of several approaches used to gather input from community members and stakeholders in the three station areas. Other community engagement activities included interviews conducted with stakeholders representing businesses, institutions (museums, hospitals, etc.), neighborhood councils, and neighborhood associations, community walk audits, and online roundtable workshops with the community walk audit participants. The majority of the community engagement activities conducted in support of the plan occurred between November 2020 and March 2021, overlapping with the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic and stay-at-home orders within Los Angeles County. This environment made in-person community engagement activities infeasible. Instead the various online-based engagement efforts described above were completed.

Engaging the public online rather than in-person has both benefits and limitations. One limitation is the difficulty of knowing whether online engagement efforts are eliciting input from the target audience. Online engagement methods tend to elicit input from those with broadband internet access, technological literacy, and English-speaking households. In this way, online community engagement poses significant challenges to social equity. On the other hand, there are many benefits of online engagement, including time and cost savings for participants, an increased number of participants, and, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, safety. In recognition of these benefits and limitations, it is important to consider how online community engagement tools can supplement traditional community engagement efforts in the future.



To assess the performance of the online survey in gathering diverse input from the community, the consultant team extracted the demographic information provided by respondents. This information is listed in the figures below.




Figure 3: Survey Responses by Age




Figure 4: Survey Responses by Gender Identity




Figure 5: Survey Responses by Ethnicity




Figure 6: Survey Responses by Household Earnings

### 1.3 Demographics Comparison

As part of its efforts to better serve its patrons, Metro regularly conducts on-board ridership surveys on its bus and rail lines. The same demographic categories used for the on-board ridership surveys were used for the Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 FLM online survey, and the responses are therefore directly comparable. When compared with the most recent Metro on-board survey results (Fall 2019), the FLM online survey respondents were significantly more affluent, older, more male, and less ethnically diverse than Metro transit riders as a whole.

Among the 891 responses received for the survey, 605 provided a zip code, and 388 of those responses (64%) identified that they lived within a zip code that has a portion within at least one

of the station areas. The zip codes that have a portion of its area within one of the three station areas include: 90005, 90010, 90019, 90020, 90035, 90036, 90048, and 90211.

To address these differences, it is recommended that future online surveys should continue to be paired with in-person surveys and engagement activities as allowed by public health guidelines. According to the on-board survey, 40% of patrons surveyed do not own a smart phone, 13% do not have internet access within their household, and less than half have access to a high-speed internet connection. These factors all contribute to a difficulty in participating in an online survey. The following strategies may help future FLM online surveys to better reflect Metro’s patrons:

- Identify and partner with community based organizations (CBOs) that may be able to help bridge the “digital divide” for those who do not have the means or technical ability to participate in online surveys, and support those organizations with equipment, funding, or staff support. This project effort included LA Walks as a participating CBO, but the COVID-19 pandemic prevented LA Walks from working in the community in person to encourage participation.
- Identify new ways to promote and attract input from groups that are underrepresented in online engagement.
- Refine public outreach strategies so that feedback received in-person or online engagement is similar and more directly comparable.
- Ensure that engagement materials are available in the languages that people can read.
- Incorporate feedback from community members in surveys and simplify the input process.
- Continue to educate the public about the planning process and how input from mapping exercises can be of value to participants.

Comparisons between demographic characteristics of respondents to the two surveys are shown in the tables below.

AGE	PURPLE (D LINE) FLM SURVEY %	METRO ON-BOARD SURVEY %
<18	0%	11%
18-24	5%	21%
25-34	19%	20%
35-49	27%	22%
50-64	31%	19%
65+	18%	8%

Table 1: Survey Comparison by Age

GENDER IDENTITY	PURPLE (D LINE) FLM SURVEY %	METRO ON-BOARD SURVEY %
Non-binary	1%	1%
Female	40%	51%
Male	59%	48%

Table 2: Survey Comparison by Gender Identity

ETHNICITY	PURPLE (D LINE) FLM SURVEY %	METRO ON-BOARD SURVEY %
Native American	0%	1%
African-American	7%	16%
Asian / Pacific-Islander	7%	8%
Other	8%	4%
Latino	13%	59%
White	65%	11%

Table 3: Survey Comparison by Ethnicity

HOUSEHOLD TOTAL ANNUAL EARNINGS	PURPLE (D LINE) FLM SURVEY %	METRO ON-BOARD SURVEY %
Under \$5,000	3%	23%
\$5,000-\$9,999	0%	7%
\$10,000-\$14,999	2%	6%
\$15,000-\$19,999	1%	16%
\$20,000-\$24,999	3%	10%
\$25,500-\$34,999	5%	7%
\$35,000-\$49,999	8%	12%
\$50,000-\$99,999	31%	13%
\$100,000+	46%	7%

Table 4: Survey Comparison by Household Earnings

## 2 Survey Results

### 2.1 Access Route Questions

The survey asked respondents to answer four basic questions about their route to the Purple (D Line), which future station would they most often utilize, and then for each station which streets would they be most likely to use to access that station.




Figure 7: Potential Station Preferences




Figure 8: Wilshire / La Cienega Station Route Choices




Figure 9: Wilshire / Fairfax Station Route Choices




Figure 10: Wilshire / La Brea Station Route Choices

## 2.2 Category Questions

The survey asked respondents to identify needs in 14 different categories covering a range of factors related to FLM planning, including accessibility, bicycle and walking infrastructure, and perceptions of comfort and safety. The categories and number of responses for each are illustrated in the chart below.




Figure 11: Needs Identification by Category

The response categories can also be broken down into five main themes: bicycling, walking, safety, comfort, and other. These themes and the number of responses in each category are illustrated in the table below and are used to organize the analysis in the section that follows.

THEME	CATEGORY	NUMBER OF COMBINED RESPONSES
Bicycling	Bicycle-friendly intersection needed	1,966
	New bicycle lane, route, or facility	
	More bicycle parking	
	Existing bicycle lanes need maintenance	
Walking	Missing, broken, or narrow sidewalks	643
	Crossings are space too far apart / long blocks	
	Lack of curb ramps or accessible crossings	
Safety	Speeding	1,882
	Not enough time to cross street / too many lanes / wide streets to cross	
	Not enough lighting	
Comfort	Not enough shade	1,429
	Inadequate bus stops	
Other	Something that is not listed here	334
	My improvement idea	
Total		6,254

Figure 12: Survey Responses Categorization




Figure 13: Survey Responses by Theme



## 2.3 Bicycle Improvements

The online survey gathered 1,966 responses related to bicycle improvements.

### 2.3.1 Bicycle-friendly intersection needed

Of the 1,966 responses related to bicycle improvements, 757 were in the category of bicycle-friendly intersection needed. Intersections introduce conflicts between vehicles traveling in opposite or perpendicular directions and can also be sources of distraction that endanger cyclists. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 14: Map of Bicycle-Friendly Intersection Needs

Responses were clustered most densely around the major intersections/station locations along Wilshire Boulevard (La Cienega Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, La Brea Avenue), as well as where San Vicente Boulevard intersects Olympic Boulevard, Crescent Heights Boulevard, and Wilshire Boulevard. Respondents also noted a high need for safer intersections along 6<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a popular parallel east-west alternative to Wilshire Boulevard. 6<sup>th</sup> Street does not currently have bicycle facilities.

### 2.3.2 New bicycle lane, route, or facility

Of the 1,966 responses related to bicycle improvements, 708 were in the category of new bicycle lane, route, or facility. Rather than using a point like in the other categories, respondents were asked to trace a line for the route. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 15: Map of New Bicycle Lane, Route, or Facility Needs

Responses were overlaid on the busiest and largest streets, including Wilshire Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard, 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Street, 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and San Vicente Boulevard in the east-west direction, and La Cienega Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, and La Brea Avenue in the north-south direction.

### 2.3.3 More bicycle parking

Of the 1,966 responses related to bicycle improvements, 433 were in the category of more bicycle parking. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 16: Map of Bicycle Parking Needs

The greatest number of responses were clustered at the future station locations at La Cienega Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, and La Brea Avenue. Other significant clusters of bicycle parking locations recommended include the following key activity centers and corridors:

- Cedars Sinai Medical Center
- The Beverly Center shopping mall
- The Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA)/La Brea Tar Pits complex
- Intersection of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and Fairfax Avenue, adjacent to The Original Farmers Market and The Grove shopping mall
- La Brea Avenue between 8<sup>th</sup> Street and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street—a busy shopping and dining corridor

### 2.3.4 Existing bicycle lanes need maintenance

Of the 1,966 responses related to bicycle improvements, 68 were in the category of existing bicycle lanes need maintenance. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 17: Map of Bicycle Lane Maintenance Needs

It is important to note that many streets in the project study (including major arterials like Wilshire Boulevard, La Cienega Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, and La Brea Avenue) do not have bicycle lanes in the existing condition. Select smaller neighborhood streets are designated as bicycle paths and some segments have sharrows to encourage cycling, but in general there is limited existing designated bicycle infrastructure in the three station areas. The only exception is an approximately half-mile segment of Hauser Boulevard between 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and 6<sup>th</sup> Street that has bicycle lanes on both sides of the street. When respondents provided comments, they generally noted locations where the pavement quality was particularly poor.

## 2.4 Walking Improvements

The online survey gathered 643 responses related to walking improvements.

### 2.4.1 Missing, broken, or narrow sidewalks

Of the 643 responses related to walking improvements, 266 were in the category of missing, broken, or narrow sidewalks. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 18: Map of Missing, Broken, or Narrow Sidewalks Reported

Respondents highlighted hundreds of instances combined across the three stations areas where broken or narrow sidewalks make walking difficult or unsafe, with the highest concentration of comments focused along Fairfax Avenue between San Vicente Boulevard and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and La Brea Avenue between Olympic Boulevard and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. Although the future Wilshire / La Cienega station area and walkshed received fewer comments, there were still several hot spots where improvements are needed such where La Cienega Boulevard intersects with Olympic Boulevard and Wilshire Boulevard.

## 2.4.2 Crossings are spaced too far apart / long blocks

Of the 643 responses related to walking improvements, 263 were in the category of crossings are spaced too far apart / long blocks. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 19: Map of Crossings Spaced Too Far Apart and Long Blocks

Similar to the category of missing and broken sidewalks, the Wilshire / Fairfax station area received the highest number of comments and issues identified. Fairfax Avenue, Wilshire Boulevard, San Vicente Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard, 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and 6<sup>th</sup> Street between Fairfax Avenue and Hauser Boulevard were highlighted as having insufficient crossings. Commenters also identified major arterials San Vicente Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard in the Wilshire / La Cienega station area as needing crossings. Within the Wilshire / La Brea station walkshed, La Brea Avenue received the highest number of locations identified as needing crossings. Due to the complicated mixture of land uses and street configurations in these station areas conditions and needs may vary from block to block. For example, 6<sup>th</sup> Street in the Wilshire / La Brea station area has short block lengths, but many intersections were flagged for needing crossings. Just a half-mile west, 6<sup>th</sup> Street has much longer blocks due to the LACMA and Park La Brea complexes on opposite sides of the street. The same street therefore may need a combination of improvements (such as bulb-outs, lighting, or continental crosswalks) at existing crossings, or entirely new crossings where walkers do not feel protected under existing conditions.

### 2.4.3 Lack of curb ramps or accessible crossings

Of the 643 responses related to walking improvements, 114 were in the category of lack of curb ramps or accessible crossings. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 20: Map of Curb Ramp or Accessible Crossing Needs

Respondents to this category noted many locations where street crossings do not have curb ramps or where the crossings do not meet accessibility standards. Within the Wilshire / La Cienega station walkshed, one respondent noted long stretches of La Cienega Boulevard and Orlando Avenue that do not have tactile warning strips in the pavement to help navigate street and driveway crossings. A segment of 8<sup>th</sup> Street was also flagged due to a lack of curb ramps between Hauser Boulevard and Cochran Avenue. Respondents highlighted the need for improvements at all three major intersections adjacent to future station locations, as well as along San Vicente Boulevard.

## 2.5 Safety Improvements

The Maptionnaire survey gathered 1,882 responses related to safety improvements.

### 2.5.1 Speeding

Of the 1,882 responses related to environmental and safety, 984 were in the category of speeding. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 21: Map of Speeding Locations

Second only to the “not enough shade” category, speeding received a very high number of comments and suggestions. All of the major arterials in the study area received high concentrations of complaints, including Wilshire Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard, San Vicente Boulevard, 6<sup>th</sup> Street, La Cienega Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, and La Brea Avenue. The category also received the highest number (186) of comments, noting dangerous behavior from drivers traveling through the area including red light running, failure to yield to walkers or leave room for cyclists, street racing, high speed cut-through traffic on smaller streets, and injuries and deaths of walkers and drivers.



### 2.5.2 Not enough time to cross street / too many lanes / wide streets to cross

Of the 1,882 responses related to comfort and safety, 622 were in the category of not enough time to cross street / too many lanes / wide streets to cross. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 22: Map of Locations Needing Crossing Improvements

Major intersections immediately adjacent to and north and south of the future station locations were all flagged for being difficult to cross. Adjustments to curb configurations and geometries as well as leading intervals and signal retiming for walkers could all help to address these needs.

### 2.5.3 Not enough lighting

Of the 1,882 responses related to comfort and safety, 276 were in the category of not enough lighting. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 23: Map of Locations Needing Lighting

Respondents highlighted a need for lighting across the project study areas, with the highest concentrations at major intersections and within the Wilshire / Fairfax and Wilshire / La Brea station areas. Commenters highlighted many areas where they felt unsafe walking at night including along 4<sup>th</sup> Street between La Brea Avenue and Highland Avenue, along Wilshire Boulevard, and on Fairfax Avenue north of San Vicente Boulevard.

## 2.6 Comfort Improvements

### 2.6.1 Not enough shade

Of the 1,429 responses related to comfort, 1,254 were in the category of lack of not enough shade. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 24: Map of Locations Needing Shade

Lack of shade was the category that received the greatest number of comments overall. The greatest number of requests were clustered along the entire length of Wilshire Boulevard, as well as the major north-south arterials of La Cienega Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, and La Brea Avenue. Large numbers of requests were also placed along 6<sup>th</sup> Street, San Vicente Avenue, 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and Olympic Boulevard. Many requests for shade along these streets were placed at intersections with bus stops, which suggests that bus riders in particular are in need of additional protection from the elements.

### 2.6.2 Inadequate bus stops

Of the 1,429 responses related to comfort and safety, 175 were in the category of inadequate bus stops. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 25: Map of Locations Needing Bus Stop Improvements

Respondents highlighted many improvements needed at bus stops in the study area. Concerns included a lack of shelter from the sun and rain, confusing signage or boarding/alighting areas, cars traveling in close proximity to waiting areas, and a lack of seating. Although the category was designed to gather input on the quality of existing bus stops, a few commenters also suggested locations for new bus stops. The majority of inadequate bus stop locations were focused at the D Line station areas, as well as at the intersections of Olympic Boulevard and La Brea Avenue, and Olympic Boulevard and San Vicente Boulevard.

## 2.7 Other Improvements

The online survey gathered 334 responses related to other improvements.

### 2.7.1 Something that is not listed here

Of the 334 responses related to other improvements, 238 comments were suggestions for something not listed in the other categories. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 26: Map of Other Improvements Needed

Many comments fell into other categories, including suggestions for new bicycle lanes and other infrastructure for cyclists, identification of areas where drivers speed, or improvements needed to crosswalks. Some frequently mentioned themes also included:

- A need for new land uses like affordable housing, retail, restaurants, public restrooms, and other amenities close to stations.
- Concerns about safety—related in particular to individuals living in the area who are experiencing homelessness.
- A need for wayfinding, new or trimmed landscaping, sidewalk cleaning, and other streetscape beautification.
- Requests for dedicated scooter/bicycle parking

## 2.7.2 My improvement idea

Of the 334 responses related to other improvements, 96 were in the category of my improvement idea. The response locations are illustrated in the map below.




Figure 27: Map of "My Improvement Ideas"

As with the previous category, some of the improvement ideas related to new bicycle lanes, crosswalk improvements, the need to slow down automobile traffic, or other aspects related to the main categories. Several commenters suggested new bridges or tunnels to connect walkers to stations, additional parking for drivers at stations, or reducing parking minimums at new construction. Others suggested bus lanes to improve service, or new shuttle service from the future stations to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, The Grove, or other areas to the north. Several commenters noted how the LACMA complex and Park La Brea impede north-south travel for walkers and cyclists.

# Next stop: a better journey.

## PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN Section 1 – Walk Audit Summary



**Metro**

FALL 2021


# Community Walk Audits


Purple (D Line) Extension First/Last Mile


## 493 unique conditions inputted

### Wilshire/La Cienega Station

Top 3 Categories


 New or Improved Crosswalks (61)


 Sidewalks/ Curb-extensions (54)


 Bus Stop Enhancements (21)

### Wilshire/Fairfax Station

Top 3 Categories


 Sidewalks/ Curb-extensions (49)


 New or Improved Crosswalks (27)


 Bus Stop Enhancements (17)

### Wilshire/La Brea Station

Top 3 Categories

 Sidewalks/ Curb-extensions (52)

 Landscaping/Shade (29)

 New or Improved Crosswalks (21)

### Overview

This document summarizes the findings from the in-the-field walk audits conducted by community members for the Purple (D Line) Extension First/Last Mile Plan. The community walk audits kicked-off with a virtual webinar that included a project introduction, a training on identifying first/last mile barriers, and a tutorial of the Audit App. Following the webinar, participants were tasked with conducting individual walk audits in a station area quadrant. The virtual webinars occurred on Thursday, January 14, 2021 (6-7pm) and Saturday, January 16, 2021 (10-11am).

Community walk audits were conducted between January 17-31, 2021. An estimated 21 community members participated in the walk audits, which represents 55%-60% of the number of participants who attended the online training webinars.

First/last mile observations fell into safety, comfort, or bike categories.\* The following pages summarize community walk audit findings for each station, by category.

In addition to the Community Walk Audits, Technical Audits were carried out during April 2020. Over 720 unique conditions were inputted by the technical team in addition to the community inputs. This document focuses on findings from the Community Walk Audits, however the maps on page 6, 10, and 14, depict the density of all audit points received (technical and community together), for reference.

\*Some first/last mile observations fell into an 'other' category. These observations were noted by the project team and are not included in the station summary maps.




# Community Walk Audits


## Density of Observed Points





### Wilshire/La Cienega Station



### Wilshire/Fairfax Station



### Wilshire/La Brea Station



### Safety Categories

- > New or Improved Crosswalks
- > Sidewalks/Curb-Extensions
- > Pedestrian Lighting
- > Traffic Speed
- > Street Width

### Comfort Categories

- > Bus Stop
- > Landscaping/Shade
- > Signage
- > Street Furniture

# Wilshire/La Cienega Station

## SAFETY: COMMUNITY DATA

Total Safety Observations - 135

- Crosswalks - 45%
- Sidewalks/Curb-Extensions - 40%
- Pedestrian Lighting - 1%
- Traffic Speed - 8%
- Street Width - 5%


### Density of Observed Points



Key observations for areas with high density of observed points

### Purple (D Line) Extension


- Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
- Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
- 10 minute walk from station
- City Boundary



# Wilshire/La Cienega Station


## COMFORT: COMMUNITY DATA

Total Comfort Observations - 50





### Density of Observed Points



 Key observations for areas with high density of observed points

### Purple (D Line) Extension

 Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)

 Purple (D Line) Extension  
Transit Project (under construction)

 10 minute walk from station

 City Boundary



# Wilshire/La Cienega Station

## BICYCLE: COMMUNITY DATA

Total Bicycle Observations - 29

### Density of Observed Points



Key observations for areas with high density of observed points

### Purple (D Line) Extension



Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)



Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)

--- 10 minute walk from station

--- City Boundary



# Wilshire/La Cienega Station: All Data

## COMMUNITY + PROJECT TEAM DATA

All Audit Conditions - 488

Density of Observed Points



Purple (D Line) Extension



Metro Station + Entrance  
(under construction)




Purple (D Line) Extension  
Transit Project  
(under construction)



10 minute walk from station



City Boundary



# Wilshire/Fairfax Station


## SAFETY: COMMUNITY DATA

Total Safety Observations - 101




- Crosswalks - 30%
- Sidewalks/Curb-Extensions - 62%
- Pedestrian Lighting - 4%
- Traffic Speed - 3%
- Street Width - 1%

### Density of Observed Points



 Key observations for areas with high density of observed points

### Purple (D Line) Extension


-  Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)
-  Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)
-  10 minute walk from station



# Wilshire/Fairfax Station


## COMFORT: COMMUNITY DATA

Total Comfort Observations - 30





### Density of Observed Points




 Key observations for areas with high density of observed points

### Purple (D Line) Extension

 Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)

 Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)

 10 minute walk from station



# Wilshire/Fairfax Station

## BICYCLE: COMMUNITY DATA

Total Bicycle Observations - 5

### Density of Observed Points



Key observations for areas with high density of observed points

### Purple (D Line) Extension



Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)



Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)



10 minute walk from station





# Wilshire/Fairfax Station: All Data


## COMMUNITY + PROJECT TEAM DATA


All Audit Conditions - 393

Density of Observed Points




Purple (D Line) Extension

 Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)

 Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)

 10 minute walk from station



# Wilshire/La Brea Station

## SAFETY: COMMUNITY DATA

Total Safety Observations - 83

- Crosswalks - 23%
- Sidewalks/Curb-Extensions - 58%
- Pedestrian Lighting - 6%
- Traffic Speed - 11%
- Street Width - 2%

### Density of Observed Points



Key observations for areas with high density of observed points

### Purple (D Line) Extension

Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)

Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)

10 minute walk from station



# Wilshire/La Brea Station

## COMFORT: COMMUNITY DATA

Total Comfort Observations - 40

Landscaping/Shade - 70%


Bus Stop - 15%

Signage - 10%


Street furniture - 5%

### Density of Observed Points



 Key observations for areas with high density of observed points

### Purple (D Line) Extension

 Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)

 Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)

 Transit Project (under construction)

 10 minute walk from station




# Wilshire/La Brea Station

## BICYCLE: COMMUNITY DATA


Total Bicycle Observations - 7


Density of Observed Points



 Key observations for areas with high density of observed points

Purple (D Line) Extension

 Metro Station + Entrance (under construction)

 Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project (under construction)

 10 minute walk from station



# Wilshire/La Brea Station: All Data

## COMMUNITY + PROJECT TEAM DATA

All Audit Conditions - 354

Density of Observed Points



Purple (D Line) Extension




Metro Station + Entrance  
(under construction)



Purple (D Line) Extension  
Transit Project  
(under construction)



10 minute walk from station



**Next stop: a better journey.**

**PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN**  
Section 1 – Project Origins



**Metro**

FALL 2021


**PROJECT ORIGINS** WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## Wilshire Boulevard

The recommendation for Wilshire Blvd is to extend one of the possible “Expanded” options from the City of Beverly Hills’ Connect Beverly Hills plan, for the length of the corridor. These modifications include sidewalk extensions in key locations within the parking lane. The Connect Beverly Hills project also received overwhelming community support for essential infrastructure projects and design standards on Wilshire Blvd. Wilshire Blvd is an important connector for all stations within the study area. The busy street needs comfort and access enhancements for pedestrians, while cyclists are encouraged to take an adjacent street (e.g. Charleville Blvd) for safety and comfort.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.




# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## La Cienega Boulevard

Long blocks should be split up with crosswalks, where possible. Mature trees already exist for much of the corridor, but pedestrian-oriented sidewalk lighting, sidewalk/curb-extensions, along with bus stop improvements at key locations, will help improve station access and transit transfer for this key corridor. The Connect Beverly Hills project also received overwhelming community support for essential infrastructure projects and design standards on La Cienega Blvd.

Proposed improvements first/last mile improvements will also support one of the possible “Expanded” options from the Connect Beverly Hills project.

### Improvements List



■ Improvements recommended for this street

■ Improvements not recommended for this street


**Note:** Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## San Vicente Boulevard

San Vicente Blvd is a wide, vehicular-oriented street, which needs a major overhaul if it is to feel completely comfortable for people walking and biking. While the First/Last Mile Pathway does not recommend a total street overhaul (e.g. road diet) due to practicality, there are several key improvements needed for transit riders, such as improved crossings for people walking and biking, a protected bike lane, bus stop enhancements, and lighting and wayfinding. Many trees already exist along the corridor in this station area. The first/last mile protected bike lane aligns with the City of LA's Mobility Plan proposed bike network. The City of Beverly Hills' Complete Streets plan proposes a south bound bike lane.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.



# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## Clifton Way

Clifton Way is proposed as a pleasant, low-stress alternative to riding a bike on Wilshire Blvd. This proposed Bike Boulevard could include improvements like corner bulb-outs, traffic circles, pedestrian and bike signage, pedestrian and bike lighting, etc.

### Improvements List



-  Improvements recommended for this street
-  Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.


\* Wayfinding recommended as part of Bike Boulevard suite of improvements.



# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## Charleville Boulevard

Charleville Blvd is proposed with a protected bike lane, as per City of Beverly Hills concepts, as part of a potential one-way couplet with Gregory Way. This residential street would also benefit from pedestrian lighting and bike friendly intersections.

### Improvements List



-  Improvements recommended for this street
-  Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## Gregory Way

Gregory Way is a key access street for the park and for people accessing the station from the southeast. First/last mile improvements needed include traffic calming and pedestrian lighting, along with key enhancements at the La Cienega Blvd/Gregory Way intersection, including bus stop improvements and crosswalk enhancements. A bike sharrow is proposed adjacent to La Cienega Park, while a protected bike lane is proposed west of La Cienega Park, to form a potential one-way couplet with Charleville Blvd, as per City of Beverly Hills' concepts.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## 6th Street

6th Street offers a pleasant east/west alternative to Wilshire for people riding bikes. A Bike Boulevard is proposed along the street, as there are a number of driveways. This proposal differs from the City of LA proposed protected facility, which would likely require elimination of parking.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.


\* Wayfinding recommended as part of Bike Boulevard suite of improvements.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## Willaman Drive

This pleasant north/south residential connector has a City of LA proposed sharrow that the First/Last Mile Pathway supports, to close a regional bike gap. To ensure a safe connection for people riding bikes, a bike friendly intersection should be included at Wilshire Blvd. Pedestrian lighting, bus stop improvements (on adjacent Wilshire Blvd), and crosswalk enhancements (at Wilshire Blvd) are also recommended.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## Le Doux Road

Le Doux Rd offers a pleasant, low-stress north/south alternative to La Cienega for people cycling. On this proposed Bike Boulevard, treatments could include corner bulb-outs, traffic circles, pedestrian and bike signage, etc. Ensuring a safe crossing at Wilshire Blvd is especially important for this north/south connector.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

\* Wayfinding recommended as part of Bike Boulevard suite of improvements.




# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## Gale Drive / Orlando Avenue

Sharrow markings, bicycle boulevard treatments and bike friendly intersections would help connect the northeast residential areas to the station. Safe crossing at San Vicente Blvd is critical on this corridor for station access.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.



# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## Santa Ynez Way

This pedestrian pathway can be used by transit riders who are walking from the southeast quadrant. While already pleasant, the pathway could be enhanced with regular and consistent pedestrian lighting. Wayfinding signage is not included on Santa Ynez Way, given the distance from the station.

### Improvements List



-  Improvements recommended for this street
-  Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## Sweetzer Avenue

A proposed Bike Boulevard along Sweetzer Ave with an enhanced and safe crossing at San Vicente Blvd would facilitate access from the northeast. The proposed Bike Boulevard is not extended south of Wilshire Blvd onto Schumacher Dr, because it does not immediately facilitate direct connection to the station. From a bike network perspective Schumacher Dr makes sense, however the First/Last Mile Pathway selects streets that most directly serve station access.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.


\* Wayfinding recommended as part of Bike Boulevard suite of improvements.



# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA CIENEGA

## Hayes Drive

Sharrow markings on Hayes Dr will connect to and extend the proposed sharrow on Gregory Way, providing a continuous east-west bike route through the station area. Hayes Dr is a residential street with mature trees and traffic calming. Pedestrian improvements are not recommended this street.

### Improvements List



-  Improvements recommended for this street
-  Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.










**PROJECT ORIGINS** WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX

## Wilshire Boulevard

The recommendation for Wilshire Blvd is to extend one of the possible “Expanded” options from the City of Beverly Hills’ streetscape project, for the length of the corridor. These modifications include sidewalk extensions in key locations within the parking lane. Wilshire Blvd is an important connector for all stations within the study area. The busy street needs comfort and access enhancements for pedestrians, while cyclists are encouraged to take an adjacent street (e.g. 6th St or 8th St) for safety and comfort.

### Improvements List

	Technical Walk Audit	Community Walk Audit	Stakeholder Interviews	Community Roundtable #2	Online Survey
 Bus Stop Improvements	●	●	●	●	●
 Landscaping & Shade	●	●		●	●
 New or Improved Crosswalks	●	●	●	●	●
 Pedestrian Lighting	●	●	●	●	●
 Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions	●	●			●
 Street Furniture	●				
 Traffic Calming	●	●	●		●
 Wayfinding Signs	●	●	●		
 Bike Facility	●	●	●	●	●

- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street










Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX

## Fairfax Avenue

Fairfax Ave provides connections to LACMA, Peterson Automotive Museum, the Farmers Market, the Grove, and Little Ethiopia. The First/Last Mile Pathway supports the City of LA proposed bike lane. Long blocks should be split up with crosswalks, where possible. The key intersection at Fairfax Ave/San Vicente Blvd/Olympic Blvd will require further study and detailed design attention to make it safer and more pleasant for people walking and biking.

### Improvements List

	Technical Walk Audit	Community Walk Audit	Stakeholder Interviews	Community Roundtable #2	Online Survey
 Bus Stop Improvements	●	●		●	●
 Landscaping & Shade	●	●		●	●
 New or Improved Crosswalks	●	●	●	●	●
 Pedestrian Lighting	●		●		●
 Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions	●	●	●		●
 Street Furniture	●				
 Traffic Calming	●	●	●		●
 Wayfinding Signs	●	●			
 Bike Facility	●	●	●	●	●

- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX

## 6th Street

West of Fairfax, 6th St is a great candidate for a Bike Boulevard, which can provide regional connectivity. Elements along the Bike Boulevard portion of 6th St could include chicanes, diverters, pedestrian and bike signage, and lighting, etc. East of Fairfax, 6th St is wider and less friendly for active transportation users. Traffic calming is needed on this portion of the street and a protected bike facility would make it more comfortable for people riding a bike. This portion of the street would require more extensive modification to ensure a safe and comfortable experience for people walking and biking.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

\*Wayfinding recommended as part of Bike Boulevard suite of improvements and at spot location.




# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX

## 8th Street/Del Valle Drive

As with 6th St, the character of 8th St changes along its length. East of Fairfax, there is more room for a bike lane, while west of Fairfax bicycle boulevard treatments are proposed. Bulb-outs at corners would help to make this street more pedestrian friendly. Trees and pedestrian lighting, along with enhanced crosswalks at key intersections would be helpful for station access.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.


\* Wayfinding recommended as part of Bike Boulevard suite of improvements.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX

## San Vicente Blvd

San Vicente Blvd is a wide, vehicular-oriented street, which needs a major overhaul if it is to feel completely comfortable for people walking and biking. While the First/Last Mile Pathway does not recommend a total street overhaul (e.g. road diet) due to practicality, there are several key improvements needed for transit riders in this area, such as improved crossings for people walking and biking, a protected bike lane, bus stop enhancements, and lighting, trees, and wayfinding. The key intersection at Fairfax Ave/San Vicente Blvd/Olympic Blvd will require further study and detailed design attention to make it safer and more pleasant for people walking and biking.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street








Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX

## Crescent Heights Blvd / McCarthy Vista

This busy residential street is often used for cut-through vehicular traffic. Especially critical for this street are safe and enhanced crossings for people walking and riding bikes. Pedestrian lighting is also recommended.

### Improvements List

	Technical Walk Audit	Community Walk Audit	Stakeholder Interviews	Community Roundtable #2	Online Survey
 Bus Stop Improvements					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
 Landscaping & Shade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
 New or Improved Crosswalks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
 Pedestrian Lighting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
 Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
 Street Furniture					<input type="checkbox"/>
 Traffic Calming	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
 Wayfinding Signs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>
 Bike Facility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Improvements recommended for this street

Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX


## San Diego Way

This helpful pedestrian passageway already has pedestrian lighting. Wayfinding signage would help Metro riders find and access the station given its proximity to the station.

### Improvements List



 Improvements recommended for this street

 Improvements not recommended for this street































Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.



# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX

## Ogden Drive

Ogden Dr connects directly to the station on Wilshire Blvd and has a pleasant street character. Improvements such as trees and pedestrian lighting could assist active transportation users.

### Improvements List

	Technical Walk Audit	Community Walk Audit	Stakeholder Interviews	Community Roundtable #2	Online Survey
 Bus Stop Improvements					
 Landscaping & Shade					
 New or Improved Crosswalks					
 Pedestrian Lighting					
 Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions					
 Street Furniture					
 Traffic Calming					
 Wayfinding Signs					
 Bike Facility					

-  Improvements recommended for this street
-  Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / FAIRFAX

## Curson Avenue

Curson Ave provides regional connectivity for people riding bikes and connects to the proposed east/west bike facility on 8th St. The Curson facility has not been extended to Wilshire Blvd because there is no proposed bike facility on Wilshire Blvd to receive cyclists. At Curson Ave/Wilshire Blvd an idea was generated from the walk audits to remove the slip road and create a larger triangular green/open space adjacent to the restaurant on the northeast corner. This would further serve transit riders and improve the experience for people walking and biking.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

\* Wayfinding recommended as part of Bike Boulevard suite of improvements.










**PROJECT ORIGINS** WILSHIRE / LA BREA

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA BREA

## Wilshire Boulevard

The recommendation for Wilshire Blvd is to extend one of the possible options from the City of Beverly Hills' streetscape project, for the length of the corridor. These modifications include sidewalk extensions in key locations within the parking lane. Wilshire Blvd is an important connector for all stations within the study area. The busy street needs comfort and access enhancements for pedestrians, while cyclists are encouraged to take an adjacent street (e.g. 8th St or 6th St) for safety and comfort.

### Improvements List

	Technical Walk Audit	Community Walk Audit	Stakeholder Interviews	Community Roundtable #2	Online Survey
 Bus Stop Improvements	●				●
 Landscaping & Shade	●	●		●	●
 New or Improved Crosswalks	●	●		●	●
 Pedestrian Lighting	●	●		●	●
 Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions	●	●		●	●
 Street Furniture	●	●			
 Traffic Calming	●				●
 Wayfinding Signs	●	●			
 Bike Facility	●				●

 Improvements recommended for this street

 Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.




# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA BREA

## La Brea Avenue

Along La Brea Ave, the City of Los Angeles' proposed bike lane would greatly assist with station connectivity and access. The street is also in need of trees, lighting, and wayfinding signage. This vehicular oriented corridor has many destinations along its length and improved access for people walking and biking to and from the station, is critical.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA BREA

## 6th Street

The goal for 6th St is to provide a high-quality bike facility along the length of the corridor. From west to east, 6th St becomes narrower, so removal of parking or other more intensive roadway modification may be necessary to accomplish this goal. 6th St is the only east-west street north of 8th St that connects to the bike network in the station area.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street










Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA BREA

## 8th Street

8th St provides regional connectivity for cyclists and is recommended as a Bike Boulevard. This street provides a more comfortable alternative to riding on Wilshire Blvd. Corner bulb-outs would help to make this street more pedestrian friendly. Bike Boulevard treatments could include elements like traffic circles, diverters, chicanes, greening, and pedestrian and bike signage. Key crosswalks are recommended for enhancement.

### Improvements List

	Technical Walk Audit	Community Walk Audit	Stakeholder Interviews	Community Roundtable #2	Online Survey
 Bus Stop Improvements		●		●	●
 Landscaping & Shade	●	●			●
 New or Improved Crosswalks	●	●		●	●
 Pedestrian Lighting				●	●
 Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions	●	●		●	●
 Street Furniture					
 Traffic Calming	●	●			●
 Wayfinding Signs*		●			
 Bike Facility	●	●	●	●	●

- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.










\* Wayfinding recommended as part of Bike Boulevard suite of improvements.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA BREA

## Cochran Avenue

Cochran Ave should be converted into a Bike Boulevard with elements like curb extensions, diverters, chicanes, and roundabouts, as appropriate.

### Improvements List

	Technical Walk Audit	Community Walk Audit	Stakeholder Interviews	Community Roundtable #2	Online Survey
 Bus Stop Improvements					
 Landscaping & Shade	●	●		●	●
 New or Improved Crosswalks	●	●		●	●
 Pedestrian Lighting		●			●
 Sidewalk/Curb-Extensions	●	●			●
 Street Furniture					
 Traffic Calming		●			●
 Wayfinding Signs*					
 Bike Facility	●		●	●	●

- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.


\* Wayfinding recommended as part of Bike Boulevard suite of improvements.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA BREA

## Mansfield Avenue

Mansfield Ave has a pleasant street character because of its scale, trees, and pedestrian lighting. Transforming the street into a Bike Boulevard with elements like curb extensions, diverters, chicanes, and roundabouts, as appropriate would support active transportation and first/last mile improvements.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

\* Wayfinding recommended as part of Bike Boulevard suite of improvements.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA BREA

## Redondo Boulevard

Redondo Blvd is a five lane residential street with on street parking and existing sharrow markings. The sharrow markings should be upgraded into a bike lane to provide a comfortable and safe alternative route to La Brea Ave.



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street


Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# PROJECT ORIGINS WILSHIRE / LA BREA

## 4th Street

4th St is a residential street with on street parking and existing sharrow markings. Transforming the street into a Bike Boulevard with elements like curb extensions, diverters, chicanes, and roundabouts, as appropriate would support active transportation and first/last mile improvements.

### Improvements List



- Improvements recommended for this street
- Improvements not recommended for this street

Note: Recommended improvements may not always align with community comments. Some community comments were not included in recommendations because they were determined to be infeasible, had already been resolved, or did not directly support access to and from the station on the first/last mile network. Some recommended improvements that did not have community and/or technical audit comments were added, based on further analysis conducted by the design team.

# Next stop: a better journey.

## PURPLE (D LINE) EXTENSION TRANSIT PROJECT FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN Section 1 – Cost Assumptions



**Metro**<sup>®</sup>

FALL 2021



# COST ASSUMPTIONS

This memorandum summarizes the project elements and unit cost assumptions used in the development of conceptual-level cost estimates associated with the implementation of proposed improvements for the Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Plan. Each individual improvement shown below is presented with unit type, and its associated unit cost. Cost estimates for improvements proposed by street on a station-by-station basis are found in the Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimates Section.

## Proposed Pedestrian Improvements

Improvement	Unit	Cost	Comments
Sidewalk & Curb Extensions	Each	\$ 30,425	Assumes extension of sidewalks and curbs at intersections. Cost is per corner of the intersection.
Bus Stop Improvements	Each	\$ 45,600	Includes shelter, benches, trash receptacle, info/signage.
Landscaping & Shade	Block	\$ 40,600	Assumes tree spacing of 40 feet.
New or Improved Crosswalks	Leg	\$ 1,150	Assumes striping of new crosswalks at existing intersections, with no changes to the traffic control devices. Assumes crosswalks striped as continental crosswalks.
New or Improved Sidewalks	Square Foot	For new: \$ 44 For improved: \$ 13	Assumes concrete sidewalk extension with curb, not including crowning of the street
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	Each (Both Sides of Street)	\$ 10,100	Assumes one pedestrian lighting post per 50 feet.
Street Furniture	Each	\$ 3,100	Assumes one bench and one trash receptacle every 200 feet.
Traffic Calming - Speed Hump	Each	\$ 10,000	Assumes one speed hump every 300 feet.

# COST ASSUMPTIONS

## Proposed Bicycle Improvements

Improvement	Unit	Cost	Comments
Mobility Hub	Each	\$ 1,800,000	Assumes installation of a new mobility hub.
Bicycle Friendly Intersection	Each	\$ 100,000	Assumes striping improvements at an intersection to create bicycle boxes and other designated bicycle waiting and crossing locations. \$50,000 for main street legs only.
Sharrow	Each	\$ 600	Beginning of each block and max of 250 foot spacing.
Bicycle Blvd	Feet	\$ 55	For signed bicycle routes, with some improvements designed to increase bicyclist visibility and calm auto traffic. Assumes average cost, dependent on context and magnitude of project.
Class II Bike Lanes	Mile	\$ 75,000	Signage and striping only. No pavement reconstruction.
Class IV Protected Bike Lane	Mile	\$ 450,000	Assumes asphalt is existing, and includes striping a 3-foot buffer, bike lane symbols, and vertical markers every 3 feet.

Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

213.922.9200 Tel  
213.922.5259 Fax  
*metro.net*





# Next stop: vibrant communities.

**First/Last Mile Plan  
Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project  
Section 1**

Planning and Programming Committee  
September 15, 2021  
File ID 2021-0485



# Recommendation



CONSIDER:

**ADOPTING** First/Last Mile Plan for Purple (D Line) Extension Transit Project, Section 1

Section 1 Stations:


- Wilshire/La Brea
- Wilshire/Fairfax
- Wilshire/La Cienega



# First/Last Mile Methodology and Process

Followed methodology in the *2014 First/Last Mile Strategic Plan*

- Analysis of existing conditions
- Technical walk-audits
- Community engagement, adapted to COVID-19 pandemic context
- Analysis of community feedback
- Drafting of Pathway Networks
- Community Presentations



# Participatory Approach

Let's talk about your pedestrian concerns.

Please place markers on the map where you would like changes in the three station areas.

- Click on the markers below depending on the barrier you would like to see improved in the station areas.
- Click on the map where the barrier is located. Zoom in and out of the map using the +/- buttons.
- If you did not place the marker in the appropriate location, click on it and select delete.
- You can add as many markers to the map as necessary.

Speeding



Not enough time to cross the street/ too many lanes/ wide streets to cross



Not enough lighting



Not enough shade



Inadequate bus stop



Crossings are spaced too far apart/ long blocks




Missing, broken or narrow sidewalks



Community engagement included:

- Partnership with CBO, *Los Angeles Walks*
- Online map-based survey (891 responses)
- Stakeholder interviews (20 participants)
- Community walk-audits (36 trainees; 21 audits)
- Roundtable discussion (10 participants)



# First/Last Mile Plan Results

- The Plan resulted in project lists with pedestrian and bicycle improvements for each station area.
- Example projects: sidewalks/curb extensions, crosswalks, pedestrian lighting, traffic calming, wayfinding, landscaping/shade, bus stop improvements, street furniture, bicycle facilities
- Next steps:
  - Plan will be transmitted to local jurisdictions for implementation
  - Adoption of Plan qualifies cities for Metro grant-writing assistance





## Board Report

File #: 2021-0490, File Type: Project

Agenda Number: 9.

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE SEPTEMBER 15, 2021

**SUBJECT: NORTH HOLLYWOOD TO PASADENA BUS RAPID TRANSIT CORRIDOR  
PROJECT**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to:

- A. INCREASE Contract Modification Authority (CMA) specific to Contract No. AE49369000 with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. in the amount of \$580,000, increasing the total authorized CMA amount from \$676,889 to \$1,256,889 to support the additional environmental technical work needed for the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR); and
- B. INCREASE CMA specific to the On-Call Communications Bench Contract No. PS44432010 with The Robert Group - Task Order No. 09 in the amount of \$380,000, increasing the total authorized CMA amount from \$100,000 to \$480,000 to implement additional community engagement activities to support the Final EIR, focusing outreach activities to better engage transit riders and equity focused communities.

#### **ISSUE**

At the May 2021 meeting, the Board approved the Proposed Project for the North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Corridor Project, including two design options for Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock, with the understanding that staff conduct additional stakeholder outreach and continue coordinating with the corridor cities before completing the Final EIR. Board action is required to increase the Contract Modification Authority (CMA) for the additional outreach and conceptual engineering and environmental work needed to evaluate additional design options, finalize the Proposed Project for completion of the Final EIR, and other work identified through these efforts to complete the environmental process.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Project is a proposed 18.1-mile BRT transit corridor that would extend east from the North Hollywood Metro B/G Line (Red/Orange) Station to Pasadena City College (PCC). The study area serves as a key regional connection between the San Fernando

---

and San Gabriel Valleys and serves North Hollywood, Burbank, Glendale, Eagle Rock, and Pasadena. The study area has a dense residential population with many cultural, entertainment, shopping and employment areas throughout, including the NoHo Arts District, Burbank Media Center, Glendale Galleria, Americana at Brand, Eagle Rock, and Old Pasadena.

In coordination with the cities of Los Angeles, Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena, Metro completed and released the Draft EIR for public review and comment, beginning on October 26, 2020, and ending on December 28, 2020. Metro received almost 500 public comments, most of which were supportive of the project. After the Draft EIR, staff conducted additional stakeholder outreach and coordination. Based on all the feedback received, several refinements, including refinements in Burbank, Glendale, and Eagle Rock, were proposed.

In Eagle Rock, the Proposed Project included two design options for center-running bus lanes on Colorado Boulevard east of Eagle Rock Boulevard. One of those options converted one travel lane in each direction to bus lanes, while the other option converts portions of the landscaped median and street parking to bus lanes while preserving the existing travel lanes. In May 2021, these refinements and design options were presented and approved by the Board. However, on-going coordination with the cities and additional outreach efforts are needed before finalizing the EIR, including on-going discussions with the City of Burbank on potential design options for bus lanes on Olive Avenue.

Staff is requesting Board action to increase the CMA to support these efforts and any other work identified as part of these on-going efforts to complete the Final EIR and remain on schedule for the Measure M opening date of FY 2024.

## **DISCUSSION**

Due to the complexity of the project, additional CMA is being requested for both the technical and outreach contracts to support the additional stakeholder outreach and coordination and final CEQA analyses and account for any additional unforeseen expenses or level(s) of effort. This allows for flexibility and responsiveness necessary to maintain the project schedule.

## **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

Approval of this item will not impact the safety of Metro's customers or employees.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The FY 2022 budget includes \$960,659 in Cost Center 4240, Project 471401 (North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor). Since this is a multiyear contract, the Cost Center Manager and Chief Planning Officer will be responsible for budgeting in future years for the balance of the remaining project budget.

### **Impact to Budget**

The source of funds is Measure M 35%. As these funds are earmarked for the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT, they are not eligible for Metro bus and rail capital and operating expenditures.

---

## **EQUITY ASSESSMENT**

This Board action will enable the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Project to avoid delays, engage in more community outreach, and perform additional analyses to advance the project.

The project area includes several Equity Focus Communities (EFCs). The project will provide the benefits of enhanced mobility and improved regional access for transit riders within the study area. The project would also provide multiple access points for people living in EFCs along the corridor that would allow them to connect with the greater regional transportation network and key destinations via Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-accessible stations. Improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities are also planned as part of the project, and a set of proposed mitigations would address any potential impacts to existing facilities within these communities during both construction and operation of this project to ensure safe and easily navigable options.

The outreach strategy for the project has been designed to engage with historically marginalized groups through the use of multilingual outreach materials (English, Spanish, Armenian, Tagalog), live-translation during project meetings, accessible meeting times and locations, regular project updates via a mailing list, as well as transit-intercept surveys to reach current riders otherwise unable to attend meetings. The project team will ground the environmental review in equity by continuing this robust stakeholder engagement and focusing outreach activities to better engage transit riders and EFCs to inform the environmental review and the ultimate recommendations that go before the Board of Directors.

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The recommendations in this report support the following goals outlined in the Metro Vision 2028 Strategic Plan:

- Strategic Goal #1: Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling;
- Strategic Goal #2: Deliver outstanding trip experiences for all users of the transportation system; and
- Strategic Goal #3: Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity.

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board may decide not to approve the recommended CMA increases for the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Project. This is not recommended as it would further delay the completion of the Final EIR and prevent the additional analyses and outreach requested by the Board. Delaying the project would further jeopardize the ability to meet the Measure M Expenditure Plan schedule, including the opening date of FY 2024.

## **NEXT STEPS**

Should the Board approve the recommendations, staff will continue completing the Final EIR, including additional stakeholder outreach and coordination. After completion of the Final EIR, staff


anticipates returning to the Board in late 2021 or early 2022 for certification of the EIR and final approval of the Proposed Project.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment A-1 - Procurement Summary (AE49369000)
- Attachment A-2 - Procurement Summary (PS44432010, Task Order No. 09)
- Attachment B-1 - Contract Modification/Change Order Log (AE49369000)
- Attachment B-2 - Contract Modification/Change Order Log (PS44432010, Task Order No. 09)
- Attachment C-1 - DEOD Summary (AE49369000)
- Attachment C-2 - DEOD Summary (PS44432010, Task Order No. 09)

Prepared by: Gary Byrne, Senior Transportation Planner, (213) 922-3719  
Scott Hartwell, Manager, Transportation Planning, (213) 922-2836  
Martha Butler, Senior Director, (213) 922-7651  
Cory Zelmer, Deputy Executive Officer, (213) 922-1079  
David Mieger, Senior Executive Officer, (213) 922-3040  
Lilian De Loza-Gutierrez, Director, Community Relations, (213) 922-7475  
Anthony Crump, Deputy Executive Officer, Community Relations, (213) 922-3292

Reviewed by: James de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-2920  
Debra Avila, Chief Vendor/Contract Management Officer, (213) 418-3051  
Yvette Rapose, Chief Communications Officer, (213) 418-3154



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer

## PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

NORTH HOLLYWOOD TO PASADENA BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT)  
ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING STUDY/AE49369000

1.	<b>Contract Number:</b> AE49369000		
2.	<b>Contractor:</b> Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
3.	<b>Mod. Work Description:</b> N/A		
4.	<b>Contract Work Description:</b> Environmental and Planning Study		
5.	<b>The following data is current as of:</b> 7/27/21		
6.	<b>Contract Completion Status</b>		<b>Financial Status</b>
	<b>Contract Awarded:</b>	5/23/18	<b>Contract Award Amount:</b> \$6,768,898
	<b>Notice to Proceed (NTP):</b>	N/A	<b>Total of Modifications Approved:</b> \$5,532,164
	<b>Original Complete Date:</b>	10/21/20	<b>Pending Modifications (including this action):</b> N/A
	<b>Current Est. Complete Date:</b>	2/27/22	<b>Current Contract Value (with this action):</b> \$12,301,062
7.	<b>Contract Administrator:</b> Samira Baghdikian		<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-1033
8.	<b>Project Manager:</b> Scott Hartwell		<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-2836

**A. Procurement Background**

This Board Action is to approve an increase in Contract Modification Authority (CMA) to support the additional environmental technical work needed for the Final Environmental Impact Report for the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT environmental and planning study.

Contract Modification(s) will be processed in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract type is a firm fixed price.

On May 23, 2018, the Board awarded a 40-month firm fixed price Contract No. AE49369000 to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. to complete the Planning and Environmental Study for the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor with one of two optional tasks to advance the design through either 1) Advanced Conceptual Engineering or 2) Preliminary Engineering.

Five modifications have been issued to date.

Refer to Attachment B – Contract Modification/Change Order Log.

**B. Cost Analysis**

Contract modification(s) will be determined to be fair and reasonable based upon an independent cost estimate, cost analysis, technical analysis, fact finding, and negotiations.

## PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

NORTH HOLLYWOOD TO PASADENA AND NORTH SAN FERNANDO VALLEY  
BRT IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS/PS44432010 TASK ORDER 009

1.	<b>Contract Number:</b> PS44432010 Task Order No. 009		
2.	<b>Contractor:</b> The Robert Group		
3.	<b>Mod. Work Description:</b> N/A		
4.	<b>Contract Work Description:</b> Community Stakeholders Outreach		
5.	<b>The following data is current as of:</b> 8/9/21		
6.	<b>Contract Completion Status</b>		<b>Financial Status</b>
	<b>Contract Awarded:</b>	7/10/18	<b>Contract Award Amount:</b> \$525,013
	<b>Notice to Proceed (NTP):</b>	7/10/18	<b>Total of Modifications Approved:</b> \$275,089
	<b>Original Complete Date:</b>	06/30/21	<b>Pending Modifications (including this action):</b> N/A
	<b>Current Est. Complete Date:</b>	2/27/22	<b>Current Contract Value (with this action):</b> \$800,102
7.	<b>Contract Administrator:</b> Antwaun Boykin		<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-1056
8.	<b>Project Manager:</b> Lilian De Loza Gutierrez		<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-9479

**A. Procurement Background**

This Board Action is to approve an increase in Contract Modification Authority (CMA) to support the Final EIR, focusing outreach activities to better engage transit riders and equity focused communities for the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT environmental and planning study.

Contract Modification(s) will be processed in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract type is a firm fixed price.

On July 10, 2018, staff awarded firm fixed Contract No. PS44432010 Task Order No. 009 to The Robert Group to elicit feedback from community stakeholders to recommend a Proposed Project for both the North Hollywood to Pasadena and North San Fernando Valley BRT corridors.

Two modifications have been issued to date.

Refer to Attachment B-2 – Contract Modification/Change Order Log.

**B. Cost Analysis**

Contract modification(s) will be determined to be fair and reasonable based upon an independent cost estimate, cost analysis, technical analysis, fact finding, and negotiations.



## CONTRACT MODIFICATION/CHANGE ORDER LOG

NORTH HOLLYWOOD TO PASADENA BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT)  
ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING STUDY/AE49369000

<b>Mod. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Status (approved or pending)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>\$ Amount</b>
1	Additional technical meetings, community workshops and public hearings.	Approved	5/21/20	\$391,189
2	Updated operating plan, updated capital and operating cost estimates, and revised ridership model.	Approved	9/24/20	\$74,311
3	Period of performance (POP) extension through 6/24/21.	Approved	10/20/20	\$0
4	Authorizing Optional Task 7.0-2 for preliminary engineering per May 2018 Board approval and POP extension through 2/28/22.	Approved	3/2/21	\$4,860,264
5	Technical support to identify a refined proposed project.	Approved	4/14/21	\$206,400
	<b>Modification Total:</b>			<b>\$5,532,164</b>
	<b>Original Contract:</b>	Approved	5/23/18	<b>\$6,768,898</b>
	<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$12,301,062</b>

## CONTRACT MODIFICATION/CHANGE ORDER LOG

NORTH HOLLYWOOD TO PASADENA AND NORTH SAN FERNANDO VALLEY  
BRT IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS/PS44432010 TASK ORDER 009

<b>Mod. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Status (approved or pending)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>\$ Amount</b>
1	Exercise Task Order Option No. 1	Approved	10/3/19	\$175,089
2	Exercise Contract Modification Authority (CMA) for Task Order	Approved	10/15/20	\$100,000
	<b>Modification Total:</b>			<b>\$275,089</b>
	<b>Original Contract:</b>	Approved	7/10/18	<b>\$525,013</b>
	<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$800,102</b>

## DEOD SUMMARY

**NORTH HOLLYWOOD TO PASADENA BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT)  
ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING STUDY/AE49369000**

**A. Small Business Participation**

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. made a 21.23% Small Business Enterprise (SBE) and a 3.68% Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) commitment. Based on payments reported, the project is 53% complete and the current level of SBE is 21.61% and the current level of DVBE participation is 3.74%. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. is exceeding its SBE/DVBE commitments by 0.38% and 0.06%, respectively.

<b>Small Business Commitment</b>	<b>SBE 21.23% DVBE 3.68%</b>	<b>Small Business Participation</b>	<b>SBE 21.61% DVBE 3.74%</b>
----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------------

	<b>SBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>	<b>Current Participation<sup>1</sup></b>
1.	AFSHA Consulting	0.60%	0.97%
2.	CHS Consulting	3.04%	3.29%
3.	Coast Surveying	2.34%	2.11%
4.	Connectics Transportation Group	1.14%	0.84%
5.	GPA Consulting	1.19%	0.52%
6.	Here Design Studio	0.62%	1.11%
7.	Impact Sciences	0.74%	0.95%
8.	Katherine Padilla & Associates	0.31%	0.47%
9.	Kilograph	0.55%	0.84%
10.	Land Econ Group, LLC	1.03%	1.66%
11.	Paleo Solutions	0.43%	0.44%
12.	Parikh Consultants, Inc.	1.29%	1.25%
13.	Terry A Hayes Associates	3.34%	4.63%
14.	Translink Consulting	1.43%	2.53%
15.	W2 Design, Inc	3.18%	Substituted
	<b>Total</b>	<b>21.23%</b>	<b>21.61%</b>

	<b>DVBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>	<b>Current Participation<sup>1</sup></b>
1.	Leland Saylor Associates	3.68%	3.74%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3.68%</b>	<b>3.74%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Current Participation = Total Actual amount Paid-to-Date to certified firms ÷ Total Actual Amount Paid-to-date to Prime.

**B. Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy Applicability**

The Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy is not applicable to this contract.

**C. Prevailing Wage Applicability**

Prevailing Wage requirements are applicable to this project. DEOD will continue to monitor contractors' compliance with the State of California Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), California Labor Code, and, if federally funded, the U S Department of Labor (DOL) Davis Bacon and Related Acts (DBRA).

**D. Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy**

Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is not applicable to this Contract. Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is applicable only to construction contracts that have a construction contract value in excess of \$2.5 million.

## DEOD SUMMARY

**NORTH HOLLYWOOD TO PASADENA AND NORTH SAN FERNANDO VALLEY  
BRT IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS/PS44432010 TASK ORDER 009**

**A. Small Business Participation**

The Robert Group, a Small Business Prime, made a 100% Small Business Enterprise (SBE) commitment on this task order. Based on payments reported, the project is 100% complete and the current SBE participation is 100%.

<b>Small Business Commitment</b>	<b>SBE 100%</b>	<b>Small Business Participation</b>	<b>SBE 100%</b>
----------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------

	<b>SBE Prime Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Committed</b>	<b>Current Participation<sup>1</sup></b>
1.	The Robert Group	100%	100%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Current Participation = Total Actual amount Paid-to-Date to certified firms ÷ Total Actual Amount Paid-to-date to Prime.

**B. Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy Applicability**

The Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy is not applicable to this contract.

**C. Prevailing Wage Applicability**

Prevailing Wage requirements are applicable to this project. DEOD will continue to monitor contractors' compliance with the State of California Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), California Labor Code, and, if federally funded, the U S Department of Labor (DOL) Davis Bacon and Related Acts (DBRA).

**D. Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy**

Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is not applicable to this Contract. Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is applicable only to construction contracts that have a construction contract value in excess of \$2.5 million.



## Board Report

File #: 2021-0531, File Type: Agreement

Agenda Number: 10.

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE SEPTEMBER 15, 2021

**SUBJECT: ALAMEDA CORRIDOR-EAST (ACE) PROJECT MEASURE R WORKING CAPITAL  
LOAN RESTRUCTURING**

**ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or their designee to negotiate and execute a project amendment to the ACE Measure R Master Funding Agreement which will restructure the associated working capital loan by extending the loan term an additional three years and restructure the loan maturity terms to allow for adjustment based on a percentage of the outstanding loan balance, thereby allowing for additional pre-payments.

#### **ISSUE**

Metro and the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) entered into a Measure R Master Funding Agreement on June 14, 2013. The Master Funding Agreement included a working capital loan in the amount of \$45,000,000. The SGVCOG has partially repaid \$15,000,000 toward the working capital loan, which was granted under a Measure R Master Funding Agreement with Metro. The SGVCOG has requested a restructuring of the loan terms and conditions (Attachment A) as Metro continues to support the delivery of the Alameda Corridor-East Grade Separation Phase II projects (ACE Project).

Under the existing agreement, payment of the outstanding balance of the working capital loan is due on the earlier of ten years (the "Initial Term") or the date in which Metro's outstanding Measure R fund obligation falls below \$75,000,000 (the "Early Trigger"). Based on a partial repayment of \$15,000,000 out of the total original loan amount of \$45,000,000, staff recommends extending the Initial Term by three additional years and adjusting the Early Trigger to reflect the \$15,000,000 partial payment and any additional future principal payment. The Early Trigger will be equal to five-thirds (5/3) of the current outstanding loan balance.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The SGVCOG established the Alameda Corridor-East (ACE) Construction Authority in 1998 to provide direction and oversight of the ACE Project, a series of rail-highway grade separation and at-grade safety improvement projects, to mitigate the impacts of significant increases in freight rail traffic

on over 70 miles of mainline railroad in the San Gabriel Valley. In the same year, Metro and SGVCOG entered into a funding agreement to support the ACE Project.

These projects are located within various San Gabriel Valley cities, primarily in the City of Industry, Diamond Bar, El Monte, Montebello, Pico Rivera and Pomona. Since then, Metro continues to support the SGVCOG in delivering the ACE Project through several commitments funded through LA County's sales tax measures.

In June 2013, Metro entered into a funding agreement with the SGVCOG to authorize Metro's Measure R contribution to the ACE Project. The agreement included a working capital loan to support the SGVCOG's cash flow needs during the project delivery.

The maximum loan amount of \$45,000,000 is counted towards the maximum Metro contribution of \$358,000,000 under the Master Funding Agreement, and is not intended to exceed the maximum Metro contribution amount outlined in Measure R.

Through the addendum No.3, dated on March 25, 2021, \$282,500,000 of Measure R funds has been authorized. The remaining balance under the Master Funding Agreement is \$75,500,000.

With the success of completing the Puente Avenue Grade Separation project, three projects presently under construction (Durfee Avenue, Fairway Drive, and Fullerton Road Grade Separation projects), the Turnbull Canyon Road Grade Separation project in construction contract award, three projects in final design (Montebello Corridor Grade Separation, Montebello At-Grade Crossing Improvements, and Pomona At-Grade Safety Improvements) and the Maple Avenue Overcrossing Safety Improvement project in right-of-way phase, the SGVCOG has determined that its cash flow needs have reduced.

The Master Funding Agreement presently stipulates that the loan repayment would be triggered either at ten (10) years from the time that the working capital loan commenced, or when Metro's outstanding obligation is at its last \$75,000,000. Based on a partial repayment of \$15,000,000 out of \$45,000,000, the SGVCOG requested that the Initial Term be extended by three additional years and the Early Trigger be adjusted accordingly to reflect the partial repayment and any future partial payments.

## **DISCUSSION**

Since its inception in 1998, the SGVCOG's Alameda Corridor-East Project has successfully implemented and delivered construction projects to mitigate vehicle delays and collisions at at-grade rail-highway crossings to address community concerns over safety, noise, air quality, and emergency vehicle access.

The SGVCOG has delivered 12 grade separation projects to date; eight projects are currently active. These completed projects have eliminated at-grade crossings and improved traveler safety throughout the San Gabriel Valley where Union Pacific's freight mainlines move containerized cargo through several communities. These projects strongly support Metro's Agency Strategic Goal as they eliminate vehicle delays at at-grade crossings caused by the movement of freight trains and improve

---

quality of life for the surrounding communities by improving safety, offering easier access and connectivity to communities that were previously separated by both rail tracks and roadways, and eliminating noise impacts and tailpipe emissions from idling vehicles at such crossings.

Implementation of ACE grade separation projects also improves safety and travel speeds for commuter rail service like Metrolink that operates on the Union Pacific shared use freight rail corridor, thus encouraging modal shift from long distance single occupancy vehicle commutes to rail transit while reducing disparities for adjacent communities caused by collisions, congestion, air pollution, and noise associated with the movement of freight trains across local highways.

### **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

This Board action will further Metro's commitment to improving safety in the San Gabriel Valley by reducing collisions between freight rail and passenger vehicles at busy at-grade rail/highway crossings.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

FY22 budget includes \$59,000,000 for this project under cost center 0441 (Subsidies to Others), project number 460307 (Phase II ACE Grade Separation). Adopting the Board action would result in restructuring the working capital loan terms and conditions outlined in the Master Funding Agreement. The Initial Term will be extended by three additional years, and the Early Trigger will be adjusted to reflect the \$15,000,000 partial payment and any additional future principal payment. The Early Trigger will be equal to five thirds (5/3) the current outstanding loan balance.

#### **Impact to Budget**

The source of funds is Measure R Highway Capital 20%, which is not eligible for bus and rail operating and capital expenditures.

### **EQUITY PLATFORM**

The SGVCOG established the ACE Project in response to growing community concerns over rapidly increasing rail freight volume as Ports of Long Beach, and Los Angeles solidified their positions as the preferred ports of entry to serve America's surging demand for imported goods.

As described in Attachment B, the ACE Project community outreach efforts have consistently sought to incorporate community concerns and input in the design of the specific improvement projects. The SGVCOG conducts extensive community engagement meetings once project design reaches the 65% level with renderings, property take and easement maps, and detour routes that provide sufficient details to allow meaningful community input. The SGVCOG ensures that translators are on hand at such meetings to provide input in English, Spanish, and Chinese languages.

This extensive community engagement seeks to establish informed opportunities for surrounding communities to shape each of the ACE projects so that the completed projects meet the communities' needs and desires. These projects enhanced safety for vulnerable roadway users by



---

incorporating protected pedestrian walkways at grade separated project sites, as well as installation of active warning signs, new pedestrian sidewalks and protections, and a variety of median improvements to discourage and/or prevent motorists from driving around lowered crossing gates at at-grade rail and highway crossings.

Majority of the ACE Project elements are located in either disadvantaged communities as defined by the CalEnviroScreen or Metro's Equity Focus Communities (EFCs). The Board action will not eliminate any funding for projects or portions of planned or proposed projects for EFCs.

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

Board approval will support Metro's Strategic Plan Goals to (1) Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling and (3) Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The Board could choose not to approve this action. However, this is not recommended as the current terms and conditions outlined in the Master Agreement would continue withholding the last remaining \$75,000,000 of Measure R funds to be used for the ACE Project delivery. This would hinder Metro's commitment to supporting the completion of the ACE Project.

### **NEXT STEPS**


Upon Board approval, staff will execute an addendum to restructure the working capital loan terms and conditions to reflect the recent partial repayment.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - SGVCOG Letter on Partial Loan Repayment and Request  
Attachment B - ACE Project Equity Outreach Process

Prepared by: Akiko Yamagami, Manager, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3114  
Michael Cano, DEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3010  
Wil Ridder, EO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-2887 Laurie Lombardi,  
SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3251

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



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer



*Via email to [JohnsonR5@metro.net](mailto:JohnsonR5@metro.net)*

August 17, 2021

Mr. Rodney Johnson  
Deputy Executive Officer, Finance  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
One Gateway Center  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: Partial repayment of \$45 million working capital loan under MOU8002R**

Dear Mr. Johnson:

This letter is intended to accompany the simultaneous wire transfer from the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro) of a total of \$15,000,000 in partial payment of an outstanding \$45,000,000 loan extended by LA Metro to SGVCOG for the purpose of financing the working capital needs of the Alameda Corridor-East (ACE) Project.

The partial repayment is based on a careful assessment of cash flow needs of the three grade separation projects currently in construction and the two projects anticipated to start construction next year. As you know, the Alameda Corridor-East Phase II Grade Separations Master Funding Agreement for the working capital loan stipulates that the loan repayment would be triggered either at 10 years from the time that the working capital loan commenced in June 2013, or when LA Metro's outstanding obligation of Measure R or Proposition C for the ACE Project reaches a trigger amount of \$75,000,000 or less. With the approval of addendum No. 3 dated March 25, 2021, \$282,500,000 of Measure R funds have been authorized, leaving a remaining balance under the Master Funding Agreement of \$75,500,000.

To provide for future, albeit reduced cash flow needs, the SGVCOG hereby requests that LA Metro amend the loan duration to extend it by three additional years and that the repayment trigger amount be adjusted accordingly to reflect the partial repayment.

I hope this information is helpful. Please contact me at [ralimoren@sgvcog.org](mailto:ralimoren@sgvcog.org) should you have questions or need more information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rey P. Alimoran".

Rey Alimoran  
Director of Finance

cc: Mr. Matthew Wingert ([WingertM@metro.net](mailto:WingertM@metro.net))  
Ms. Akiko Yamagami ([YamagamiA@metro.net](mailto:YamagamiA@metro.net))



*Via email to [yamagamia@metro.net](mailto:yamagamia@metro.net)*

August 16, 2021

Ms. Akiko Yamagami  
Transportation Planning Manager  
Goods Movement  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
One Gateway Center  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Ms. Yamagami:

This letter is in response to your request for information on the consistency with LA Metro's Equity Platform of the community engagement conducted on behalf of the Alameda Corridor-East (ACE) Project, a comprehensive program of safety and mobility improvements along the freight mainline railroads in the San Gabriel Valley implemented by the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) and funded in partnership by LA Metro.

The ACE Project was started in 1998, well before current equity considerations were in place. However, as illustrated below, the SGVCOG community outreach approaches since inception of the ACE Project have largely been consistent with the goals and objectives of LA Metro's equity framework. The SGVCOG established the ACE Project in response to sharpening community concerns over the safety, congestion, air pollution, noise and other local impacts of growing freight rail traffic at at-grade crossings in the San Gabriel Valley with the completion of the Alameda Corridor rail expressway between the San Pedro Bay ports and downtown Los Angeles. The ACE Project program goals are to increase safety, improve mobility, reduce emissions and foster economic vitality. These broad goals reflect desired community outcomes of reducing the impacts of increased freight rail traffic through San Gabriel Valley communities which otherwise are burdened with the growth of freight movement in Southern California, the nation's largest trade gateway and inland corridor. Further, quality of life benefits include restoration of community connectivity and cohesion, which was previously divided by the railroad tracks.

In addition to the overall ACE Project reflecting community outcomes, SGVCOG's community outreach efforts have sought to incorporate community concerns and input in the design of the specific improvement projects that make up the comprehensive ACE Project. During the design engineering phase for each ACE project, SGVCOG conducted extensive community engagement meetings once project design reached the 65% level. At that level of design, renderings, property take and easement maps and detour routes are sufficiently detailed to allow meaningful community input. SGVCOG ensured that translators were on hand at community engagement meetings to allow input to be provided in English, Spanish and Chinese languages.

This extensive community engagement seeks to establish informed opportunities for surrounding communities to shape each of the ACE projects so that the completed projects meet the needs and the desires of the communities. For instance, at the most recent community outreach meeting for the Turnbull Canyon Road grade separation project in July 2019, community input and concerns resulted in the addition to the project of street lights to deter crime and dumping, installation of no-truck-through traffic signs on residential streets and fencing to be added to a pedestrian overcrossing to deter graffiti and camping, among other design revisions. During individual project construction, communities are kept apprised in advance of impactful construction activities so mitigation efforts can be developed to ease or offset impacts on neighboring residents and businesses.

Attached to this letter in response to your request are the SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities and AB 1550 Low-income Communities assessments prepared as part of the applications seeking SB 1 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program funds for the ACE grade separation projects at Montebello Boulevard and Turnbull Canyon Road.

I hope this information is helpful. Please contact me at [phubler@sgvcog.org](mailto:phubler@sgvcog.org) should you have questions or need more information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paul R. Hubler". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "P".

Paul Hubler  
Director of Government and Community Relations

Attachment

Attachment  
SB535 Disadvantaged Communities and  
AB1550 Low-Income Communities Assessment



## vi. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

ACE has conducted extensive community outreach for the Montebello Boulevard Grade Separation Project and planned safety improvements for the remaining at-grade crossings in the City of Montebello. In coordination with the City of Montebello, ACE held a community-wide project public information meeting on May 17, 2016. The meeting was well-publicized, with more than 22,000 invitation letters mailed to Montebello residents, businesses and key stakeholders and articles published in community newspapers. Nearly 90 people attended the meeting at a conference center in Montebello, including residents, business owners and representatives of the City of Montebello, Congresswoman Linda Sanchez’s office, Montebello Unified School District, Montebello Chamber of Commerce and Beverly Hospital.

The purpose of the meeting was to provide information and solicit comments and questions based on updated concept design plans for the proposed roadway underpasses at Montebello Boulevard and Maple Avenue and safety gate and crossing improvements at Greenwood and Vail Avenues. Display boards were made available showing concept design plans, traffic detours and right-of-way/easements required at each crossing. Materials were made available in English, Spanish and Chinese and translators were on hand to provide assistance to attendees. The plans developed were based on conceptual proposals approved by the Montebello City Council in February 2015.

The community input and concerns and ACE responses were summarized in a written report sent to the Montebello City Manager. ACE staff presented the concept plans for review and approval by the Montebello City Council, and the final concept was approved in July 2016, with an amendment to replace the underpass on Maple Avenue with a pedestrian overcrossing and quad gates. The underpass was replaced due to concerns over potential property access impacts to a nearby dairy and the lack of significant vehicular traffic on Maple Avenue.

The Montebello Boulevard Grade Separation Project received clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in November 2017.

## vii. COMMUNITY BENEFITS AND IMPACTS — DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES AND LOW-INCOME AREAS

The Project will produce mobility, safety, environmental, and quality-of-life benefits for the communities in and around the Project area by restoring connectivity and cohesion to a community divided by the UPRR rail line. That community is primarily Hispanic, lower-income and more transit-dependent than the overall population of Los Angeles County, with nearly 15% of residents living below the poverty level<sup>4</sup>.

The Project is located in Census tract #6037532101, which is designated as both a disadvantaged community and a low-income community. It is among the most disadvantaged 25% in the state,

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/montebellocitycalifornia/PST045216>



according to the California Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Section 39711 of the Health and Safety Code, and contains households with a median income at or below 80% of the statewide median or with median household incomes at or below the threshold designated as low income by the Department of Housing and Community Development’s list of state income limits adopted pursuant to Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code.

Figure 4 shows the SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities and AB 1550 Low-income Communities impacted by the Project<sup>5</sup>. The red and blue circles indicate the area within .5 and 1.0 miles of the Project site, respectively, where property values are expected to increase due to the grade separation construction. These increased property values will all occur in communities designated as disadvantaged or low income.





Figure 4: Montebello Boulevard Grade Separation Project  
 Disadvantaged Communities and Low-Income Areas

**viii. COMMUNITY BENEFITS AND IMPACTS – GENERAL**


As also described in the Benefit-Cost Analysis section of this narrative, the impact of the Project goes beyond the immediate project area, and extends to communities not designated as disadvantaged or low-income. The Project will improve the quality-of-life for residents in the City of Montebello and the San Gabriel Valley by reducing the hours that vehicles are delayed due to crossing trains, which will also lead to reductions in toxic emissions from idling vehicles, which will improve air quality throughout the region. The Project will improve safety for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians by eliminating the possibility of a crash, and will also eliminate delays for emergency responders. These improvements will reduce traffic congestion and create travel time savings throughout the region’s highly congested

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/capandtrade/auctionproceeds/communityinvestments.htm>





highways, and improve the reliability of freight movement between the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, thus reducing the costs associated with freight delays.



## **vi. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

The ACE Construction Authority intends to conduct community and public involvement for the Project throughout 2018. ACE staff has briefed the offices of Los Angeles County Supervisors Hilda Solis and Janice Hahn in preparation for holding a Community Open House meeting for the Project in 2018. The purpose of the open house meeting will be to present to residents and businesses the preliminary design plans and renderings, traffic detour information, and right-of-way/easements required from private property for the Project, as well to solicit comments from the public and affected parties. Public comments received at the meeting or by letter will be documented and responded to in writing. Information will be available in English, Spanish and Chinese languages.

## **vii. COMMUNITY-IDENTIFIED NEEDS, AND BENEFITS TO DISADVANTAGED AND LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES**

The Project will produce mobility, safety, environmental, and quality-of-life benefits for the communities in and around the Project area by restoring connectivity and cohesion to a community divided by the UPRR rail line. Additionally, the Project will increase low-income and minority access to jobs located in the City of Industry by eliminating congestion and delay. The project census tract (#6037408202) and the surrounding area are home to both SB 535 disadvantaged communities and AB 1550 low-income communities.

Figure 3 shows the SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities and AB 1550 Low-income Communities impacted by the Project. The circles indicate the area within 0.5, 1.0 and 1.5 miles of the Project site, respectively, where property values are expected to increase due to the grade separation construction. These increased property values will primarily occur in communities designated as disadvantaged and low income.


## **i. COMMUNITY-IDENTIFIED NEEDS AND BENEFITS TO OTHER AREAS**

As described above in Section VII and later in Section XI of this narrative, the Project will improve the quality-of-life for residents in the surrounding communities and the San Gabriel Valley. These benefits go beyond the immediate project area, and extend to communities not designated as disadvantaged or low-income.

The project will benefit these other communities by reducing the hours that vehicles are delayed due to crossing trains. Reducing vehicle hours and miles in the area will also lead to reductions in toxic emissions from idling vehicles, which will improve air quality throughout the region. The Project will improve safety for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians by eliminating the possibility of a crash, and will also eliminate delays for emergency responders. These improvements will reduce traffic congestion and create travel time savings throughout the region's highly congested highways, and improve the reliability of freight movement between the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, thus reducing the costs associated with freight delays. As mentioned above, the project is also the last at-grade crossing in the area, eliminating train horn noise at the crossing for all communities in the area.



Figure 3: Disadvantaged and Low-Income Communities



Source: California Air Resources Board



# We're planning a better way to move goods.

September 2021 Metro Board Meeting  
Item 2021-0531: ACE Project Measure R  
Working Capital Loan Restructuring



# Measure R Working Capital Loan

Measure R Master Funding Agreement includes a working capital loan to support the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments with its cash flow to deliver the ACE Project.

## Current loan amount, terms and conditions

Loan amount: \$45 million

Terms and conditions:

- > 10-year loan term
- > Repayment will be triggered when Metro's outstanding Measure R fund obligation falls below \$75million.

## Proposed terms and conditions

Partial repayment amount: \$15 million  
(received on September 1, 2021)

Upon Board approval, update terms and conditions as follows:

New outstanding balance: \$30 million

- > Extend the initial term by additional 3 years
- > Adjust the repayment trigger to be equal to five thirds (5/3) the current outstanding loan balance



## Board Report

File #: 2021-0530, File Type: Motion / Motion Response

Agenda Number: 11.

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE SEPTEMBER 15, 2021

**SUBJECT: I-710 SOUTH CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS STATUS  
UPDATE AND RESPONSE TO MOTION 47**

**ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE I-710 South Corridor Project Motion 47 Response.

#### **ISSUE**

At the May 27, 2021, regular Board meeting, Motion 47 (Solis, Sandoval, Butts, and Garcetti) on the I-710 (South) corridor improvements environmental process was approved (Attachment A). The Motion requested a report back at the September Board meeting.

#### **BACKGROUND**

##### *Draft EIR/EIS Development*

The environmental studies for the I-710 corridor improvements started in 2008 to address significant traffic congestion, safety, and air quality issues resulting from increasing traffic volumes and infrastructure deficiencies. Metro, in partnership with Caltrans, Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG), Port of Los Angeles, Port of Long Beach, Southern California Association of Governments, and the I-5 Joint Powers Authority (collectively, the Funding Partners), completed scoping, alternatives analysis and other technical work in early 2011, leading to the preparation of the draft environmental document (DED) and preliminary engineering. The development of the potential improvement alternatives was guided by the stated purpose statement approved by all study Partners and regulatory and resources agencies:

- Improve air quality and public health
- Improve traffic safety
- Address design deficiencies
- Address projected traffic volume
- Address projected growth in population, employment, and economic activity related to goods movement

The development of the DED was guided by a public outreach framework.

The DED circulated on June 28, 2012, evaluated four build alternatives, three of which, in addition to

---

improvements to the mainline freeway, included a grade-separated freight corridor. Close to 3,000 comments were received during the initial circulation. In early 2013, the Study Team, consisting of Metro, Caltrans, and the GCCOG, decided that reevaluation of the alternatives and re-circulation of the DED were necessary to address:

- 1) changes in the Ports' growth forecast scenarios and initial assumptions made about the future distribution of truck trips in Southern California;
- 2) significant right of way requirements for the original design that could make the project infeasible; and
- 3) a proposal by the Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice (CEHAJ) comprising community-based organizations and public health advocates to consider a new alternative to be added to those considered in the DED. This alternative was known as Community Alternative 7 and proposed the construction of a zero-emission freight corridor and significant investment in active transportation improvements and community benefits.

In response to community input regarding the need to address corridor issues beyond the freeway itself, both Build Alternatives included the following programmatic elements: the phased-in Zero Emission Truck Technology Deployment Program (a.k.a. I-710 Clean Truck Program), Community Benefits Grant Program, Congestion Relief Program and the Transit Enhancements Program. The 710 Clean Truck Program (CTP) would deploy 4,000 near zero-emission (NZE) or zero-emission (ZE) heavy duty (Class 8) trucks for use within the I-710 Corridor by 2035, assuming that such trucks would be commercially available and funds would be available to purchase those.

The Metro Board of Directors adopted Alternative 5C as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) on March 1, 2018 (Legistar File #2017-0849). In addition to approving the LPA for the I-710, the Board also approved two motions - Motion 5.1 by Directors Hahn, Solis, Garcia, and Dupont-Walker (Legistar File # 2018-0053) and Motion 5.2 by Directors Solis, Garcia, Ridley-Thomas, Butts, Najarian, and Hahn (Legistar File # 2018-0068) that provided additional direction to Metro staff to follow in implementing a I-710 Early Action Program.

#### *Final EIR/EIS Development*

Completion/closure of the environmental process requires the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to issue a Record of Decision (ROD), which confirms the formal federal approval of the FEIR/FEIS and allows Metro and Caltrans to proceed with the final design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of the project elements. As part of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) review process, FHWA is legally required to consult with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other state and local agencies on the Project's ability to meet project-level air quality conformity requirements. This multi-agency consultation process begins before the DED is prepared. A final air quality conformity determination is needed before the environmental document can be finalized.

Transportation conformity is required under Clean Air Act (CAA) section 176(c) (42 U.S.C. 7506(c)) to ensure that federally supported highway and transit project activities are consistent with/conform to the purpose of a state air quality implementation plan (SIP). Under these regulations, the I-710 Project would normally be considered a "Project of Air Quality Concern" (POAQC) because of the number of diesel trucks that currently travel on the freeway, the existing traffic congestion levels, and potential for the Project to significantly increase the number of diesel trucks traveling on the freeway. The underlying assumption is that new capacity on I-710 re-distributes traffic that had previously spilled over from the increasingly congested I-710 into communities on



---

local arterial streets and onto other regional freeways back onto the I-710. Although the determination of a POAQC is ultimately an FHWA decision, EPA's understanding of the benefits embedded in this Project and concurrence with Metro and Caltrans' recommendations are fundamental in supporting FHWA in their decision-making.

Because the I-710 CTP was already included as part of the I-710 investments when the DED was publicly circulated in 2017, Metro/Caltrans ascertained that there were grounds to challenge the Project's classification as a POAQC (since the Project's implementation would result in an overall reduction in diesel truck trips) thus obviating the need for a quantitative Particulate Matter (PM) "Hot Spot" analysis. This approach had never been tried before. The quantitative PM "Hot Spot" analysis methodology was a concern as preliminary tests indicated that the zero-emissions freight corridor alternative (Alternative 7) failed due to increases in particulate matter attributable to increases of roadway dust and brake/tire wear, that are created regardless of, and ultimately overwhelm, the tailpipe emission reductions expected with the deployment of cleaner truck technology. This outcome would have also been the case for the board-approved Alternative 5C or even a scenario introducing 100% zero emission trucks for the CTP. EPA has not yet established guidelines to identify and quantify potential mitigations for these entrained emission increases.

Metro and Caltrans have been coordinating with EPA throughout the environmental process. The idea of classifying the Project as "not a project of air quality concern" was initially discussed with EPA in August 2018. EPA was open to this idea but required:

- 1) a strong enough written commitment by Metro to the CTP;
- 2) more detail on the CTP program description, including funding and how the CTP would be administered, implemented, and enforced. EPA saw this approach as "legally vulnerable" because "it deviated from the standard regulatory procedures" and "could set precedent" but was open to discussions. In October 2018, EPA issued a white paper delineating all the requirements that would constitute the written commitment, including programming of funds towards program implementation.

In response to EPA's requirement for a written commitment, in July 2019, Metro, Caltrans, SCAG, and the GCCOG signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) memorializing their commitment to the I-710 Clean Truck Program (Attachment B~~D~~). To address EPA's principal concern about funding for the CTP, at the January 2020 Board meeting, Directors Hahn, Solis, Butts, Garcia, and Najarian introduced Motion 8.1 (Legistar File #2020-0067) that directed staff to include the I-710 Clean Truck Program as an Early Action investment under both the Goods Movement Strategic Plan and the I-710 South Corridor Project. Following staff's response to this motion, the Metro Board also voted in March 2020 (Legistar File#2020-0129) to program \$50 million in funding from Metro-controlled sources, including but not limited to Measure R, as "seed funding" for the CTP, to be made available contingent upon a ROD issued by FHWA for the Project. The Board's action was to accomplish three important goals:

- 1) Sending a strong message of good faith and meaningful commitment by Metro to the EPA that Metro intends to fund and implement the Clean Truck Program following FHWA issuing a ROD for the I-710 Project;

- 
- 2) Programming the initial funding to allow Metro to develop the I-710 Clean Truck Program in partnership with regional stakeholders and regulatory agencies; and,
  - 3) Identifying local seed funding that would allow Metro to leverage matching funds from state and federal discretionary grant programs to fulfill the Board's \$200 million funding target to support the implementation of the I-710 Clean Truck Program.

Following Metro Board's approval of programming of \$50 million in I-710 Early Action funds as seed funding for the I-710 CTP, Metro led a multi-agency coordination meeting on June 9, 2020, with the goal of reaching an agreement on the project-level air quality conformity determination for the Project. This meeting included executive-level representatives from Metro, SCAQMD, FHWA, EPA, and Caltrans. The meeting was positive - all parties committed to working towards an agreement; however, EPA was not ready to agree on the conformity determination before having additional time to discuss the details of the CTP and the size of the commitment Metro/Caltrans were willing to offer (beyond the \$50 million).

Over the following three months, Metro and Caltrans staff held additional meetings with EPA, AQMD, and FHWA. The staff discussed the remaining concerns and further detail needed on both the technical and regulatory sides. Based on the information shared and the in-depth discussions held during the recent meetings, Metro/Caltrans provided the following additional information to help EPA make the final determination as recommended by Metro and Caltrans:

- Specifics of the Program Description (e.g. identification of target vehicles, tracking, reporting, auditing, incentive structures, etc.)
  - A Roles & Responsibilities document for the CTP's Steering Committee that memorialized all the important details and decisions that cannot be finalized at this time.
  - A phasing plan, including deployment years and number of trucks for the initial phase of the CTP, assuming \$50 million of initial investment. Future estimates for the remainder of the CTP deployment were also included, but only for illustrative purposes as the funding, infrastructure and technological variables are impossible to predict today.
- Justification of "back-stop" measures to guarantee the program's viability

Despite all these efforts, additional program development, and seed funding commitments, EPA continued to dispute the viability of the CTP, which presents an insurmountable barrier to applying the I-710 CTP, either as a project feature or as mitigation, as the means to reduce diesel truck trips in the I-710 Corridor and to achieve project level conformity. The EPA's final position was memorialized in their March 25, 2021 letter (Attachment B).

## **DISCUSSION**

Per Board direction, all work related to the development of a FEIR/FEIS for the I-710 Corridor Project was suspended by the end of May 2021. With the suspension of the FEIR/FEIS, Metro and Caltrans have initiated the I-710 Task Force to review the Purpose and Need for this project and to develop a multimodal set of strategies, projects, and programs that will meet the goals set forth by a community-inclusive group of stakeholders, including GCCOG, that will serve on the task force.

The goal is to identify and work with stakeholders to develop a multimodal investment strategy to improve

regional mobility, safety, and air quality in concert with fostering economic vitality (including opportunities for local hire), social equity, environmental sustainability, and access to opportunity for LA County residents—particularly for the most impacted residents that live adjacent to I-710. The focal point of Metro’s engagement strategy will be a new stakeholder committee called the I-710 South Corridor Task Force (I-710 Task Force), entrusted with the important responsibility of working collaboratively and constructively to accomplish the following outcomes: (1) review the purpose and need, (2) develop multimodal and multipurpose strategies to meet these goals in alignment with state and local policies, (3) identify projects and programs to realize these strategies, and (4) create an investment plan to implement priority projects that leverage local (Measure R/M) funding and provide benefit to local communities and the region at-large.

In partnership with Caltrans (District 7), Metro will conduct a series of workshops with the I-710 Task Force over the next six to eight months to accomplish these overarching goals. The first meeting of the I-710 Task Force is scheduled for Monday, September 13, 2021, from 6:00 pm - 8:30 pm (via Zoom). This process will be modeled upon Metro’s 2021 Goods Movement Strategic Plan (GMSP) that brought together a robust and diverse set of key stakeholders, including GCCOG, through a third-party facilitated workshop setting to develop a shared vision and set of objectives, strategies, and outcomes to advance Metro’s priorities of social equity, environmental sustainability, and economic vitality for LA County.

On July 7, 2021, the GCCOG convened a special meeting of their Board of Directors and Executive Committee to discuss current policy considerations, regulatory issues and funding opportunities for the I-710 South Corridor and other highways in the sub-region. Metro, Caltrans, SCAG, Port of Los Angeles, and Port of Long Beach participated. As a result of this discussion, the GCCOG Board and Executive Committee resolved to create an I-710 Ad Hoc Committee to return to the GCCOG with recommendations regarding the future of the project.

Metro will work with the GCCOG to share information and will host “joint sessions” at key intervals over the next six months to help receive feedback from the GCCOG I-710 Ad Hoc Committee, share discussion, and incorporate their findings into the I-710 Task Force’s recommendations. At the end of the process, the Task Force will report back to the Metro Board on its findings and make recommendations on the scope of its investment plan to realize the refreshed Purpose and Need of the I-710 South Corridor. A detailed work plan for the new I-710 Task Force is included in Attachment C.

### **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

The proposed actions have no adverse impact on the safety of Metro’s patrons, employees, or users of these facilities.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

This is a Receive and File report for information only with no financial impacts. Any Board direction provided on the information presented in this report could result in financial and/or schedule impacts.

### **Equity Platform**

Equitable opportunities will be incorporated into all future decision-making, budget allocation, and community engagement for the Project(s) along the I-710. Staff will continue to work with stakeholders, including residents most impacted by projects, along the corridor to gather input and develop the framework for a I-710 South Corridor investment strategic plan to implement priority multimodal projects and programs based on their suggestions and feedback. Additional Program elements proposed by stakeholders will be considered and may be advanced in support of equitable outcomes. Transparent communication with the stakeholders will

---

help build consensus and trust moving forward and hopefully strengthen the communities' support for the needed improvements. Without timely investment to address the current corridor conditions, the I-710 users and corridor communities will continue to experience congestion, unsafe traffic conditions, spillage of freeway traffic onto local neighborhoods, pollution, and other negative impacts of the anticipated escalating traffic demand in the corridor.

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

Metro staff collaboration with local, regional, State, and Federal agencies, as well as the local communities towards the development of an Early Action Program for the I-710 Corridor and a long-term vision to improve I-710 is consistent with 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.

Goal 4: Transform LA County through regional collaboration by partnering with the GCCOG, Caltrans, impacted communities, and regional stakeholders to identify the needed improvements and take the lead in developing and implementing the Projects.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Activities in pursuit of major highway investments on I-710 are ceased until the Board provides further guidance, and we reach agreement with necessary regional, state, and federal agencies.

Metro and Caltrans will continue to lead the 710 Task Force to revisit the I-710 South Corridor project Purpose and Need, develop multimodal strategies to address these goals, identify projects that advance the multimodal strategies, and create an investment and policy strategic plan to implement the prioritized projects.

The I-710 Task Force outcomes will be presented to the Metro Board in early 2022, with updates provided periodically during this process. Staff will seek Board adoption of the I-710 Task Force investment and strategic plan at that time.

### **ATTACHMENT**


Attachment A - Motion 47 (May 21, 2021 Board Meeting)

Attachment B - March 25, 2021 Letter from EPA

Attachment C - Draft New Metro/Caltrans 710 South Corridor Task Force Engagement Strategy

Prepared by: Ernesto Chaves, Deputy Executive Officer, (213) 418-3142  
Michael Cano, Deputy Executive Officer, (213) 418-3010  
KeAndra Cylear Dodds, Executive Officer, (213) 922-4850  
Abdollah Ansari, Sr. Executive Officer, (213) 922-4781

Reviewed by: Bryan Pennington, Interim Chief, Program Management Officer, (213) 922-7449  
James de la Loza, Chief, Countywide Planning and Development, (213) 922-2920



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer



## Board Report

**File #:** 2021-0368, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response

**Agenda Number:** 47.

### REGULAR BOARD MEETING MAY 27, 2021

#### Motion by:

#### **DIRECTORS SOLIS, SANDOVAL, BUTTS, AND GARCETTI**

#### 710 South Corridor Project

In March of 2018, the Metro Board of Directors approved Motion 5.2 which adopted Alternative 5C as the Locally Preferred Alternative for the 710 South Corridor Project Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). The Motion also directed staff to implement an Early Action Program that would quickly deliver safety, mobility, and air quality benefits to the region, and to “re-evaluate and re-validate the remaining elements of Alternative 5C” upon completion of the Early Action Program. The Early Action Program includes a slew of projects throughout the 710 South Corridor such as streets and interchange improvements, active transportation facilities, the Clean Truck Program, and the Community Health Benefit Program. These Early Action Program improvements were required for completion before any mainline freeway work began.

Since approval of Motion 5.2, Metro staff has worked towards completion of the EIR/EIS. However, in just the last few weeks, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) opined that a particulate matter hot-spot analysis would be required for the 710 South Corridor Project’s EIR/EIS transportation conformity determination. Without this hot-spot analysis, the EPA cannot determine whether or not the Project is a project of air quality concern and a record of decision cannot be issued for the EIR/EIS. Additionally, at a recent meeting of the California Transportation Commission, Caltrans Director Toks Omishakin stated that Caltrans would “put an absolute pause on this project in the format that it’s currently in,” explaining that the Project does not align with the current trajectory of California’s transportation policy.

The issues raised by our federal and state partners suggest the need to re-think the Project scope and undertake a holistic, equity-based examination of the Project to ensure Metro’s investments do not disproportionately impact communities of color, inadvertently worsen induced demand, or work against existing greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals. There are elements currently included in the EIR/EIS that support local and state transportation goals and should move forward as individual projects separate from any mainline improvements to the 710 South Corridor.

**SUBJECT: 710 SOUTH CORRIDOR PROJECT**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

APPROVE Motion by Directors Solis, Sandoval, Butts, and Garcetti that direct the Chief Executive Officer to:

1. Immediately cease further work to advance the current 710 South Corridor Project EIR/EIS;
2. Evaluate all improvements included in the EIR/EIS that can be advanced separately from mainline 710 South infrastructure improvements including, but not limited to, projects related to active transportation, operational improvements, clean truck infrastructure, and community health;
3. Identify additional locally-supported projects that can be advanced to enhance mobility along the 710 South Corridor and complement the non-freeway projects mentioned above, including but not limited to the West Santa Ana Branch, the LA River/Rio Hondo Confluence Station, LA River Master Plan, and the Atlantic Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit;
4. Collaborate with corridor cities, local stakeholders, community based organizations, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and the Gateway Council of Governments to conduct outreach and develop a funding plan in order to advance a revised Early Action Program that includes projects identified in Directives 2 and 3. The revised Early Action Program should emphasize shovel ready projects and prioritize partnerships with labor to advance Metro's Project Labor Agreement and Construction Careers Policy;
5. Report back on all directives in September 2021.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**  
**REGION IX**  
**75 Hawthorne Street**  
**San Francisco, CA 94105-3901**

Tony Tavares, Director, District 7  
California Department of Transportation, District 7  
100 South Main Street, Suite 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Philip A. Washington, Chief Executive Officer  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 9012-2952

Re: EPA technical response for project-level transportation conformity status- Interstate 710 South

Dear Mr. Tavares and Mr. Washington:

In 2018, following publication of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS for the Interstate 710 (I-710) South Corridor project, Caltrans and Metro asked the EPA to consider a variation from project level transportation conformity analysis processes and requirements. Prior to this request, the transportation agencies were pursuing coordination related to required particulate matter (PM) hot-spot modeling assumptions and protocols. As an alternative, Caltrans and Metro proposed the I-710 Clean Truck Program to potentially offset the significant increase of diesel-emitting trucks that would result from the project, thereby attempting to remove the status of the project as a “Project of Air Quality Concern” and the need for a PM hot-spot analysis as part of the project-level transportation conformity determination.

The EPA recognizes the collective challenges to protecting human health while delivering transportation projects within the I-710 Corridor, an area with communities already overburdened by existing goods movement and industry in an area with the worst air quality in the United States, including some of the highest PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels in the country. After thoughtful consideration, multiple interagency meetings, and good faith efforts by EPA, Caltrans and Metro to identify a potential alternative path forward for the analysis of project-level transportation conformity, the EPA ultimately concludes that a PM hot-spot analysis is necessary for the project’s transportation conformity determination. Please see the attached Technical Response supporting this position, the details of which were also shared verbally during our November 20, 2020 senior leadership meeting with Caltrans, Metro, and the Federal Highway Administration.

EPA continues to support efforts to increase clean transportation along the corridor and we remain committed to partnering with you as you evaluate pathways to advance transportation solutions while being protective of human health. I understand that our staff are already in dialogue on possible



alternatives. If you would like to speak further, please contact me at (415) 972-3183, or your staff can contact Karina O'Connor, Project Level Transportation Conformity Lead, at (775) 434-8176 or [Oconnor.Karina@epa.gov](mailto:Oconnor.Karina@epa.gov).

Sincerely,

Elizabeth J. Adams, Director  
Air & Radiation Division

Attachment: Technical Response

cc: Vincent Mammano, Division Administrator, FHWA  
Antonio Johnson, Planning Team Leader, FHWA  
Abdollah Ansari, Senior Executive Officer, Metro  
Ron Kosinski, Deputy District Director, Caltrans

# Technical Response: Summary of Issues for the I-710 Highway Expansion Project and I-710 Clean Truck Program

## I. Introduction and Purpose

### A. Purpose of this Document

On November 20, 2020, after considerable coordination between Caltrans, Metro, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and EPA, EPA indicated that we would not be able to concur that the proposed I-710 highway expansion project was not a project of air quality concern under the Clean Air Act transportation conformity requirements. Caltrans and Metro requested more details regarding the specific legal and technical issues that we identified with using the I-710 Clean Truck Program to avoid completion of a particulate matter (PM) hot-spot analysis to satisfy transportation conformity requirements for the I-710 expansion project. In response, this document describes in more detail why, after careful consideration and based on the information before us, EPA does not agree that the I-710 Clean Truck Program renders the I-710 project as a project that is not of air quality concern, and describes how project sponsors should proceed with meeting conformity requirements.

### B. Summary of Findings

EPA is very supportive of using zero emissions truck technology on the I-710 freight corridor, but it is critical that public agencies develop a program that meets all of the regulatory requirements so that emissions will not increase and negatively impact public health in the future. This document describes why EPA does not agree that (1) the I-710 Clean Truck Program renders the I-710 project as a project that is not of air quality concern and (2) that the project does not need a PM hot-spot analysis. To summarize:

- The I-710 project requires a PM hot-spot analysis under the Clean Air Act (CAA) and EPA's transportation conformity regulations because it is a highway expansion project that would result in a significant increase in the number of diesel vehicles.
- The clear purpose of the hot-spot regulations are to implement the Clean Air Act's requirements that projects do not cause or contribute to violations of EPA's national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS), worsen existing violations, or delay attainment or other milestones.
- There is no current air quality modeling that demonstrates that the I-710 Clean Truck Program sufficiently reduces emissions such that the I-710 expansion project does not create PM NAAQS hot-spots. In fact, we expect increases in the severity of existing violations even if the proposed I-710 Clean Truck Program were to be fully implemented given dust, tire wear and brake wear.
- The transportation conformity regulation allows mitigation measures to be included as part of a hot-spot analysis for a project but does not permit mitigation measures to avoid a hot-spot analysis for a project of air quality concern.
- As a mitigation measure, the I-710 Clean Truck Program would need a federally enforceable written commitment to be relied upon for a project-level transportation conformity determination.
- The project sponsor has not utilized more recent travel activity assumptions for truck movement along the I-710 freight corridor.

- The I-710 Clean Truck Program does not meet EPA’s guidance that diesel replacement programs can be used in a conformity determination if the older diesel vehicles are scrapped.

### C. Background on the Los Angeles Air Quality and the Surrounding Community

The proposed project area, 18 miles of the I-710 freeway extending north from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, serves as a primary freight corridor connecting two of the busiest container ports in the country with downtown intermodal railyards and the goods movement network extending east into the Inland Valley. The greater Los Angeles area has among the worst air quality in the United States, including some of the highest PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels in the country. In 2020, EPA determined that the South Coast Air District failed to attain the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS (or standard) by its December 31, 2019 attainment date and bumped up the area to Serious for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard, requiring additional planning work by the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

The I-710 corridor accommodates a daily count of approximately 50,000 diesel-fueled freight trucks and 165,000 other vehicles running directly through, and adjacent to, numerous densely populated communities with environmental justice concerns. These low-income and minority communities are already heavily burdened by pollution from existing goods movement and industrial activity and experience health disparities, including asthma burdens. These communities are vulnerable to any increases in particulate matter emissions associated with the proposed I-710 expansion project, and have historically voiced strong concerns about air quality impacts from freight-related projects in this area, including ongoing engagement with the I-710 project. Environmental and community groups have expressed support for exclusively zero-emission truck technology and associated infrastructure for the I-710 project.

### D. Background on the Transportation Conformity PM Hot-spot Requirement

Transportation conformity applies to transportation plans, transportation improvement programs (TIPs), and federally-supported transportation projects (i.e., FHWA and FTA funded or approved projects) in nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related pollutants, including PM, ozone, and carbon monoxide (CO).

Section 176(c)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) states that federally-supported transportation projects cannot:

- (i) cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area;
- (ii) increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or
- (iii) delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area. See CAA § 176(c)(1)(B).

To ensure that transportation projects meet these criteria, EPA’s transportation conformity regulations require a hot-spot analysis in PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> areas for certain highway and transit projects. To ensure that CAA requirements are met, large projects that result in “a significant increase in the number of diesel vehicles” (40 CFR 93.123(b)(1)) need a quantitative PM hot-spot analysis. Such a project is referred to as a “project of air quality concern.” A hot-spot analysis is an estimation of likely future localized pollutant concentrations with the proposed project and a comparison of those concentrations to the relevant PM NAAQS. A hot-spot analysis assesses the air quality impacts on a scale smaller than an

entire nonattainment or maintenance area, including, for example, congested highways or freight terminals.

For a project that is not of air quality concern, the project-level conformity determination consists of verifying that there is a conforming regional transportation plan and Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and that the project is included in that conforming transportation plan and TIP.

The interagency consultation process must be used to develop project-level conformity determinations to meet all applicable conformity requirements for a given project. Project sponsors typically make the determination whether a highway project needs a quantitative PM hot-spot analysis through an interagency consultation process with FHWA, EPA, the State DOT, and the other state and local agencies involved.

#### E. I-710 and the PM Hot-spot Requirement

The proposed I-710 transportation project is an 18-mile project to increase capacity on I-710 by adding new general purpose lanes, truck by-pass lanes, and intersection improvements along this corridor. The latest iteration of the I-710 project had been determined to be a project of air quality concern since reports developed for the project's environmental documentation (such as the June 2018 modeling protocol for hot-spot modeling) showed that the project would increase heavy-duty diesel truck traffic as much as 6,900 trucks each day for some segments of I-710 (in addition to the existing 50,000 trucks and 165,000 other vehicles that drive on this highway every day).

On August 1, 2018, Caltrans requested that the EPA reconsider the I-710 project's status as a project of air quality concern (also referred to as a "POAQC"), with Caltrans' assumption that the I-710 Clean Truck Program would reduce diesel truck traffic (by funding the replacement of diesel trucks with zero emission/near zero emission (ZE/NZE) trucks).

In October 2018, Region 9 sent an email to Caltrans with an attachment with preliminary, staff-level information for a written commitment for the I-710 Clean Truck Program. In response, in October 2019, Caltrans and Metro sent a letter to EPA indicating that they did not agree that a written commitment would be required for the I-710 Clean Truck Program. EPA responded in a letter dated March 3, 2020 that we continue to believe that a written commitment describing the program was necessary. Further information regarding implementation of the I-710 Clean Truck Program was described in the June 4, 2020 Responses to Questions from USEPA/FHWA on the I-710 Clean Truck Program and the July 27, 2020 I-710 Clean Truck Program Responses to Technical Questions documents.

Caltrans' and Metro's I-710 Clean Truck Program Project Description, dated September 18, 2020, describes the major components of the I-710 Clean Truck Program and contains some information on related programs such as the Metro Countywide Clean Truck Initiative. According to this document, the I-710 Clean Truck Program would be implemented by a program administrator at the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) with direction from the Metro Board of Directors and the I-710 Steering Committee with assistance from contractors and vendors. The Metro Board would have responsibility and authority for development and implementation as well as approval for any major policy decisions related to the program.

The September 18, 2020 description further states that the I-710 Steering Committee, a multi-agency group operating under the October 2019 Memorandum of Understanding, would be tasked with developing implementation details, eligibility requirements, institutional arrangements, management and administration for the program as well as identifying and obtaining funding, creating a phasing plan and comprehensive goals, and issuing quarterly reports. These roles and responsibilities are further elaborated in Appendix C of the September 2020 program description.

EPA's regulatory analysis of the approach proposed by Caltrans to reconsider the I-710 project's status as a POAQC, with Caltrans' assumption that the I-710 Clean Truck Program would reduce diesel truck traffic (by funding the replacement of diesel trucks with ZE/NZE) trucks) is based on a careful consideration of these documents as well as the NEPA documents developed for the I-710 project and information discussed in the Technical Workgroup meetings with Caltrans, Metro and FHWA. The legal and technical issues supporting EPA's decision that the proposed I-710 highway expansion project is a project of air quality concern under the Clean Air Act transportation conformity requirements, are described in more detail below.

## II. Discussion

The Clean Air Act and EPA's transportation conformity rule require completion of a quantitative PM hot-spot analysis for the I-710 project because it is a project of air quality concern.

### A. Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

The regulatory hot-spot analysis requirement was adopted to implement the Clean Air Act requirement that federally-supported transportation projects cannot "cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area; increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or delay timely attainment of any standard of any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area." See CAA §176(c)(1)(B). EPA has interpreted "in any area" to include not just entire nonattainment and maintenance areas, but also the localized area surrounding a transportation project. See 75 Fed. Reg. 14260, 14274 (Mar. 24, 2010).

EPA adopted the regulatory PM hot-spot requirements in 2006, including the requirement that a hot-spot analysis be completed for expanded highway projects with a significant increase in the number of diesel vehicles. The preamble for the final rule explains that this criterion was intended to identify projects with significant PM emissions increases. See, e.g., 71 Fed. Reg. 12467, 12491 (Mar. 10, 2006) ("The final rule's criteria for hot-spot analyses targets highway and transit projects that involve a significant increase in diesel vehicle traffic, since EPA believes that directly emitted particles from diesel vehicles are the primary consideration for potential PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> hot-spots.") The 2006 preamble also contains a lengthy discussion of the technical basis for EPA's conclusion that projects that are not of air quality concern will not increase PM emissions. *Id.* at 12471-74 and 12490-93. We further said that PM hot-spot analyses must include emissions from re-entrained road dust. *Id.* at 12494.

The I-710 highway expansion project would result in a significant increase in the number of diesel vehicles and consequently in significant PM emissions increases. Therefore, the project meets the regulatory criterion for requiring a quantitative PM hot-spot analysis. This is particularly important in light of the factual circumstances of the project. First, the greater Los Angeles area has some of the highest PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels in the country with people living and working all along the I-710 corridor. In addition, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach are the terminus of the I-710 and are the largest container ports in the country, with a significant portion of freight moving every day by diesel truck.

#### B. Need for a PM Hot-Spot Analysis for I-710

The I-710 clearly meets the relevant regulatory criterion for a PM hot-spot analysis: Caltrans' June 2018 modeling shows an additional 6,900 heavy-duty diesel vehicles per day, which is consistent with numbers EPA has concluded constitute a "significant increase" in other instances. Even if the I-710 Clean Truck Program is implemented, the project would still result in a significant increase in heavy-duty trucks, which would increase PM emissions. Consistent with SIP inventories and past conformity analyses, brake/tire wear and road dust would be significantly increased by the I-710 project, and as a result, make air quality worse in communities along the I-710 corridor.

We expect increases in the severity of existing violations even if the proposed I-710 Clean Truck Program were to be fully implemented given dust, tire wear and brake wear emissions. Given that the project would likely result in localized increases in PM in an existing nonattainment area, determining that the project is not a project of air quality concern would be inconsistent with the conformity requirement in the Clean Air Act and EPA's implementing regulations.

#### C. I-710 Clean Truck Program as a Mitigation Measure

It is possible that the I-710 Clean Truck Program could be used to mitigate the impacts of the I-710 expansion *as part of* a hot-spot analysis. See 40 C.F.R. § 93.123(c)(4): "...mitigation or control measures shall be assumed in the hot-spot analysis only where there are written commitments...". However, mitigation measures cannot be used to *avoid* a hot-spot analysis for a project of air quality concern.

Mitigation should address a project's impact on the NAAQS in the conformity determination, which can only be determined through a hot-spot analysis with measures included, per the conformity rule and guidance. EPA addressed the inclusion of new technologies in a PM hot-spot analysis in the preamble to the March 24, 2010 final rule (75 CFR 14280):

Last, it is entirely appropriate that a hot-spot analysis include the effects of new technologies and fleet turnover that is expected to occur in a future analysis year. The conformity rule has always allowed the future effects of federal vehicle emissions standards, fleet turnover, fuel programs, and other control measures to be reflected in hot-spot analyses when they are assured to occur, because including such effects provides a reasonable estimate of future emissions that is more accurate than not including such effects.

For the emission reductions of the Clean Truck Program to be relied on for conformity, significant additional work would be necessary by the project sponsor to ensure the Clean Truck Program meets the regulatory requirements for mitigation measures, including a *written commitment* to such a measure that includes, among other things, "a demonstration that funding necessary to implement the action has been authorized by the appropriating or authorizing body." See 40 C.F.R. §§ 93.101 and 93.125(a).

Furthermore, under Metro's documentation, some of the final details, commitments and funding for the Clean Truck Program would be deferred to a later date as the Steering Committee sees how well the program performs in the first few years of operation. This leaves EPA with less certainty today that diesel truck traffic would not increase significantly and would limit the program from being an enforceable mitigation measure under the transportation conformity regulations. More EPA concerns on components of the I-710 Clean Truck Program and discussion on why it is a mitigation measure is included in Section IV below.

### III. Modeling Issues

Another concern with Caltrans' and Metro's proposal is the lack of evidence that the I-710 Clean Truck Program would sufficiently reduce diesel vehicles on the I-710 expansion to the point where the project would no longer be of air quality concern. Under EPA regulations, mitigation would be included in the hot-spot analysis done for a project, so it can be demonstrated whether or not mitigation is sufficient for the project to meet the Clean Air Act and conformity requirements. In other words, it is important that the agencies involved understand how many truck replacements would be necessary to ensure that the proposed highway expansion does not negatively impact the PM NAAQS or interim milestones and that the public health of the people living along this corridor is protected. However, in this case, Caltrans and Metro are assuming the I-710 Clean Truck Program sufficiently reduces the number of diesel trucks such that the project no longer needs a hot-spot analysis, ignoring the need for an analysis that would support such an assumption.

As explained above, EPA's regulation requires Caltrans to perform a PM hot-spot analysis. In addition, even if the I-710 Clean Truck Program were improved to qualify as a mitigation measure, it is unclear to EPA at this time how many trucks would remain on the I-710 once the Clean Truck Program would be in effect and if that number would be sufficiently low to declare that there is not a significant increase in the number of trucks. In the last few years, there have been projects determined to need a hot-spot analysis where the daily increase in diesel trucks has been under 4,000 in California and elsewhere.

#### A. Review of truck travel

The estimated increases in truck traffic projected for the I-710 project is based on the I-710 travel demand forecasting model developed for the air quality analysis in the I-710 EIR/EIS, which was published in early 2017. Modeling conducted for the I-710's NEPA document estimating the number of trucks necessary to be offset is now outdated, and therefore does not satisfy the conformity requirement to use the latest planning assumptions in an analysis (40 CFR 93.110). Improved and updated modeling is needed to better understand how many trucks are still projected, both with and without the I-710 Clean Truck Program, and the air quality impacts of those levels of trucks. This analysis must be based on the latest planning assumptions, including vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per truck, to demonstrate whether or not the project would result in any new or worsened PM NAAQS violations.

The current estimate that 4,000 diesel trucks will travel two trips per day is based on a 2013 study.<sup>1</sup> We do not have more recent data on truck traffic so we do not know how many trucks currently travel an average of 42.5 miles each day on I-710 or if there would be at least 4,000 such trucks that could be targeted by the I-710 Clean Truck Program. Given the length of time to phase in the proposed program,

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 17 of November 15, 2013 Key Performance Parameters for Drayage Trucks Operating at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, Prepared by Andrew Papsen and Michael Ippoliti of CALSTART.

these diesel trucks may not all be on the road at the same time, and therefore, it is possible that more than 4,000 trucks (including more trucks traveling only one trip per day) may need to be replaced by the I-710 Clean Truck Program.

#### B. No scrappage/ No requirements for replaced vehicles

There are some program design elements which do not appear to support reduction in diesel traffic and PM emissions from the project. In order to be eligible for program funding for the I-710 Clean Truck Program, owners or operators would need to own trucks that travel “frequently” on I-710. The I-710 Clean Truck Program funds could be used to purchase additional trucks that the owners or operators agree will meet average weekday VMT thresholds within the 20-mile I-710 corridor. It is unclear what the minimum threshold would be since the stated objective of the program is to reach a target of 42.5 VMT per NZE/ZE truck per weekday “in aggregate, on average.”

EPA had previously assumed that the original trucks that are envisioned to be replaced through the I-710 Clean Truck Program (i.e., those that traveled “frequently” on I-710) would no longer be operating on the I-710 once the highway expansion is open to traffic. However, the I-710 Clean Truck Program does not include contractual restrictions or requirements to scrap the original vehicle, since, in Caltrans’ view, scrappage requirements would be considered as “barriers to program entry” by some applicants.<sup>2</sup> This approach does not appear to be consistent with EPA’s Diesel Retrofit and Replacement Guidance which discusses scrappage programs in light of parties seeking conformity or SIP credit. For more information about scrappage for truck replacements in conformity analyses, see EPA’s Diesel Retrofit and Replacement Guidance.<sup>3</sup>

Assuming that the financial incentive would be sufficient for some truck owners to accept, the I-710 Clean Truck Program could potentially incentivize *more* truck travel on I-710, for example:

- Since there is no requirement for trucks being replaced to be scrapped or in any way limited in traveling I-710, trucks being replaced could continue to operate on I-710 under the proposed program. With both the new and old trucks continuing to drive on I-710, this overall fleet expansion could increase VMT and particulate matter emissions, burdening local communities and possibly the larger nonattainment area.
- Under the proposed program, instead of relying on historical travel data, any truck owner agreeing to a minimum VMT on I-710 could receive the financial incentive, and applicants could get a higher ranking in the competition for funding “for agreeing to add additional VMT on I-710.” This aspect could incentivize more travel on I-710.
- The Program is described as having check-ins every six months to provide “early warning indicators so that corrective action can be taken by recipients to get back on track before penalties are invoked.” The only type of “corrective action” that EPA can envision would be for truckers to drive more miles on I-710. If this assumption is true, such an action could incentivize more heavy-duty truck travel on I-710.

---

<sup>2</sup> Pages 2-3 of July 27, 2020 I-710 Clean Truck Program Responses to Technical Questions.

<sup>3</sup> Page 9 of March 2018 Diesel Retrofit and Replacement Projects: Quantifying and Using Their Emission Benefits in SIPs and Conformity, Guidance for State and Local Air and Transportation Agencies, available at <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockey=P100U3LT.pdf>.



## IV. Technical Issues with Program Implementation and Enforceability

EPA continues to consider the I-710 Clean Truck Program to be a mitigation measure that would need to be federally enforceable as part of a conformity determination with a PM hot-spot analysis.<sup>4</sup> EPA's PM Hot-spot Guidance provides a description of the types of "mitigation and control measures that could be considered by project sponsors to reduce emissions and any predicted new or worsened PM NAAQS violations" in Section 10 of the Guidance.<sup>5</sup> The first category of mitigation and control measures discussed in this document is "Retrofitting, replacing vehicles/engines, and using cleaner fuels." The proposed I-710 Clean Truck Program belongs in this category, as it is designed to replace diesel vehicles with those that use cleaner fuels. Because this program would be a mitigation measure, a written commitment<sup>6</sup> is necessary for it to be relied upon in a conformity determination, per 40 CFR 93.125(a):

a) Prior to determining that a transportation project is in conformity, the MPO, other recipient of funds designated under title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws, FHWA, or FTA must obtain from the project sponsor and/or operator written commitments to implement in the construction of the project and operation of the resulting facility or service any project-level mitigation or control measures which are identified as conditions for NEPA process completion with respect to local CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, or PM<sub>2.5</sub> impacts. *Before a conformity determination is made, written commitments must also be obtained for project-level mitigation or control measures which are conditions for making conformity determinations* for a transportation plan or TIP and are included in the project design concept and scope which is used in the regional emissions analysis required by §§93.118 ("Motor vehicle emissions budget") and 93.119 ("Interim emissions in areas without motor vehicle emissions budgets") *or used in the project-level hot-spot analysis required by §93.116 [emphasis added].*

As noted above, in October 2018, Region 9 sent an email to Caltrans with an attachment with preliminary, staff-level information for a written commitment. In the Caltrans and Metro response letter of October 2019, Caltrans and Metro claimed that the I-710 Clean Truck Program "is not intended to mitigate air quality impacts. Rather, it has been designed in conjunction with the other elements that comprise the entire I-710 project – to improve air quality in general."

EPA does not see any distinction. The purpose of improving air quality in general does not change the fact that the I-710 Clean Truck Program is a mitigation or control measure. In fact, mitigation measures must necessarily improve air quality in order to offset a project's emissions. Section 10 of the PM Hot-Spot Guidance recognizes that there may be other programs not directly related to the project that improve air quality in general that are still mitigation measures. For example, in Section 10.2.5, EPA states: "Controlling emissions from other sources may sufficiently reduce background concentrations in the PM hot-spot analysis" and thus still count as mitigation measures.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> A written commitment can be enforced by EPA directly against project sponsors under section 113 of the Clean Air Act, which authorizes EPA to enforce the provisions of rules promulgated under the Act, and by citizens under section 304 of the Clean Air Act. See 58 FR 62199.

<sup>5</sup> *Transportation Conformity Guidance for Quantitative Hot-spot Analyses in PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas*, EPA-420-B-15-084, November 2015, available on EPA's web site at <https://www.epa.gov/state-and-local-transportation/project-level-conformity-and-hot-spot-analyses#pmguidance>, p. 149.

<sup>6</sup> As defined in 40 CFR 93.101, "Written commitment for the purposes of this subpart means a written commitment that includes a description of the action to be taken; a schedule for the completion of the action; a demonstration that funding necessary to implement the action has been authorized by the appropriating or authorizing body; and an acknowledgment that the commitment is an enforceable obligation under the applicable implementation plan."

<sup>7</sup> Same source, Section 10.2.5, p. 152.

In the October 2019 letter, Caltrans and Metro provided several arguments, such as that the I-710 Clean Truck Program does not need a written commitment because the program is (1) a core element of the broader project, not a mitigation or control measure and (2) dependent upon a multi-agency commitment including agencies outside of Caltrans and Metro. The letter stated that if the I-710 Clean Truck Program is not successful due to future uncertainties that result in significant increases in diesel truck traffic, the program “would be subject to re-evaluation and/or supplemental documentation. Therefore the EIR/EIS is a written commitment that the Clean Truck Program is an integral part of the project.” The September 2020 document describing the Clean Truck Program contains no further discussion of a written commitment to be provided by Metro. Therefore, we assume that Caltrans and Metro’s position continues to be that they do not believe that a written commitment is necessary.

As we described in our March 3, 2020 letter, EPA’s position is that the Clean Truck Program is a mitigation measure and the EIR/EIS does not suffice as a written commitment under the requirements of EPA’s transportation conformity regulations. Caltrans’ and Metro’s proposal that the I-710 project does not need a PM hot-spot analysis depends on the I-710 Clean Truck Program reducing the number of diesel trucks. As explained above, EPA disagrees and believes the project requires a hot-spot analysis under the Clean Air Act and EPA’s implementing regulations. A program to reduce PM emissions that is necessary for a transportation project to demonstrate conformity requires a written commitment, per 40 CFR 93.125.

EPA’s October 2018 email included preliminary information for a written commitment. This paper (“Preliminary Information for the I-710 ZE/NZE Truck Deployment Program Written Commitment, October 23, 2018 – staff draft”) provided staff thoughts about the types of information that a written commitment should include per the regulatory definition in 40 CFR 93.101:

- a description of the action,
- a schedule for completion,
- a demonstration that funding has been authorized by the appropriating or authorizing body (and is surplus to what would be funded in the no-build alternative), and
- acknowledgment that the commitment is an enforceable obligation under the SIP.

We provided this document to help Caltrans consider what would be needed for the I-710 Clean Truck Program, given that at the time, there was just a mention of the program in the I-710 NEPA documentation without any detail.

To date, Caltrans and Metro have not developed a written commitment for this project. In addition, information provided to EPA thus far about the I-710 Clean Truck Program would not be sufficient to meet the regulatory definition of a written commitment as described in the following paragraphs below.

#### A. Description of the Action

A written commitment must contain a description of the program. (40 CFR 93.101). EPA’s October 2018 paper indicated that the written description of the program should be fairly detailed, and include information about the agency implementing the program, identification of potential participants, truck activity, data and assumptions relied upon to estimate VMT, tracking and enforcement and verification of the program parameters, scrappage of replaced vehicles, and information about the number and type of support facilities. Information provided to EPA thus far lacks detail as many aspects of the program are not described and are left to the Steering Committee to design, fund, and implement.

While Metro has authorized \$50 million and started defining the I-710 Clean Truck Program in its September 2020 document, many of the details of the program and the associated funding are undeveloped<sup>8</sup> and are described as evolving as the Steering Committee reviews the program performance and adjusts the program as needed. In order to be considered a mitigation measure to support a hot-spot analysis and CAA conformity determination, the program must be well-defined and fully funded with certainty that the project will not negatively impact the PM NAAQS or interim milestones.

A critical part of the I-710 Clean Truck Program, needed to ensure that the program would reduce truck traffic to levels needed to meet the CAA requirements, is the verification and compliance components of the program. The September 2020 document describes some of the overall compliance activities that Metro anticipates would be needed to support the I-710 Clean Truck Program, for example: developing a website to track trucks deployed, funding sources, funding expenditures, and ZE/NZE VMT data within the corridor. The document also describes how truck VMT data would be collected via a GIS monitoring device, based on geofencing within the I-710 corridor and that if a recipient truck does not meet the annual VMT requirement for one year, the truck owner would be required to reimburse some or all of the funding. However, it is not clear what specific targets would be required for individual truck owners. Metro has stated repeatedly that the program would target 4,000 trucks, at 42.5 VMT per weekday, in aggregate, on average. How this aggregate estimate translates to individual contracts to be verified is unclear at this time.

In addition, an important part of the program description is what technologies are targeted by a diesel truck replacement program. This level of detail is necessary to include in the written commitment to ensure successful program implementation as well as to include the effectiveness of reducing PM emissions for such truck replacements in the PM hot-spot analysis.

The September 2020 program description identifies transition to ZE trucks as a goal and indicates that the proposed I-710 Clean Truck Program includes a feature that allows for the funding of up to 20 electric charging stations and 10 hydrogen refueling stations between 2022 and 2035. However, the I-710 Clean Truck Program would only provide 4% of the initial \$50 million in funding, i.e., \$2 million, as seed funding for infrastructure and a target of 10% ZE trucks.<sup>9</sup>

While inclusion of these targets is an improvement from previous documents on the I-710 Clean Truck Program, Metro has made no specific commitment to any percentage of ZE trucks.<sup>10</sup> In fact, Metro has stated that NZE trucks satisfy the primary goal of the program to improve air quality and reduce diesel particulate matter. In addition, there is no commitment to fund electric vehicle or hydrogen refueling infrastructure since in Metro's view, it is not essential to meeting the ZE/NZE truck development

---

<sup>8</sup> Page 12 of the September 2020 Program Description describes how the program will be developed in more detail in a I-710 Clean Truck Manual which would be developed by Metro and the I-710 Steering Committee and be updated for each deployment phase.

<sup>9</sup> Pages 7-8 and 26 of September 18, 2020 I-710 Clean Truck Program, Program Description.

<sup>10</sup> Page 3 of July 27, 2020 U-710 Clean Truck Program Responses to Technical Questions.

objectives. Under Metro's proposed program, infrastructure would be funded by partner agencies only after the Final EIR/EIS is deemed valid.

### B. Schedule for Completion

A written commitment must contain a schedule for completion. (40 CFR 93.101). EPA's October 2018 paper indicated that the schedule should include a detailed (month and year) for the Program's start, opening of support facilities, the schedule for program verification, and end date. Information provided thus far lacks detailed milestones by which someone could judge whether or not the project is on schedule. The September 2020 document includes some information on the major milestones for initiation of the three phases of the program and the total number of trucks to be targeted in each phase and the expected criteria for eligibility, program documentation and compliance reporting, but no additional details or milestones are provided, and there are no specific commitments to ensure compliance with planned milestones (600 trucks by 2025, 1,700 additional trucks by 2030, and 1,700 additional trucks) given to the Steering Committee.

### C. Demonstration of Funding

A written commitment must contain a demonstration that funding necessary to implement the action has been authorized by the appropriating or authorizing body (40 CFR 93.101). This criterion has not been met, given that only \$50 million of the estimated \$200 million in program funding has been identified. In addition, since it is not clear if 4,000 trucks would offset the I-710 project's impacts, additional funding may be needed.

Information on funding for the I-710 Clean Truck Program is described in multiple sections throughout the September 2020 document. First, under 2. Program Goals and Milestones, the document states that in March 2017, Metro identified \$200 million as a funding target for the I-710 Clean Truck Program and in April 2020, Metro's Board programmed \$50 million for the first phase of the project.<sup>11</sup> Section 9, Funding for the I-710 Clean Truck Program, also identified the \$200 million target, but indicated that this total may not be needed due a variety of factors related to costs, and indicated that Metro hopes to get the remaining \$150 million by leveraging the initial \$50 million with assistance from the I-710 Steering Committee. The project sponsors for the I-710 Clean Truck Program have not yet identified funding sources for the estimated funding target, haven't committed to the funding sources, and may not have estimated the full funding necessary to mitigate the additional diesel traffic anticipated by implementation of the project. There is no assurance or guarantee that other funding will be obtained.

As stated above, in the fall of 2018, EPA provided draft information on the major components needed to support a written commitment to the I-710 Clean Truck Program. For funding, we indicated that the demonstration of funding should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- the level of funding for the program in each year the program is in effect,
- funding agencies and legal authority, and
- the sources of the funding, including a discussion of how the funding will be documented and enforced over the time that the program operates.

The funding sources that were mentioned in the September 2020 document were only a list of potential sources that Metro would expect the Steering Committee to investigate to leverage the limited funding that Metro has obtained. Funds from these potential sources are uncertain, and therefore, there is currently insufficient commitment that the funding necessary to support the program is available.

---

<sup>11</sup> Page 6 of September 18, 2020 I-710 Clean Truck Program, Program Description.

The project sponsor has the responsibility for implementing the I-710 Clean Truck Program. However, Caltrans and Metro have placed responsibility for obtaining funding with a multi-agency Steering Committee. Metro has assigned this group of representatives from different agencies the task of identifying funding opportunities for the program, though the Steering Committee has no legal responsibility for the I-710 project or the associated Clean Truck Program. The anticipated roles and responsibilities identified only assign the Metro's board responsibility to approve fiscal plans, funding levels and approval of budgets and programming of the initial \$50 million as needed for the Clean Truck Program.

EPA is concerned that \$200 million may not be enough to ensure that the I-710 expansion project would not negatively impact the PM NAAQS and public health. The September 2020 document provides an average incentive estimate of \$45,000 to \$56,000 per NZE truck that is currently being considered for the I-710 Clean Truck Program.<sup>12</sup> If those costs, with the other estimated costs for the Incentive Reserve, Administration and ZE Power Infrastructure, and an assumption of 10% zero emission incentives at \$150,000 to \$188,000 are extended for replacement of the full 4,000 trucks, total costs could be closer to \$300 million. Based on these assumptions, the \$50 million that was programmed by the Metro Board is less than 20% of the total funding anticipated by extension of Metro's proposed budget for the first phase. A higher per truck funding commitment would also likely be needed to provide a realistic incentive.

#### D. Commitment is an Enforceable Obligation

A written commitment must include an acknowledgement that the commitment is an enforceable action. (40 CFR 93.101). The responsibility for the program's implementation belongs to Metro and Caltrans as the project sponsors, per 40 CFR 93.125(b). There has been no acknowledgement thus far that the I-710 Clean Truck Program would be an enforceable commitment by Metro.

The September 2020 document describes the different groups expected to implement the I-710 Clean Truck Program. The groups include the Metro Board of Directors, the I-710 Steering Committee and Metro staff with help from contractors and vendors. The Metro proposal states that the I-710 Steering Committee would be drawn from the Countywide Clean Truck Initiative (CCTI) and representatives from selected agencies and localities with a focused interest in the I-710 corridor. The roles and responsibilities of these groups are discussed in Appendix C of the September 2020 document as well as in the Memorandum of Understanding document that Metro is relying upon to create the I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee to Implement the I-710 Clean Truck Program.

The Steering Committee is tasked with obtaining funding to implement the program and is the main group to make recommendations and suggestions to improve the program, increase program applicants and participation, and optimize NZE/ZE travel within the I-710 corridor. The Metro board can authorize course corrections for the I-710 Clean Truck Program to ensure consistency with program objectives, milestone, and NZE/ZE VMT targets, but the Steering Committee must review, advise, and make the recommendations needed for these corrective actions.

---

<sup>12</sup> The cost breakdown provided the September 2020 document, in section 10.5. Cost Breakdown – Initial Deployment Phase, indicates a low cost breakdown of \$45,000, and a high cost of \$56,000 per low NOx Certified emission truck.

However, the proposed multi-agency Steering Committee does not meet the regulation's requirements for mitigation measures in 40 CFR 93.125(b): "Project sponsors voluntarily committing to mitigation measures to facilitate positive conformity determinations must comply with the obligations of such commitments."

## Conclusion

As described in this document, EPA finds there are significant issues with this proposal that are in conflict with the Clean Air Act and the transportation conformity regulation. EPA continues to support using ZE truck technology on the I-710 freight corridor but does not accept the proposal that the I-710 Clean Truck Program eliminates the need for a PM hot-spot analysis for the I-710 project. It is critical that public agencies develop a program that meets all of the regulatory requirements so that emissions will not increase and negatively impact the PM NAAQS and public health in the future.

We appreciate the opportunity to outline our concerns and hope to continue working with you on a new direction for the I-710 project and I-710 Clean Truck Program.

## ATTACHMENT C

### I-710 South Corridor Task Force

*Draft document*

#### **PURPOSE:**

Metro seeks to re-engage vital stakeholders that depend upon and are impacted by the movement of people and goods along Interstate 710 (I-710) between the Ports of LA and Long Beach (San Pedro Bay [SPB] Ports) and State Route 60.

Metro's goal is to identify and work with stakeholders to develop a multimodal, multidimensional investment strategy to improve regional mobility and air quality in concert with fostering economic vitality, social equity, environmental sustainability, and access to opportunity for LA County residents—particularly for the most impacted residents that live adjacent to I-710. These residents are represented by local elected officials who serve on the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (COG). In July 2021 the COG formed an I-710 Ad Hoc Committee (AHC) composed of 14 Board members. Metro intends to work closely with the AHC to ensure locally-supported solutions emerge from the process described here.

The original I-710 project scope approved by the Metro Board (Alternative 5C) in 2018 to advance through the EIS/EIR process comprised highway, active transportation, community benefit, and clean-truck technology elements. The scope also included a recommendation to widen and modernize the freeway, generating great concern from local communities over the impending disparities created by displacement required near major freeway interchange improvements for this alternative.

As the project advanced through the EIS/EIR process over the past three years, the Metro Board and the State of California aggressively advanced new policies and executive orders in support of more equitable, climate friendly, and sustainable outcomes through transportation investment decisions.

US E.P.A.'s decision to halt the EIS/EIR process due to air quality conformity concerns has allowed Caltrans and the Metro Board to re-examine the project through this more advanced equity and environmental policy focus, leading to the withdrawal of support for Alternative 5C and suspension of the EIS/EIR process in recognition of the project's misalignment with current policy objectives.

In response to these developments, the Metro Board and Caltrans have agreed to develop a more comprehensive approach over the next six months to engage local communities and regional stakeholders in a process that will lead to improved mobility, air quality, health outcomes, and other important improvements, particularly for those residents most impacted by the movement of goods and people in, through and around the I-710 corridor.

## **ATTACHMENT C**

This process will first focus on identifying and discussing vital issues to be addressed during this process, including development of a shared understanding of priority areas of focus, with a commitment and plan for leading with equity that will allow the 710 South Corridor Task Force to conduct its work as found in the proposed goals for the task force.

### **PROPOSED GOALS FOR THE 710 TASK FORCE:**

The **I-710 South Corridor Task Force (the 710 Task Force)** will be entrusted with the important task of working collaboratively and constructively to accomplish the following outcomes by March 2022:

1. Review and re-assess the Purpose and Need of improvements to the I-710 corridor between the SPB Ports and SR-60;
2. Develop multimodal strategies to meet the Purpose and Need, in alignment with the existing regional and state policy framework;
3. Identify an array of projects and programs, prioritized in the near-term to long-term, that will realize the goals to meet the needs of stakeholders and corridor users;
4. Create a prioritized investment plan that will allow Metro and Caltrans—in partnership with 710 South Corridor Task Force members and local, regional, state, and federal agencies—to implement these projects and programs; and
5. Report to the Metro Board and State of California with the outcomes of the 710 Task Force work by March 2022.

The **710 Task Force** will also continue to meet on a regular basis (2-4 times per year), in conjunction with the COG, to help Metro and Caltrans deliver the investment plan developed by this group and to provide a recurrent forum for dialogue, input, and support regarding important mobility, air quality, equity, sustainability and economic issues affecting I-710 stakeholders.

### **ENGAGEMENT PROCESS:**

Metro in partnership with Caltrans (District 7) will convene the 710 Task Force over the course of the next six to eight months (September 2021 – February 2022) to accomplish these overarching goals. Metro will work with 710 Task Force members, particularly with the community groups, to determine what inclusive and meaningful engagement looks like.

Concurrent and in parallel to this process, the COG has convened an Ad Hoc Committee (AHC) of its Board Members to create a locally-supported approach to developing recommendations for the future of the I-710 corridor. Metro will work with the COG to share information and will host “joint sessions” at key intervals over the next six months to share discussion and help integrate recommendations from the COG 710 AHC.



## ATTACHMENT C

At the end of the six-to-eight month process, the 710 Task Force will report back to the Metro Board on its findings and make recommendations as to the scope of its investment plan that will realize the reevaluated Purpose and Need of the I-710 South Corridor.

### STAKEHOLDER ROSTER:

The Metro Board and Caltrans have stated that the investment in the I-710 must be reassessed through a process that engages local community stakeholders, especially those most impacted by the freeway corridor, in concert with the key regional stakeholders that depend upon the movement of people and goods along I-710 (i.e., the SPB Ports).

For the 710 Task Force to be effective it must represent a broad set of community and regional voices that will help this group review the Purpose and Need of the corridor and develop multimodal and multipurpose strategies, projects and programs, and investment priorities to advance social equity, environmental sustainability, economic vitality, and access to opportunity for local communities and the region.

Metro also recognizes that additional small-group discussions—particularly with community/equity-focused groups—may be necessary to ensure that the work of the larger 710 Task Force remains focused on and incorporates the needs of the local impacted communities.

### 710 TASK FORCE PROPOSED PARTICIPANTS 43 MEMBERS

Type	Number	Organization
LA County	1	LA County Department of Public Works
MPO	1	Southern California Association of Governments
Ports	2	Port of Los Angeles
		Port of Long Beach
Railroad	3	Alameda Corridor (ACTA)
		Union Pacific RR
		BNSF Railway
Trucking	3	Harbor Trucking Association
		Total Transportation Services (TTSI)
		International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local Union 848
Air Quality	2	SCAQMD
		CARB
Academic	3	METRANS / CSULB
		USC Equity Research Institute (ERI)
		Harbor College

**ATTACHMENT C**

<b>Community Based Organizations, Equity, Health and Environmental Advocacy</b>	<b>9</b>	BREATHE Los Angeles County
		Southeast Los Angeles (SELA) Collaborative
		Communities for a Better Environment
		East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
		Legal Aid Foundation of LA-LB (LAFLA)
		California Endowment
		Coalition for Clean Air
		Environmental Defense Fund
		Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma
<b>Local Jurisdictions</b>	<b>8</b>	LA County Supervisorial District 1
		LA County Supervisorial District 2
		LA County Supervisorial District 4
		City of Bell*
		City of Commerce*
		City of Cudahy*
		City of Long Beach
		LA City Council District 15 (San Pedro)
		<i>*Representing the COG Ad Hoc Committee</i>
Gateway Cities Council of Government <i>(ex officio representation by staff)</i>		
<b>Transit Agencies</b>	<b>2</b>	Long Beach Transit
		Metrolink
<b>Economic, Labor and Workforce Development</b>	<b>5</b>	LA County Economic Development Corporation
		International Longshoremen Workers Union
		Warehouse Workers Union
		Watson Land Company
		BizFed
<b>Freight Industry</b>	<b>2</b>	LA Customs Broker & Freight Forwarders Association, Inc.
		Pacific Merchant Shipping Association (PMSA)
<b>Policy</b>	<b>2</b>	Automobile Club of Southern California (AAA)
		CalStart

Page Break

**SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS:**

Metro and Caltrans will convene the 710 Task Force approximately every three weeks. This schedule will help advance the work of the group over the next six months, while allowing Metro and Caltrans to develop meeting materials, information, and opportunities for additional engagement in between meetings.

## **ATTACHMENT C**

Metro and Caltrans will develop the topics and flow of meetings for the 710 Task Force with its membership and will also work with community representatives to help develop a meaningful public comment and input process to help inform the 710 Task Force's work.



**Planning and Programming Committee**  
Presentation on Items 11 & 12  
*Response to I-710 South Corridor Project Motions 47 & 48*  
September 15, 2021

# Motion 47 Response

Work on the 710 South Corridor Project EIR/EIS has been **suspended**.

Existing Project elements in the EIR/EIS will be examined through the new 710 Task Force process, including additional locally-supported, complementary non-highway projects.

# Motion 48 Response, Item 1

## EPA and Conformity Requirements

EPA re-affirmed to Metro and Caltrans that it intends to require a Particulate Matter (PM) Hot Spot conformity analysis

- **\$50 million commitment from Board for the I-710 Clean Truck Program (CTP) helped - allowed Metro/Caltrans to re-engage EPA on conformity determination**
- Ultimately EPA would not agree to create precedent with Metro/Caltrans proposal to use the CTP as a programmatic feature to reduce diesel emissions
  - CTP would demonstrate reduction in diesel truck trips
  - CTP deemed by EPA to be non-enforceable under CEQA & NEPA
  - **EPA concerned with PM increases caused by entrained road dust and tire/break wear – not just tailpipe emissions**
  - I-710 Project held to higher standard than most highway projects
- Mitigations (e.g. CTP), while allowed as part of the Hot Spot Conformity Analysis, cannot substitute for the analysis
- EPA could not provide acceptable/quantifiable ways to fully mitigate entrained road dust and tire/break wear PM increases
- **Result: No viable way to demonstrate air quality conformity for 710 Project.**

# Motion 48 Response, Items 2 & 3

## Potential for State and Federal Support

### Current Project elements (non-freeway)

- Include the Clean Truck Program, transit enhancements, or active transportation improvements, for example
- Individually would not fully address the Project's original purpose and need
- Are eligible to be considered as part of a re-evaluation of alternatives developed through the 710 Task Force

### Ideas that were not fully vetted during the environmental process

- Some examples include conversion of existing mixed flow freeway lanes to new purposes, priced/managed lanes or dedicating lanes for ZE trucks
- To be considered as part of the 710 Task Force process

State and Federal support for the Project will ultimately require a re-evaluation of the Project, from Purpose and Need to Project Elements

# 710 Task Force: Re-envisioning the Project

The Metro Board via Motions 47 & 48 called for a new process for examining how to make improvements within the 710 Corridor that focused on collaboration with affected communities and local stakeholders.

In response, Metro and Caltrans will convene a robust set of 710 Corridor stakeholders to review the Purpose and Need for investment within the corridor.

- **Focus:** Bringing Community Based Organizations to the table
- Work together to develop effective community outreach strategies.
- Modeled after Goods Movement Strategic Plan engagement process

**Equity:** Metro will lead the reimagining of the 710 Corridor project with equity by seeking engagement with impacted communities, understanding disparities experienced, and developing multimodal approaches to delivering benefits for these communities while improving regional mobility, safety and air quality.



# 710 Task Force: Re-envisioning the Project

**Partnership:** Partner with the Gateway Cities COG to develop and deliver an investment plan developed through the 710 Task Force process that implements projects and programs designed to realize multimodal strategies that address the re-established purpose and need.

**Ultimate goal:** Develop a collaborative engagement process where local stakeholders, impacted communities and regional partners can work together to develop a new approach to investing in the 710 Corridor that will reduce disparities, increase benefits and improve mobility and safety within the corridor for local residents and the regional movement of people and goods.

**First meeting:** Took place on Monday, September 13, 2021 @ 6pm (Zoom)

# 710 Task Force: Community Outreach

Central to the 710 Task Force's work will be a **commitment to community outreach and public engagement**

**Community-Based Organizations (CBOs)** will have a seat at the table

- Metro will partner with CBOs to develop an effective strategy to inform and engage residents from impacted communities as part of process


Re-engage residents **previously contacted** through the prior 710 Project process

Employ innovative outreach methods


Bring outreach into local communities to meet residents where they are

Public encouraged to attend and provide comment at 710 Task Force meetings

# 710 Task Force: Stakeholder Engagement



# 710 Task Force: Process and Goals



# 710 Task Force: Meeting #1 Recap

**Attendance:** Excellent turnout – approximately 150 participants

**Topics:** Introductions and Keynote Addresses  
History of the 710 Corridor and Lessons Learned  
How the 710 Task Force Can Come Together  
How to Build an Effective Community Engagement Strategy

**What We Heard:** Build stronger outreach effort to engage corridor residents  
Create longer lead times for notices, agenda and materials  
Overcome the digital divide  
Translation services for meetings and materials  
Eliminate “jargon” and provide clear information

**Next Meeting:** Equity Assessment Tool  
Charter and Terms of Engagement  
Review Purpose and Need

# 710 Task Force: Next Steps

Work with community-based organizations to develop public engagement strategies, identify resources and plan events

Engage Task Force members to link outreach network opportunities to coordinate / build on existing engagement structures

Finalize webpage and public-facing information to meet transparency goals

- Post meeting recording, summary, additional information

Evaluate and finalize Task Force membership

Identify opportunities to create focus groups and community input opportunities before Meeting #2

Coordinate with Gateway Cities COG Ad Hoc Committee on joint meetings

**Board Report**

---

**File #:** 2021-0310, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response**Agenda Number:** 12.

---

**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 15, 2021****SUBJECT: I-710 SOUTH CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS STATUS  
UPDATE AND RESPONSE TO MOTION 48****ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE****RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE I-710 South Corridor Project Motion 48 Response.

**ISSUE**

At the May 27, 2021, regular Board meeting, Motion 48 (Hahn, Solis, Butts, and Dutra) on the I-710 (South) corridor improvements environmental process was approved. (Attachment A) Motion 48 directed the CEO to report back at the September Board Meeting.

**BACKGROUND***Draft EIR/EIS Development*

The environmental studies for the I-710 corridor improvements started in 2008 to address significant traffic congestion, safety, and air quality issues resulting from increasing traffic volumes and infrastructure deficiencies. Metro, in partnership with Caltrans, Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG), Port of Los Angeles, Port of Long Beach, Southern California Association of Governments and the I-5 Joint Powers Authority (collectively, the Funding Partners), completed scoping, alternatives analysis and other technical work in early 2011, leading to the preparation of the draft environmental document (DED) and preliminary engineering. The development of the potential improvement alternatives was guided by the stated purpose statement approved by all study Partners and regulatory and resources agencies:

- Improve air quality and public health
- Improve traffic safety
- Address design deficiencies
- Address projected traffic volume
- Address projected growth in population, employment, and economic activity related to goods movement

The development of the DED was guided by a public outreach framework.

The DED circulated on June 28, 2012, evaluated four build alternatives, three of which, in addition to improvements to the mainline freeway, included a grade-separated freight corridor. Close to 3,000 comments

---

were received during the initial circulation. In early 2013, the Study Team, consisting of Metro, Caltrans, and the GCCOG, decided that reevaluation of the alternatives and re-circulation of the DED were necessary to address:

- 1) changes in the Ports' growth forecast scenarios and initial assumptions made about the future distribution of truck trips in Southern California;
- 2) significant right of way requirements for the original design that could make the project infeasible; and
- 3) a proposal by the Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice (CEHAJ) comprising community-based organizations and public health advocates to consider a new alternative to be added to those considered in the DED. This alternative was known as Community Alternative 7 and proposed the construction of a zero-emission freight corridor and significant investment in active transportation improvements and community benefits. In response to community input regarding the need to address corridor issues beyond the freeway itself, both Build Alternatives included the following programmatic elements: the phased-in Zero Emission Truck Technology Deployment Program (a.k.a. I-710 Clean Truck Program), Community Benefits Grant Program, Congestion Relief Program and the Transit Enhancements Program. The 710 Clean Truck Program (CTP) would deploy 4,000 near zero-emission (NZE) or zero-emission (ZE) heavy duty (Class 8) trucks for use within the I-710 Corridor by 2035, assuming that such trucks would be commercially available and funds would be available to purchase those.

The Metro Board of Directors adopted Alternative 5C as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) on March 1, 2018 (Legistar File #2017-0849). In addition to approving the LPA for the I-710, the Board also approved two motions - Motion 5.1 by Directors Hahn, Solis, Garcia, and Dupont-Walker (Legistar File # 2018-0053) and Motion 5.2 by Directors Solis, Garcia, Ridley-Thomas, Butts, Najarian, and Hahn (Legistar File # 2018-0068) that provided additional direction to Metro staff to follow in implementing a I-710 Early Action Program.

### *Final EIR/EIS Development*

Completion/closure of the environmental process requires the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to issue a Record of Decision (ROD), which confirms the formal federal approval of the FEIR/FEIS and allows Metro and Caltrans to proceed with the final design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of the project elements. As part of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) review process, FHWA is legally required to consult with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other state and local agencies on the Project's ability to meet project-level air quality conformity requirements. This multi-agency consultation process begins before the DED is prepared. A final air quality conformity determination is needed before the environmental document can be finalized.

Transportation conformity is required under Clean Air Act (CAA) section 176(c) (42 U.S.C. 7506(c)) to ensure that federally supported highway and transit project activities are consistent with/conform to the purpose of a state air quality implementation plan (SIP). Under these regulations, the I-710 Project would normally be considered a "Project of Air Quality Concern" (POAQC) because of the number of diesel trucks that currently travel on the freeway, the existing traffic congestion levels, and potential for the Project to significantly increase the number of diesel trucks traveling on the freeway. The underlying assumption is that new capacity on I-710 re-distributes traffic that had previously spilled over from the increasingly congested I-710 into communities on local arterial streets and onto other regional freeways back onto the I-710. Although the determination of a POAQC is ultimately an FHWA decision, EPA's understanding of the benefits embedded in this Project and concurrence with Metro and Caltrans' recommendations are fundamental in supporting FHWA in their decision-making.



---

Because the I-710 CTP was already included as part of the I-710 investments when the DED was publicly circulated in 2017, Metro/Caltrans ascertained that there were grounds to challenge the Project's classification as a POAQC (since the Project's implementation would result in an overall reduction in diesel truck trips) thus obviating the need for a quantitative Particulate Matter (PM) "Hot Spot" analysis. This approach had never been tried before. The quantitative PM "Hot Spot" analysis methodology was a concern as preliminary tests indicated that the zero-emissions freight corridor alternative (Alternative 7) failed due to increases in particulate matter attributable to increases of roadway dust and brake/tire wear, that are created regardless of, and ultimately overwhelm, the tailpipe emission reductions expected with the deployment of cleaner truck technology. This outcome would have also been the case for the board-approved Alternative 5C or even a scenario introducing 100% zero emission trucks for the CTP. EPA has not yet established guidelines to identify and quantify potential mitigations for these entrained emission increases.

Metro and Caltrans have been coordinating with EPA throughout the environmental process. The idea of classifying the Project as "not a project of air quality concern" was initially discussed with EPA in August 2018. EPA was open to this idea but required:

- 1) a strong enough written commitment by Metro to the CTP;
- 2) more detail on the CTP program description, including funding and how the CTP would be administered, implemented, and enforced. EPA saw this approach as "legally vulnerable" because "it deviated from the standard regulatory procedures" and "could set precedent" but was open to discussions. In October 2018, EPA issued a white paper delineating all the requirements that would constitute the written commitment, including programming of funds towards program implementation.

In response to EPA's requirement for a written commitment, in July 2019, Metro, Caltrans, SCAG, and the GCCOG signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) memorializing their commitment to the I-710 Clean Truck Program (Attachment B). To address EPA's principal concern about funding for the CTP, at the January 2020 Board meeting, Directors Hahn, Solis, Butts, Garcia and Najarian introduced Motion 8.1 (Legistar File #2020-0067) that directed staff to include the I-710 Clean Truck Program as an Early Action investment under both the Goods Movement Strategic Plan and the I-710 South Corridor Project. Following staff's response to this motion, the Metro Board also voted in March 2020 (Legistar File#2020-0129) to program \$50 million in funding from Metro-controlled sources, including but not limited to Measure R, as "seed funding" for the CTP, to be made available contingent upon a ROD issued by FHWA for the Project. The Board's action was to accomplish three important goals:

- 1) Sending a strong message of good faith and meaningful commitment by Metro to the EPA that Metro intends to fund and implement the Clean Truck Program following FHWA issuing a ROD for the I-710 Project;
- 2) Programming the initial funding to allow Metro to develop the I-710 Clean Truck Program in partnership with regional stakeholders and regulatory agencies; and,
- 3) Identifying local seed funding that would allow Metro to leverage matching funds from state and federal discretionary grant programs to fulfill the Board's \$200 million funding target to support the implementation of the I-710 Clean Truck Program.

Following Metro Board's approval of programming of \$50 million in I-710 Early Action funds as seed funding for the I-710 CTP, Metro led a multi-agency coordination meeting on June 9, 2020, with the goal of reaching an agreement on the project-level air quality conformity determination for the Project. This meeting included executive-level representatives from Metro, SCAQMD, FHWA, EPA, and Caltrans. The meeting was positive - all parties committed to working towards an agreement; however, EPA was not ready to agree on the conformity determination before having additional time to discuss the details of the CTP and the size of the commitment Metro/Caltrans were willing to offer (beyond the \$50 million).

Over the following three months, Metro and Caltrans staff held additional meetings with EPA, AQMD, and FHWA. The staff discussed the remaining concerns and further detail needed on both the technical and regulatory sides. Based on the information shared and the in-depth discussions held during the recent meetings, Metro/Caltrans provided the following additional information to help EPA make the final determination as recommended by Metro and Caltrans:

- Specifics of the Program Description (e.g. identification of target vehicles, tracking, reporting, auditing, incentive structures, etc.)
- A Roles & Responsibilities document for the CTP's Steering Committee that memorialized all the important details and decisions that cannot be finalized at this time.
- A phasing plan, including deployment years and number of trucks for the initial phase of the CTP, assuming \$50 million of initial investment. Future estimates for the remainder of the CTP deployment were also included but only for illustrative purposes as the funding, infrastructure and technological variables are impossible to predict today.

Justification of "back-stop" measures to guarantee the program's viability

Despite all these efforts, additional program development, and seed funding commitments, EPA continued to dispute the viability of the CTP, which presents an insurmountable barrier to applying the I-710 CTP, either as a project feature or as mitigation, as the means to reduce diesel truck trips in the I-710 Corridor and to achieve project level conformity. The EPA's final position was memorialized in their March 25, 2021 letter (Attachment C).

## **DISCUSSION**

### *EPA Response Reaffirms Requirement for a PM Hot-Spot Analysis*

After a multi-agency meeting and extensive discussions with the EPA, in their March 25, 2021 response to Caltrans and Metro (Attachment E), EPA ultimately rejected the Metro/Caltrans proposal to use the I-710 CTP, as a programmatic feature of the Project, to demonstrate how the project could help reduce trips made by diesel trucks within the corridor and thus qualify it as "Not a Project of Air Quality Concern" in order to fulfill the requirements of the Clean Air Act. EPA's position is summarized as follows:

- The I-710 project requires a PM hot-spot analysis under the Clean Air Act and EPA's transportation conformity regulations because it is a highway expansion project (in a non-attainment area and with a large percentage of truck utilization) that would result in significant increase in the number of diesel vehicles.

- The clear purpose of the hot-spot regulations is to implement the Clean Air Act's requirements that projects do not cause or contribute to violations of EPA's national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS), worsen existing violations, or delay attainment or other milestones.
- EPA expects increases in the severity of existing PM violations even if the proposed I-710 Clean Truck Program were to be fully implemented given dust, tire wear and brake wear. There is no current air quality modeling that demonstrates that the I-710 Clean Truck Program sufficiently reduces emissions such that the I-710 expansion project would not create PM NAAQS hot-spots.
- The transportation conformity regulation allows mitigation measures to be included as part of a hot-spot analysis for a project but does not permit mitigation measures to avoid a hot-spot analysis for a project of air quality concern.
- As a mitigation measure, the I-710 Clean Truck Program would need a federally enforceable written commitment to be relied upon for a project-level transportation conformity determination.
- The I-710 Clean Truck Program does not meet EPA's guidance that diesel replacement programs can be used in a conformity determination if the older diesel vehicles are scrapped.

The EPA's position is ultimately to evaluate the I-710 CTP as a project mitigation, not as a project feature, as originally described in the I-710 Corridor RDEIR/SDEIS publicly circulated in July 2017, under that premise the I-710 CTP is not enforceable under CEQA and NEPA. The CTP was included as part of the I-710 investments because it directly addressed one of the most important elements of the Purpose and Need, to improve air quality, by reducing diesel truck trips and thus cancer risk in the corridor. Reframing the program as mitigation places additional regulatory burden and requirements upon the I-710 CTP. Metro and Caltrans staff has long recognized the regulatory challenges associated with seeking project-level conformity approval for the I-710 improvements.

As stated in the Background discussions, given that EPA has not yet developed acceptable and/or quantifiable ways to fully mitigate PM increases, Metro and Caltrans did not see a reasonable ending in proceeding with the PM "hot spots" analysis and instead, offered an alternative approach, including a technical demonstration of how the I-710 CTP would help reduce the number of diesel trucks traversing the corridor. As described above, despite many months of discussion and additional program development, EPA has continued to dispute the viability of the CTP, which presents an insurmountable barrier to applying the I-710 CTP, either as a project feature or as mitigation, as the means to reduce diesel truck trips in the I-710 Corridor and to achieve project-level conformity.

### *Current Status*

Metro has been actively engaged with the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) in their development of the draft Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) which will implement Governor Newsom's Executive Orders (EOs) on Climate Change. These EOs rest on the foundation of climate legislation such as AB 32 (2006), SB 375 (2008), and SB 743 (2013), as well as Governor Brown's EO B-30-15 (2015). EO N-19-19 calls for actions to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by leveraging discretionary state transportation funds. EO N-79-20 requires state transportation agencies to identify near-term actions and investment strategies to improve clean transportation, sustainable freight, and transit options.

The Project was initiated before these recent pieces of legislation and EOs. However, the Project's alternatives were developed in support of its purpose statement of improving air quality and public health, along with safety, mobility, and goods movement. Over the past several years, a number of strategies and concepts were

---

evaluated through the extensive alternatives development and refinement process to determine how and if, either as stand-alone or in conjunction with improvements to the I-710 freeway, each one of these would address the Project's purpose and need. Some of these ideas were included as part of the Project alternatives (e.g. Clean Truck Program, Active Transportation improvements) or incorporated in the I-710 studies in the No Build conditions (e.g. on-dock rail improvements and maximization of the Alameda Corridor capacity) based on freight rail projects in development by others. These Project elements on their own could not address the full purpose and need but can continue to be considered as part of a reevaluation of alternatives. Furthermore, other ideas such as converting existing mixed flow freeway lanes to priced/managed lanes and dedicating existing lanes only to clean trucks were not evaluated in detail during the environmental process because, at the time, it was not considered viable from an equity, legislative, mobility and/or operational standpoint. There is an opportunity now to work with our State and Federal partners, and local and regional stakeholders to evaluate these and other alternatives that can address the regional/local mobility and goods movement demands, and the need for air quality improvements.

### State and Federal Support

Considering the Governor's EOs, environmental legislations, equity considerations, and the position taken by Caltrans, the Project, as currently defined under the Locally Preferred Alternative (5C), will not gain approval from the State. Furthermore, these considerations are significant enough to suggest the need to review the Project's purpose and need. Additional discussions with State/Federal agencies are needed to determine what ideas generated by the proposed I-710 Task Force (described below) could be supported. Continued coordination and consultation with EPA and Caltrans will also be critical to an alternatives development process because the issues outlined in response to particulate matter from entrained road dust and tire/brake wear will still need to be addressed under any improvement scenario that includes additional roadway capacity, or operational enhancements that may increase vehicle miles traveled.

In May 2021, Metro's then-CEO Phil Washington issued a Board Box (Attachment D) about the need to reimagine Metro's investment in the highway system and to engage all stakeholders in an open-minded manner to explore and create a set of principles guiding future highway investment. Staff anticipates the stakeholder engagement process that will inform development of solutions for the I-710 and plans will also help inform the broader discussion with Caltrans and CalSTA about the future of highway investments, with the goal of developing a set of guiding principles that would enable both agencies to make sustainable and long-lasting improvements that benefit the communities served along the 710 South Corridor.

### Re-engaging Cities and Stakeholders Along the Corridor

Metro and Caltrans will seek to re-engage vital stakeholders that depend upon and are impacted by the movement of people and goods along the corridor. The goal is to identify and work with stakeholders to develop a multimodal investment strategy to improve regional mobility, safety, and air quality in concert with fostering economic vitality, social equity, environmental sustainability, and access to opportunity for LA County residents-particularly for the most impacted residents that live adjacent to I-710. The focal point of Metro's engagement strategy will be a new stakeholder committee called the I-710 South Corridor Task Force (I-710 Task Force), entrusted with the important responsibility of working collaboratively and constructively to accomplish the following outcomes: (1) review the purpose and need (2) develop multimodal and multipurpose strategies to meet these goals in alignment with state and local policies, (3) identify projects and programs to realize these strategies, and (4) create an investment plan to implement priority projects that leverage local (Measure R/M) funding and provide benefit to local communities and the region at-large.

Metro, in partnership with Caltrans (District 7), will conduct a series of workshops with the I-710 Task Force over the course of the next six to eight months to accomplish these overarching goals. The first meeting of the

---

I-710 Task Force is scheduled for Monday, September 13, 2021, from 6:00 pm - 8:30 pm (via Zoom). This process will be modeled upon Metro's 2021 Goods Movement Strategic Plan (GMSP) that brought together a robust and diverse set of key stakeholders, including GCCOG, through a third-party facilitated workshop setting to develop a shared vision and set of objectives, strategies, and outcomes to advance Metro's priorities of social equity, environmental sustainability, and economic vitality for LA County.

On July 7, 2021, the GCCOG convened a special meeting of their Board of Directors and Executive Committee to discuss current policy considerations, regulatory issues, and funding opportunities for the I-710 South Corridor and other highways in the sub-region. Metro, Caltrans, SCAG, Port of Los Angeles, and Port of Long Beach participated at this event. As a result of this discussion, the GCCOG Board and Executive Committee resolved to create an I-710 Ad-Hoc Committee to return to the GCCOG with recommendations regarding the future of the project.

Metro will work with the GCCOG to share information and will host "joint sessions" at key intervals over the next six months to help receive feedback from the GCCOG I-710 ad hoc committee, share discussion, and incorporate their findings into the 710 Task Force's recommendations. At the end of the process, the Task Force will report back to the Metro Board on its findings and make recommendations as to the scope of its investment plan that will realize the refreshed Purpose and Need of the I-710 South Corridor. A detailed work plan for the I-710 Task Force is included in Attachment E.

#### **DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT**

The proposed actions have no adverse impact on the safety of Metro's patrons, employees, or users of these facilities.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

This is a Receive and File report for information only with no financial impacts. Any Board direction provided on the information presented in this report could result in financial and/or schedule impacts.

#### **EQUITY PLATFORM**

Equitable opportunities will be incorporated into all future decision-making, budget allocation, and community engagement for the Project(s) along the I-710. Staff will continue to work with stakeholders, including residents most impacted by projects, along the corridor to gather input and develop the framework for a I-710 South Corridor investment strategic plan to implement priority multimodal projects and programs based on their suggestions and feedback. Additional Program elements proposed by stakeholders will be considered and may be advanced in support of equitable outcomes. Transparent communication with the stakeholders will help build consensus and trust moving forward and hopefully strengthen the communities' support for the needed improvements. Without timely investment to address the current corridor conditions, the I-710 users and corridor communities will continue to experience congestion, unsafe traffic conditions, spillage of freeway traffic onto local neighborhoods, pollution, and other negative impacts of the anticipated escalating traffic demand in the corridor.

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

Metro staff collaboration with local, regional, State and Federal agencies as well as the local communities towards the development of an Early Action Program for the I-710 Corridor and a long-term vision to improve I-710 is consistent with 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.

Goal 4: Transform LA County through regional collaboration by partnering with the GCCOG, Caltrans, impacted communities, and regional stakeholders to identify the needed improvements and take the lead in development and implementation of the Projects.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Activities in pursuit of major highway investments on I-710 are ceased until further guidance is provided by the Board and agreements are reached with necessary regional, state, and federal agencies.

Metro and Caltrans will continue to lead the 710 Task Force to revisit the I-710 South Corridor project Purpose and Need, develop multimodal strategies to address these goals, identify projects that advance the multimodal strategies, and create an investment and policy strategic plan to implement the prioritized projects.


The I-710 Task Force outcomes will be presented to the Metro Board in early 2022, with updates provided periodically during this process. Staff will seek Board adoption of the I-710 Task Force investment and strategic plan at that time.

### **ATTACHMENT**

- Attachment A - Motion 48 (May 21, 2021 Board Meeting)
- Attachment B - Multi-Agency MOU for I-710 CTP
- Attachment C - March 25, 2021 Letter from EPA
- Attachment D - CEO Board Box - Reimagining Highway Improvements
- Attachment E - Draft New Metro/Caltrans I-710 South Corridor Task Force Engagement Strategy

Prepared by: Ernesto Chaves, Deputy Executive Officer, (213) 418-3142  
Michael Cano, Deputy Executive Officer, (213) 418-3010  
KeAndra Cylear Dodds, Executive Officer, (213) 922-4850  
Abdollah Ansari, Sr. Executive Officer, (213) 922-4781

Reviewed by: Bryan Pennington, Interim Chief, Program Management Officer, (213) 922-7449  
James de la Loza, Chief, Countywide Planning and Development, (213) 922-2920



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer



**Board Report**

---

**File #:** 2021-0365, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response

**Agenda Number:** 48.

---

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING  
MAY 27, 2021**

**Motion by:**

**DIRECTORS HAHN, SOLIS, BUTTS, AND DUTRA**

**I-710 South Corridor Project**

Metro, the California Transportation Agency (Caltrans), and the corridor cities have studied the I-710 South Corridor Project for over a decade, with goals of reducing goods movement congestion and improving air quality and mobility for communities along the corridor.

The Project is a high priority for goods movement, as the I-710 directly links the broader region with the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, which combined account for 40% of the nation's imports.

Three years ago, the Metro Board approved Alternative 5C as the Locally Preferred Alternative, at an estimated cost of \$6 billion. The Board also voted to limit property impacts, ensure local hiring priorities, and prioritize an Early Action Program. Further, Motion 5.1 doubled the size of the Zero Emissions Truck program to \$200 million and called for a Zero Emissions truck lane. Once the Board approved the Project, staff sought Federal environmental clearance in order to be eligible for Federal funding.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), in a letter dated March 25, 2021 and addressed to Metro CEO Phil Washington and Caltrans District 7 Director Tony Tavares, stated that "a PM [Particulate Matter] hot-spot analysis is necessary for the project's transportation conformity determination." That analysis has not yet been conducted for this Project, and the Project cannot receive Federal funding until a hot-spot analysis is conducted and meets Federal requirements.

At the California Transportation Commission's May 12, 2021 meeting, Caltrans Director Toks Omishakin stated "I don't see how we can move forward with the I-710 South Corridor Project in its current format" and that the Metro Board "may have to take another vote on this particular project."

Without Federal and State support and funding for the I-710 South Corridor Project in its current form, there is insufficient funding to proceed with Alternative 5C as approved by the Board. However, the status of the project and Metro's and Caltrans' recommended approach for addressing the ongoing goods movement, air quality, and mobility needs along this corridor remains unclear.

**SUBJECT: I-710 SOUTH CORRIDOR PROJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

APPROVE Motion by Directors Hahn, Solis, Butts, and Dutra that the Board direct the Chief Executive Officer to report back to the Board in July 2021 on:

1. Why the EPA concluded the project does not meet conformity requirements and why Caltrans Director Toks Omishakin stated that Caltrans cannot support the Project “in its current format”;
2. Identify what elements of the Project can either be moved forward or modified in order to get State and Federal support, including but not limited to: price-managed freeway lanes, zero emissions-only truck lanes, short- and long-haul rail, Atlantic Avenue bus rapid transit, Metrolink capital and service improvements, and State and Federal funding for near-zero and zero-emissions goods movement investments earmarked for the I-710 South Corridor;
3. If inclusion of some or all of the elements in Directive 2 above will be enough to get State and Federal support for the Project or if it needs to be reimagined entirely; and,
4. A plan for re-engaging cities and stakeholders along the corridor.



**Memorandum of Understanding  
Creating the I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee to  
Implement the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program**

This Memorandum of Understanding Creating the I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee to Implement the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program (“MOU”) is entered into between the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (“Metro”), the California Department of Transportation (“Caltrans”), the Southern California Association of Governments (“SCAG”), and the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (“Gateway Cities COG”), (collectively the “Parties”). In order to implement the program contemplated herein, the Parties have voluntarily arrived at the following mutual understandings and agreements.

Recitals

WHEREAS, the I-710 Freeway is a major transportation corridor (I-710 Corridor) accommodating both daily commutes and significant freight movement to and from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

WHEREAS, Caltrans and Metro have partnered with the Gateway Cities COG, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, the Cities along the I-710 Corridor, and community groups and worked with the California Air Resources Board (CARB), SCAG and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to identify features for the I-710 Corridor Project that improve mobility, support commerce, and address air quality and public health concerns in the corridor.

WHEREAS, Caltrans and Metro have prepared a draft Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report (“EIS/EIR”) for the I-710 Corridor Project. On March 1, 2018, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 5C as the Locally Preferred Alternative (“LPA”) for the I-710 Corridor Project. Caltrans has endorsed Metro’s recommendation to advance Alternative 5C as the Preferred Alternative through the I-710 EIS/EIR. Alternative 5C includes the I-710 Zero Emission/Near Zero Emission Truck Technology Deployment Program (also known as the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program or “Program” herein) as a focused I-710 incentive program for heavy-duty trucks that meet or exceed CARB’s 0.02 g/bhp-hr NOx standard (i.e., Zero Emission (“ZE”)/Near Zero Emission (“NZE”) trucks).

WHEREAS, within the greater project area, several agencies have published commitments to development of ZE/NZE trucks and understand that deployment will take a collaborative approach. The Parties will form a Steering Committee (and invite other agencies to join the Steering Committee) to implement the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program (which qualifies for and contributes to each agency’s plans and goals as identified and summarized below and more comprehensively described in Appendix A) in the I-710 Corridor to improve air quality for communities along the corridor.

- a. SCAQMD: [2016 Air Quality Management Plan \(“AQMP”\)](#) seeks to leverage strong federal, state, and local partnerships to secure incentive funding and supporting infrastructure for early deployment of zero and near-zero technologies, inclusive of the mobile source sector, specifically heavy-duty trucks.

- b. SCAG: [2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy](#) and 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy include a commitment to reduce emissions from transportation sources to comply with SB 375 by pledging to a broad deployment of zero and near zero emission transportation technologies especially in the goods movement system.
- c. Port of Long Beach: The [2017 San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan \("CAAP"\) Update](#) set the Port of LB on the path to zero emission goods movement, with a goal of transitioning terminal equipment to zero emissions by 2030 and on-road trucks by 2035.
- d. Port of Los Angeles: The [Zero Emission Technologies](#) effort, including the San Pedro Bay Ports CAAP, Zero Emissions Roadmap commits to finding new ways to reduce emissions from ships, trains, trucks, harbor craft, and cargo handling equipment with the goal of eliminating all pollution from port-related operations. The Port Zero-Emissions White Paper outlines a specific plan of action including expanded development and testing of zero emission technologies, identification of new strategic funding opportunities, and new planning for long-term infrastructure development.
- e. California Air Resources Board: The [CARB Mobile Source Strategy: Further Deployment of Cleaner Technologies: On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicles](#) control measure in the 2016 AQMP and CARB's related State Implementation Plan ("SIP") submittal to USEPA commits to expanding and enhancing existing incentive funding and innovative funding programs for heavy-duty vehicles to increase the emphasis on and support for purchase of near-zero and zero emission equipment. Furthermore, full implementation of this CARB measure would require funding approximately 15,000 to 20,000 trucks per year over a seven year period, depending upon the availability of vehicles and engines certified to the ZE and/or NZE standards.
- f. USEPA: The [National ZEV Investment Plan](#) commits to \$1.2 billion (outside California) and \$800 million (within California) for a total of \$2 billion in funding over 10 years for zero emission vehicle ("ZEV") infrastructure, education, and access. The funding supports the increased adoption of ZEV technology by installing ZEV fueling infrastructure (for both electric- and hydrogen-powered cars), funding brand-neutral consumer awareness campaigns that will help grow the ZEV vehicle market, and investing in projects such as car-sharing programs that will increase access to ZEVs for all consumers in California, including those in lower-income and disadvantaged communities.

The [Clean Diesel Program](#) provides support for projects that protect human health and improve air quality by reducing harmful emissions from diesel engines. This program includes grants and rebates funded under the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act ("DERA"). The program solicited proposals nationwide for projects that achieve significant reductions in diesel emissions in terms of tons of pollution produced and exposure, particularly from fleets operating in areas designated by the Administrator as poor air quality areas. Eligible diesel vehicles, engines and equipment include school buses, class 5 – class 8 heavy-duty highway vehicles, locomotive engines, marine engines, nonroad engines, and equipment or vehicles used in construction, handling of

cargo (including at ports or airports), agriculture, mining or energy production (including stationary generators and pumps).

The Cleaner Trucks Initiative (“CTI”) is a future planned rulemaking to update standards for nitrogen oxide (“NOx”) emissions from highway heavy-duty trucks and engines. USEPA expects that heavy-duty trucks will be responsible for one-third of NOx emissions from transportation in 2025. Updating these standards will result in NOx reductions from mobile sources and could be one important way that allows areas across the U.S. to meet National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and particulate matter.

WHEREAS, the Parties to this MOU wish to implement the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program (which qualifies for and contributes to each agency’s plans and goals discussed above) in the I-710 Corridor to improve air quality for communities along the corridor. The purpose of this MOU is to clarify the Parties’ interests, commitments, roles and responsibilities in the implementation of the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program.

THEREFORE, in furtherance of this MOU and incorporating by reference the above Recitals, the Parties agree as follows:

1.0 I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program

The I-710 Phased-In Zero Emission Truck Technology Development Program (also known as the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program) is a component of Alternative 5C, also known as the Preferred Alternative (“PA”), for the I-710 Corridor Improvement Project. The Clean Truck Emissions Program would seek funding to assist individual owner-operators and privately owned truck fleets to subsidize the purchase of heavy duty zero or near zero emission trucks for use within the I-710 Corridor as well as seed money for electric charging stations and hydrogen refueling stations within the I-710 Corridor. The recharging/refueling stations would be constructed near locations served by heavy-duty vehicles such as intermodal terminals at the ports, rail yards, warehouses, and distribution centers. The Clean Truck Emissions Program is consistent with goals and strategies of the SCAQMD 2016 AQMP and the 2016 AQMP Funding Plan, as well as other similar clean technology incentive programs administered by the SCAQMD. The Clean Truck Emissions Program is also consistent with the plans, goals and strategies of the other Parties to this MOU as described above.

2.0 I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee

The Clean Truck Emissions Program addresses one element of the overall air quality/environmental improvement needs of the corridor. It will take a collaborative effort of all the Parties and Steering Committee members to be able to bring the Parties’ plans and goals to fruition. Therefore, the Parties agree to form the I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee (“Committee”), that will consist of the Parties to this MOU and subsequent invited agencies, funding partners and industry engine/truck providers and users. The formation of the Committee will allow for a more comprehensive approach and faster implementation of the improvements/incentives, goals, plans and the Clean Truck Emissions Program. The Parties to this MOU agree to have a representative actively serve on the Committee.

### 3.0 Responsibilities of the Committee

The Committee will:

- a. Further develop implementation details, including eligibility requirements, institutional arrangements, management, and administration for the Clean Truck Emissions Program.
- b. Explore and identify funding opportunities, financial impact, and other implementation factors along with the development of a phasing plan for the achievement of the funding target developed by Caltrans and Metro for the Clean Truck Emissions Program, and the more comprehensive goals, based on existing and new potential funding, including local, state, federal and private resources. This includes collaborating with the Port of Long Beach, the Port of Los Angeles and the South Coast Air Quality Management District in identifying funding and project/program opportunities to implement.
- c. Develop a strategy that outlines progressive transition to ZEVs in the corridor starting with the latest feasible and sustainable technologies.
- d. Identify and evaluate other potential strategies to address the air quality concerns in the corridor.
- e. Obtain or assist with obtaining funding to implement the Clean Truck Emissions Program and more comprehensive programs.
- f. Issue quarterly reports on the development and progress toward the established and agreed upon goals. The progress reports will be presented to the governing bodies of the participating agencies and those of other agencies, as necessary.

### 4.0 TERM

- 4.1. The term of this MOU will begin on the Effective Date and shall continue until Program is fully implemented or until terminated by the Parties.

### 5.0 AMENDMENT

- 5.1. Amendment of any provision of this MOU shall be effective only if in writing and signed by authorized representatives of the Parties.

### 6.0 MISCELLANEOUS

- 6.1. **Effective Date.** The date the last signatory executes the MOU.
- 6.2. **Assignment.** The Parties shall not assign rights or responsibilities under this MOU without written permission from the remaining Parties.
- 6.3. **Governing Law; Venue.** This MOU, and any claims relating to or arising out of this MOU, whether arising in contract, tort, or otherwise, shall be governed and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California, without giving effect to conflicts of laws and principles. Any action or proceeding between the

Parties relating to this MOU shall take place in the State of California in the County of Los Angeles.

- 6.4. Notices. Any notice required or permitted hereunder shall be in writing and shall be given to each Party's Designated Representative at the address below, or at such other address as the Party may hereafter specify in writing. Such notice shall be deemed given: upon personal delivery to the appropriate address; or three (3) business days after the date of mailing if sent by certified or registered mail; or one (1) business day after the date of deposit with a commercial courier service offering next business day service with confirmation of delivery. Each Party may change the Designated Representative as needed and shall provide notice to the other Parties by email of the change.
- 6.5. Dispute Resolution. In the event of any dispute between the Parties arising out of or in connection with this MOU, the Parties shall attempt, promptly and in good faith, to resolve any such dispute. If the Parties are unable to resolve any such dispute within a reasonable time (not to exceed thirty (30) days), then either Party may submit such dispute to non-binding mediation in Los Angeles County, California. Each Party shall bear its own expenses in connection with the mediation and share equally the fees and expenses of the mediator. If the dispute cannot be resolved through mediation within a reasonable time, then the Parties shall be free to pursue any right or remedy available to them under applicable law. The requirements of this section shall not preclude a Party from pursuing equitable relief, if delay in seeking such relief may result in irreparable harm to such Party.
- 6.6. Force Majeure. Subject to the express provisions of Section 4 (Term) above, no Party will be deemed in default of this MOU to the extent that performance of its obligations or attempts to cure any breach are delayed or prevented by reason of any event beyond the reasonable control of such Party, which event was not caused by such Party's negligence and could not have been avoided by such Party's commercially reasonable efforts (including, but not limited to, any act of God, fire, earthquake, natural disaster, accident, pandemic, labor unrest, civil disobedience, acts of terrorism or act of government), and provided further that such Party gives other Parties written notice thereof promptly and, in any event, within five (5) business days of discovery thereof, and thereafter uses its best efforts to continue to so perform or cure. In the event of such a force majeure event, the time for performance or cure will be extended for a period equal to the duration of the force majeure event plus reasonable repair timeframes, but in no event more than thirty (30) days unless agreed upon by the Parties.
- 6.7. No Third Party Beneficiaries. This MOU is executed and entered into by the Parties solely for their benefit, and for no other party (including without limitation any individual employee, officer, director, contractor or agent of a Party).
- 6.8. Counterparts. This MOU may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original and all of which together shall constitute one instrument.
- 6.9. Waiver; Modification. No amendment, modification, waiver or supplement shall be made with respect to this MOU or any provision of this MOU by course of

performance, or by the failure of a Party to object to a deviation from the terms of this MOU. Any waiver, modification or amendment of any provision of this MOU shall be effective only if in writing and signed by authorized representatives of the Parties.

- 6.10. Complete Understanding. This MOU and any attached exhibits, schedules and addenda, all of which are incorporated into this MOU by this reference, constitute the full and complete understanding and agreement of the Parties relating to the subject matter hereof and supersede all prior understandings and agreements relating to such subject matter. The provisions of this MOU shall prevail over any conflicting provisions in any purchase order, acceptance notice or other document generated by the Parties except as expressly provided in the preceding sentence.

## 7.0 EXECUTION

- 7.1. By their signatures below, each of the following represents that it has authority to execute this MOU and to bind the Party on whose behalf the execution is made.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this MOU has been executed by each of the Parties as of the date set forth next to such Party's authorized representative's signature.

[Signature Page to follow.]

Los Angeles County Metropolitan  
Transportation Authority

Phillip A. Washburn  
Printed Name of Individual

*[Signature]*  
Signature of Individual

CEO  
Title

One Gateway Plaza LA 90012  
Address

Washburn@metro.net  
Email

(213) 922-7555  
Telephone

California Department of Transportation,  
District 7

John Bulinski  
Printed Name of Individual

*[Signature]*  
Signature of Individual

DISTRICT DIRECTOR  
Title

100 S. MAIN ST LA, CA 90012  
Address

john.bulinski@dot.ca.gov  
Email

213-897-0540  
Telephone

Gateway Cities Council of Governments

NANCY PFEFFER  
Printed Name of Individual

*[Signature]*  
Signature of Individual

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
Title

16401 PARAMOUNT Blvd  
Address PARAMOUNT, CA 90723

NANCY@gatewaycog.org  
Email

562-663-6850  
Telephone

Southern California Association of  
Governments

Kome Ajise  
Printed Name of Individual

*[Signature]*  
Signature of Individual

Kome Ajise  
Title

900 Wilshire Blvd Suite 1700  
Address Los Angeles, CA 90017

ajise@scag.ca.gov  
Email

213-236-1835  
Telephone

## Appendix A

### Examples of Agencies Plans and Goals to Implement Clean Truck Emissions Technology

a. SCAQMD: 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)

Page 5 Executive Summary: *Identify and secure significant funding for incentives to implement early deployment and commercialization of zero and near-zero technologies. The 2016 AQMP control strategy strongly relies on a transition to zero and near-zero emission technologies in the mobile source sector, including automobiles, transit buses, medium- and heavy-duty trucks, and off-road applications. The plan focuses on existing commercialized technologies and energy sources including their supporting infrastructure, along with newer technologies that are nearing commercialization based on recent demonstration programs and limited test markets. Prioritizing and expanding funding in Environmental Justice (EJ) areas will be sought.*

Page 4-3: *The 2016 AQMP relies strongly upon partnerships at federal, state, and local levels, seeking to expand existing collaborations and establish new coalitions. These strategies include aggressive new regulations and development of incentive funding and supporting infrastructure for early deployment of advanced control technologies... The SCAQMD will continue to support technology demonstration projects for both mobile and stationary sources and will work to create new or expanded funding opportunities for earlier deployment of cleaner technologies, thus contributing to a smooth transition to zero and near-zero emission technologies in the mobile and stationary source sectors.*

b. SCAG: 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

Page 107: *The 2016 RTP/SCS focuses on a two-pronged approach for achieving an efficient freight system that reduces environmental impacts. For the near term, the regional strategy supports the deployment of commercially available low-emission trucks and locomotives while centering on continued investments into improved system efficiencies. For example, the region envisions increased market penetration of technologies already in use, such as heavy-duty hybrid trucks and natural gas trucks. Applying ITS solutions to improve operational efficiency is also recommended. In the longer term, the strategy focuses on advancing technologies – taking critical steps now toward the phased implementation of a zero- and near zero-emission freight system. SCAG is cognizant of the need to incorporate evolving technologies with plans for new infrastructure. These include technologies to fuel vehicles, as well as to charge batteries and provide power. The plan to develop and deploy advanced technologies includes phased implementation, during which technology needs are defined, prototypes are tested and developed, and efforts are scaled up. The phases are summarized as follows:*

- *Phase 1: Project Scoping and Evaluation of Existing Work*
- *Phase 2: Evaluation, Development and Prototype Demonstrations*
- *Phase 3: Initial Deployment and Operational Demonstration*



- *Phase 4: Full-Scale Demonstrations and Commercial Deployment*

Page 43: *The 2016 RTP/SCS Goods Movement Appendix further details an updated environmental action plan for the goods movement system that builds on regional progress to date. This includes an Action Plan for Advancement of Zero-Emission Technology. As the four phases of the updated action plan are reviewed, the text also points to progress made related to specific action steps identified in 2012. The technology development and deployment plan is inclusive of all stages of technology development and deployment: beginning from an initial definition of key operational parameters, moving through prototype development, initial demonstration and evaluation, and eventually a staged roll-out. This start-to-finish framework is useful as there are many potential technologies available, each at different stages of readiness.*

*Significant regional actions will be needed in order to realize this vision of a zero- and near zero-emission freight transportation system that meets regional objectives for long-term sustainability and can also meet the performance objectives required by industry. SCAG may act together with key partner agencies such as the Port of Los Angeles, the Port of Long Beach, the SCAQMD and the region's county transportation commissions to update and implement this plan as needed. Since SCAG adopted the 2012 RTP/SCS, the region has attracted outside funding and committed its own funding to support research and development efforts. Several studies have been conducted to date that contribute to "project scoping" by providing a greater understanding of the regional truck market and how truck use defines key performance parameters such as range and power needs. To evaluate and develop prototypes, three large-scale research and development efforts are underway to develop and test zero-emission trucks and charging infrastructure. These projects require continuing collaboration between original equipment manufacturers and public sector agencies.*

c. Port of Long Beach

*The 2017 San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan Update set the Port of Long Beach on the path to zero-emission goods movement, with a goal of transitioning terminal equipment to zero emissions by 2030 and on-road trucks by 2035.*

d. Port of Los Angeles: Zero Emission Technologies

*Although significant emissions reductions have been achieved under the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP), the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (the San Pedro Bay Ports) continue to place great emphasis on green development, including a particular focus on zero emission technologies. Fostering the development of zero emission technologies is not only a key component of the Ports' plans to achieve their voluntary air quality goals, but it will also help to greatly reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions. To that effect, the San Pedro Bay Ports prepared a Zero-Emissions Roadmap designed to guide their actions going forward.*

- e. California Air Resources Board (CARB): 2016 AQMP Appendix IV-B CARB Mobile Source Strategy: “Further Deployment of Cleaner Technologies: On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicles”

Page IV-B-50: *Overview: The goal of this proposed measure is to identify concepts that will further reduce NOx emissions. These concepts will include additional incentive funding and developing technologies to accelerate the penetration of near-zero and zero equipment beyond the rate of natural turnover achieved through implementation of the other proposed measures identified for on-road heavy-duty vehicles. This measure is specifically for the South Coast.*

Page IV-B-51: *Expand and enhance existing incentive and other innovative funding programs for heavy-duty vehicles to increase the emphasis on and support for purchase of near-zero and zero equipment. Funding mechanisms would target technologies that meet either lower NOx standards or are hybrid/zero-emission technologies. If incentive funding is the primary mechanism to achieve the scope of further technology deployment described above, funding would be required for approximately 15,000 to 20,000 trucks per year over a seven year period, depending upon the availability of zero-emission vehicles and engines certified to [C]ARB’s optional low-NOx standards of 0.05 g/bhp-hr and 0.02 g/bhp-hr or other advanced hybrid/zero-emission technologies. The incentive funding required for this effort would go beyond the amount currently authorized for existing programs through 2023. Continued incentive funding post-2023 to further accelerate the deployment of trucks meeting or exceeding a 0.02 g/bhp-hr standard would provide additional reductions for 2031.*

*Determination of the needed resources will be based on assessment of the incremental cost of technologies, cost effectiveness, and the type of financing mechanism employed. Funding needs and mechanisms will be identified working in collaboration with the District and other State agencies over the next several months.*

- f. USEPA: National ZEV Investment Plan

Page 3: *As required by Appendix C to the 2.0-Liter Partial Consent Decree entered by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California on October 25, 2016, Volkswagen Group of America is investing \$1.2 billion over the next 10 years in zero emission vehicle (ZEV) infrastructure, education, and access outside California to support the increased adoption of ZEV technology in the United States, representing the largest commitment of its kind to date. Based on figures from the Council of Economic Advisors and U.S. Department of Transportation related to highway and transit investments, the \$1.2 billion being spent here is estimated to support up to 15,000 jobs throughout the United States over the 10 year course of the investment [Dept. of Transportation, Council of Economic Advisors]. The first cycle of a separate investment of \$800 million in California is the subject of the California ZEV Investment Plan, which was submitted to the California Air Resources Board on March 8.*



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**  
**REGION IX**  
**75 Hawthorne Street**  
**San Francisco, CA 94105-3901**

Tony Tavares, Director, District 7  
California Department of Transportation, District 7  
100 South Main Street, Suite 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Philip A. Washington, Chief Executive Officer  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 9012-2952

Re: EPA technical response for project-level transportation conformity status- Interstate 710 South

Dear Mr. Tavares and Mr. Washington:

In 2018, following publication of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS for the Interstate 710 (I-710) South Corridor project, Caltrans and Metro asked the EPA to consider a variation from project level transportation conformity analysis processes and requirements. Prior to this request, the transportation agencies were pursuing coordination related to required particulate matter (PM) hot-spot modeling assumptions and protocols. As an alternative, Caltrans and Metro proposed the I-710 Clean Truck Program to potentially offset the significant increase of diesel-emitting trucks that would result from the project, thereby attempting to remove the status of the project as a “Project of Air Quality Concern” and the need for a PM hot-spot analysis as part of the project-level transportation conformity determination.

The EPA recognizes the collective challenges to protecting human health while delivering transportation projects within the I-710 Corridor, an area with communities already overburdened by existing goods movement and industry in an area with the worst air quality in the United States, including some of the highest PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels in the country. After thoughtful consideration, multiple interagency meetings, and good faith efforts by EPA, Caltrans and Metro to identify a potential alternative path forward for the analysis of project-level transportation conformity, the EPA ultimately concludes that a PM hot-spot analysis is necessary for the project’s transportation conformity determination. Please see the attached Technical Response supporting this position, the details of which were also shared verbally during our November 20, 2020 senior leadership meeting with Caltrans, Metro, and the Federal Highway Administration.

EPA continues to support efforts to increase clean transportation along the corridor and we remain committed to partnering with you as you evaluate pathways to advance transportation solutions while being protective of human health. I understand that our staff are already in dialogue on possible

alternatives. If you would like to speak further, please contact me at (415) 972-3183, or your staff can contact Karina O'Connor, Project Level Transportation Conformity Lead, at (775) 434-8176 or Oconnor.Karina@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth J. Adams, Director  
Air & Radiation Division

Attachment: Technical Response

cc: Vincent Mammano, Division Administrator, FHWA  
Antonio Johnson, Planning Team Leader, FHWA  
Abdollah Ansari, Senior Executive Officer, Metro  
Ron Kosinski, Deputy District Director, Caltrans

# Technical Response: Summary of Issues for the I-710 Highway Expansion Project and I-710 Clean Truck Program

## I. Introduction and Purpose

### A. Purpose of this Document

On November 20, 2020, after considerable coordination between Caltrans, Metro, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and EPA, EPA indicated that we would not be able to concur that the proposed I-710 highway expansion project was not a project of air quality concern under the Clean Air Act transportation conformity requirements. Caltrans and Metro requested more details regarding the specific legal and technical issues that we identified with using the I-710 Clean Truck Program to avoid completion of a particulate matter (PM) hot-spot analysis to satisfy transportation conformity requirements for the I-710 expansion project. In response, this document describes in more detail why, after careful consideration and based on the information before us, EPA does not agree that the I-710 Clean Truck Program renders the I-710 project as a project that is not of air quality concern, and describes how project sponsors should proceed with meeting conformity requirements.

### B. Summary of Findings

EPA is very supportive of using zero emissions truck technology on the I-710 freight corridor, but it is critical that public agencies develop a program that meets all of the regulatory requirements so that emissions will not increase and negatively impact public health in the future. This document describes why EPA does not agree that (1) the I-710 Clean Truck Program renders the I-710 project as a project that is not of air quality concern and (2) that the project does not need a PM hot-spot analysis. To summarize:

- The I-710 project requires a PM hot-spot analysis under the Clean Air Act (CAA) and EPA's transportation conformity regulations because it is a highway expansion project that would result in a significant increase in the number of diesel vehicles.
- The clear purpose of the hot-spot regulations are to implement the Clean Air Act's requirements that projects do not cause or contribute to violations of EPA's national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS), worsen existing violations, or delay attainment or other milestones.
- There is no current air quality modeling that demonstrates that the I-710 Clean Truck Program sufficiently reduces emissions such that the I-710 expansion project does not create PM NAAQS hot-spots. In fact, we expect increases in the severity of existing violations even if the proposed I-710 Clean Truck Program were to be fully implemented given dust, tire wear and brake wear.
- The transportation conformity regulation allows mitigation measures to be included as part of a hot-spot analysis for a project but does not permit mitigation measures to avoid a hot-spot analysis for a project of air quality concern.
- As a mitigation measure, the I-710 Clean Truck Program would need a federally enforceable written commitment to be relied upon for a project-level transportation conformity determination.
- The project sponsor has not utilized more recent travel activity assumptions for truck movement along the I-710 freight corridor.

- The I-710 Clean Truck Program does not meet EPA’s guidance that diesel replacement programs can be used in a conformity determination if the older diesel vehicles are scrapped.

### C. Background on the Los Angeles Air Quality and the Surrounding Community

The proposed project area, 18 miles of the I-710 freeway extending north from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, serves as a primary freight corridor connecting two of the busiest container ports in the country with downtown intermodal railyards and the goods movement network extending east into the Inland Valley. The greater Los Angeles area has among the worst air quality in the United States, including some of the highest PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels in the country. In 2020, EPA determined that the South Coast Air District failed to attain the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS (or standard) by its December 31, 2019 attainment date and bumped up the area to Serious for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard, requiring additional planning work by the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

The I-710 corridor accommodates a daily count of approximately 50,000 diesel-fueled freight trucks and 165,000 other vehicles running directly through, and adjacent to, numerous densely populated communities with environmental justice concerns. These low-income and minority communities are already heavily burdened by pollution from existing goods movement and industrial activity and experience health disparities, including asthma burdens. These communities are vulnerable to any increases in particulate matter emissions associated with the proposed I-710 expansion project, and have historically voiced strong concerns about air quality impacts from freight-related projects in this area, including ongoing engagement with the I-710 project. Environmental and community groups have expressed support for exclusively zero-emission truck technology and associated infrastructure for the I-710 project.

### D. Background on the Transportation Conformity PM Hot-spot Requirement

Transportation conformity applies to transportation plans, transportation improvement programs (TIPs), and federally-supported transportation projects (i.e., FHWA and FTA funded or approved projects) in nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related pollutants, including PM, ozone, and carbon monoxide (CO).

Section 176(c)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) states that federally-supported transportation projects cannot:

- (i) cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area;
- (ii) increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or
- (iii) delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area. See CAA § 176(c)(1)(B).

To ensure that transportation projects meet these criteria, EPA’s transportation conformity regulations require a hot-spot analysis in PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> areas for certain highway and transit projects. To ensure that CAA requirements are met, large projects that result in “a significant increase in the number of diesel vehicles” (40 CFR 93.123(b)(1)) need a quantitative PM hot-spot analysis. Such a project is referred to as a “project of air quality concern.” A hot-spot analysis is an estimation of likely future localized pollutant concentrations with the proposed project and a comparison of those concentrations to the relevant PM NAAQS. A hot-spot analysis assesses the air quality impacts on a scale smaller than an

entire nonattainment or maintenance area, including, for example, congested highways or freight terminals.

For a project that is not of air quality concern, the project-level conformity determination consists of verifying that there is a conforming regional transportation plan and Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and that the project is included in that conforming transportation plan and TIP.

The interagency consultation process must be used to develop project-level conformity determinations to meet all applicable conformity requirements for a given project. Project sponsors typically make the determination whether a highway project needs a quantitative PM hot-spot analysis through an interagency consultation process with FHWA, EPA, the State DOT, and the other state and local agencies involved.

#### E. I-710 and the PM Hot-spot Requirement

The proposed I-710 transportation project is an 18-mile project to increase capacity on I-710 by adding new general purpose lanes, truck by-pass lanes, and intersection improvements along this corridor. The latest iteration of the I-710 project had been determined to be a project of air quality concern since reports developed for the project's environmental documentation (such as the June 2018 modeling protocol for hot-spot modeling) showed that the project would increase heavy-duty diesel truck traffic as much as 6,900 trucks each day for some segments of I-710 (in addition to the existing 50,000 trucks and 165,000 other vehicles that drive on this highway every day).

On August 1, 2018, Caltrans requested that the EPA reconsider the I-710 project's status as a project of air quality concern (also referred to as a "POAQC"), with Caltrans' assumption that the I-710 Clean Truck Program would reduce diesel truck traffic (by funding the replacement of diesel trucks with zero emission/near zero emission (ZE/NZE) trucks).

In October 2018, Region 9 sent an email to Caltrans with an attachment with preliminary, staff-level information for a written commitment for the I-710 Clean Truck Program. In response, in October 2019, Caltrans and Metro sent a letter to EPA indicating that they did not agree that a written commitment would be required for the I-710 Clean Truck Program. EPA responded in a letter dated March 3, 2020 that we continue to believe that a written commitment describing the program was necessary. Further information regarding implementation of the I-710 Clean Truck Program was described in the June 4, 2020 Responses to Questions from USEPA/FHWA on the I-710 Clean Truck Program and the July 27, 2020 I-710 Clean Truck Program Responses to Technical Questions documents.

Caltrans' and Metro's I-710 Clean Truck Program Project Description, dated September 18, 2020, describes the major components of the I-710 Clean Truck Program and contains some information on related programs such as the Metro Countywide Clean Truck Initiative. According to this document, the I-710 Clean Truck Program would be implemented by a program administrator at the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) with direction from the Metro Board of Directors and the I-710 Steering Committee with assistance from contractors and vendors. The Metro Board would have responsibility and authority for development and implementation as well as approval for any major policy decisions related to the program.

The September 18, 2020 description further states that the I-710 Steering Committee, a multi-agency group operating under the October 2019 Memorandum of Understanding, would be tasked with developing implementation details, eligibility requirements, institutional arrangements, management and administration for the program as well as identifying and obtaining funding, creating a phasing plan and comprehensive goals, and issuing quarterly reports. These roles and responsibilities are further elaborated in Appendix C of the September 2020 program description.

EPA's regulatory analysis of the approach proposed by Caltrans to reconsider the I-710 project's status as a POAQC, with Caltrans' assumption that the I-710 Clean Truck Program would reduce diesel truck traffic (by funding the replacement of diesel trucks with ZE/NZE) trucks) is based on a careful consideration of these documents as well as the NEPA documents developed for the I-710 project and information discussed in the Technical Workgroup meetings with Caltrans, Metro and FHWA. The legal and technical issues supporting EPA's decision that the proposed I-710 highway expansion project is a project of air quality concern under the Clean Air Act transportation conformity requirements, are described in more detail below.

## II. Discussion

The Clean Air Act and EPA's transportation conformity rule require completion of a quantitative PM hot-spot analysis for the I-710 project because it is a project of air quality concern.

### A. Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

The regulatory hot-spot analysis requirement was adopted to implement the Clean Air Act requirement that federally-supported transportation projects cannot "cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area; increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or delay timely attainment of any standard of any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area." See CAA §176(c)(1)(B). EPA has interpreted "in any area" to include not just entire nonattainment and maintenance areas, but also the localized area surrounding a transportation project. See 75 Fed. Reg. 14260, 14274 (Mar. 24, 2010).

EPA adopted the regulatory PM hot-spot requirements in 2006, including the requirement that a hot-spot analysis be completed for expanded highway projects with a significant increase in the number of diesel vehicles. The preamble for the final rule explains that this criterion was intended to identify projects with significant PM emissions increases. See, e.g., 71 Fed. Reg. 12467, 12491 (Mar. 10, 2006) ("The final rule's criteria for hot-spot analyses targets highway and transit projects that involve a significant increase in diesel vehicle traffic, since EPA believes that directly emitted particles from diesel vehicles are the primary consideration for potential PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> hot-spots.") The 2006 preamble also contains a lengthy discussion of the technical basis for EPA's conclusion that projects that are not of air quality concern will not increase PM emissions. *Id.* at 12471-74 and 12490-93. We further said that PM hot-spot analyses must include emissions from re-entrained road dust. *Id.* at 12494.



The I-710 highway expansion project would result in a significant increase in the number of diesel vehicles and consequently in significant PM emissions increases. Therefore, the project meets the regulatory criterion for requiring a quantitative PM hot-spot analysis. This is particularly important in light of the factual circumstances of the project. First, the greater Los Angeles area has some of the highest PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels in the country with people living and working all along the I-710 corridor. In addition, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach are the terminus of the I-710 and are the largest container ports in the country, with a significant portion of freight moving every day by diesel truck.

#### B. Need for a PM Hot-Spot Analysis for I-710

The I-710 clearly meets the relevant regulatory criterion for a PM hot-spot analysis: Caltrans' June 2018 modeling shows an additional 6,900 heavy-duty diesel vehicles per day, which is consistent with numbers EPA has concluded constitute a "significant increase" in other instances. Even if the I-710 Clean Truck Program is implemented, the project would still result in a significant increase in heavy-duty trucks, which would increase PM emissions. Consistent with SIP inventories and past conformity analyses, brake/tire wear and road dust would be significantly increased by the I-710 project, and as a result, make air quality worse in communities along the I-710 corridor.

We expect increases in the severity of existing violations even if the proposed I-710 Clean Truck Program were to be fully implemented given dust, tire wear and brake wear emissions. Given that the project would likely result in localized increases in PM in an existing nonattainment area, determining that the project is not a project of air quality concern would be inconsistent with the conformity requirement in the Clean Air Act and EPA's implementing regulations.

#### C. I-710 Clean Truck Program as a Mitigation Measure

It is possible that the I-710 Clean Truck Program could be used to mitigate the impacts of the I-710 expansion *as part of* a hot-spot analysis. See 40 C.F.R. § 93.123(c)(4): "...mitigation or control measures shall be assumed in the hot-spot analysis only where there are written commitments...". However, mitigation measures cannot be used to *avoid* a hot-spot analysis for a project of air quality concern.

Mitigation should address a project's impact on the NAAQS in the conformity determination, which can only be determined through a hot-spot analysis with measures included, per the conformity rule and guidance. EPA addressed the inclusion of new technologies in a PM hot-spot analysis in the preamble to the March 24, 2010 final rule (75 CFR 14280):

Last, it is entirely appropriate that a hot-spot analysis include the effects of new technologies and fleet turnover that is expected to occur in a future analysis year. The conformity rule has always allowed the future effects of federal vehicle emissions standards, fleet turnover, fuel programs, and other control measures to be reflected in hot-spot analyses when they are assured to occur, because including such effects provides a reasonable estimate of future emissions that is more accurate than not including such effects.

For the emission reductions of the Clean Truck Program to be relied on for conformity, significant additional work would be necessary by the project sponsor to ensure the Clean Truck Program meets the regulatory requirements for mitigation measures, including a *written commitment* to such a measure that includes, among other things, "a demonstration that funding necessary to implement the action has been authorized by the appropriating or authorizing body." See 40 C.F.R. §§ 93.101 and 93.125(a).

Furthermore, under Metro's documentation, some of the final details, commitments and funding for the Clean Truck Program would be deferred to a later date as the Steering Committee sees how well the program performs in the first few years of operation. This leaves EPA with less certainty today that diesel truck traffic would not increase significantly and would limit the program from being an enforceable mitigation measure under the transportation conformity regulations. More EPA concerns on components of the I-710 Clean Truck Program and discussion on why it is a mitigation measure is included in Section IV below.

### III. Modeling Issues

Another concern with Caltrans' and Metro's proposal is the lack of evidence that the I-710 Clean Truck Program would sufficiently reduce diesel vehicles on the I-710 expansion to the point where the project would no longer be of air quality concern. Under EPA regulations, mitigation would be included in the hot-spot analysis done for a project, so it can be demonstrated whether or not mitigation is sufficient for the project to meet the Clean Air Act and conformity requirements. In other words, it is important that the agencies involved understand how many truck replacements would be necessary to ensure that the proposed highway expansion does not negatively impact the PM NAAQS or interim milestones and that the public health of the people living along this corridor is protected. However, in this case, Caltrans and Metro are assuming the I-710 Clean Truck Program sufficiently reduces the number of diesel trucks such that the project no longer needs a hot-spot analysis, ignoring the need for an analysis that would support such an assumption.

As explained above, EPA's regulation requires Caltrans to perform a PM hot-spot analysis. In addition, even if the I-710 Clean Truck Program were improved to qualify as a mitigation measure, it is unclear to EPA at this time how many trucks would remain on the I-710 once the Clean Truck Program would be in effect and if that number would be sufficiently low to declare that there is not a significant increase in the number of trucks. In the last few years, there have been projects determined to need a hot-spot analysis where the daily increase in diesel trucks has been under 4,000 in California and elsewhere.

#### A. Review of truck travel

The estimated increases in truck traffic projected for the I-710 project is based on the I-710 travel demand forecasting model developed for the air quality analysis in the I-710 EIR/EIS, which was published in early 2017. Modeling conducted for the I-710's NEPA document estimating the number of trucks necessary to be offset is now outdated, and therefore does not satisfy the conformity requirement to use the latest planning assumptions in an analysis (40 CFR 93.110). Improved and updated modeling is needed to better understand how many trucks are still projected, both with and without the I-710 Clean Truck Program, and the air quality impacts of those levels of trucks. This analysis must be based on the latest planning assumptions, including vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per truck, to demonstrate whether or not the project would result in any new or worsened PM NAAQS violations.

The current estimate that 4,000 diesel trucks will travel two trips per day is based on a 2013 study.<sup>1</sup> We do not have more recent data on truck traffic so we do not know how many trucks currently travel an average of 42.5 miles each day on I-710 or if there would be at least 4,000 such trucks that could be targeted by the I-710 Clean Truck Program. Given the length of time to phase in the proposed program,

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 17 of November 15, 2013 Key Performance Parameters for Drayage Trucks Operating at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, Prepared by Andrew Papsen and Michael Ippoliti of CALSTART.

these diesel trucks may not all be on the road at the same time, and therefore, it is possible that more than 4,000 trucks (including more trucks traveling only one trip per day) may need to be replaced by the I-710 Clean Truck Program.

#### B. No scrappage/ No requirements for replaced vehicles

There are some program design elements which do not appear to support reduction in diesel traffic and PM emissions from the project. In order to be eligible for program funding for the I-710 Clean Truck Program, owners or operators would need to own trucks that travel “frequently” on I-710. The I-710 Clean Truck Program funds could be used to purchase additional trucks that the owners or operators agree will meet average weekday VMT thresholds within the 20-mile I-710 corridor. It is unclear what the minimum threshold would be since the stated objective of the program is to reach a target of 42.5 VMT per NZE/ZE truck per weekday “in aggregate, on average.”

EPA had previously assumed that the original trucks that are envisioned to be replaced through the I-710 Clean Truck Program (i.e., those that traveled “frequently” on I-710) would no longer be operating on the I-710 once the highway expansion is open to traffic. However, the I-710 Clean Truck Program does not include contractual restrictions or requirements to scrap the original vehicle, since, in Caltrans’ view, scrappage requirements would be considered as “barriers to program entry” by some applicants.<sup>2</sup> This approach does not appear to be consistent with EPA’s Diesel Retrofit and Replacement Guidance which discusses scrappage programs in light of parties seeking conformity or SIP credit. For more information about scrappage for truck replacements in conformity analyses, see EPA’s Diesel Retrofit and Replacement Guidance.<sup>3</sup>

Assuming that the financial incentive would be sufficient for some truck owners to accept, the I-710 Clean Truck Program could potentially incentivize *more* truck travel on I-710, for example:

- Since there is no requirement for trucks being replaced to be scrapped or in any way limited in traveling I-710, trucks being replaced could continue to operate on I-710 under the proposed program. With both the new and old trucks continuing to drive on I-710, this overall fleet expansion could increase VMT and particulate matter emissions, burdening local communities and possibly the larger nonattainment area.
- Under the proposed program, instead of relying on historical travel data, any truck owner agreeing to a minimum VMT on I-710 could receive the financial incentive, and applicants could get a higher ranking in the competition for funding “for agreeing to add additional VMT on I-710.” This aspect could incentivize more travel on I-710.
- The Program is described as having check-ins every six months to provide “early warning indicators so that corrective action can be taken by recipients to get back on track before penalties are invoked.” The only type of “corrective action” that EPA can envision would be for truckers to drive more miles on I-710. If this assumption is true, such an action could incentivize more heavy-duty truck travel on I-710.

---

<sup>2</sup> Pages 2-3 of July 27, 2020 I-710 Clean Truck Program Responses to Technical Questions.

<sup>3</sup> Page 9 of March 2018 Diesel Retrofit and Replacement Projects: Quantifying and Using Their Emission Benefits in SIPs and Conformity, Guidance for State and Local Air and Transportation Agencies, available at <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockey=P100U3LT.pdf>.

## IV. Technical Issues with Program Implementation and Enforceability

EPA continues to consider the I-710 Clean Truck Program to be a mitigation measure that would need to be federally enforceable as part of a conformity determination with a PM hot-spot analysis.<sup>4</sup> EPA's PM Hot-spot Guidance provides a description of the types of "mitigation and control measures that could be considered by project sponsors to reduce emissions and any predicted new or worsened PM NAAQS violations" in Section 10 of the Guidance.<sup>5</sup> The first category of mitigation and control measures discussed in this document is "Retrofitting, replacing vehicles/engines, and using cleaner fuels." The proposed I-710 Clean Truck Program belongs in this category, as it is designed to replace diesel vehicles with those that use cleaner fuels. Because this program would be a mitigation measure, a written commitment<sup>6</sup> is necessary for it to be relied upon in a conformity determination, per 40 CFR 93.125(a):

a) Prior to determining that a transportation project is in conformity, the MPO, other recipient of funds designated under title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws, FHWA, or FTA must obtain from the project sponsor and/or operator written commitments to implement in the construction of the project and operation of the resulting facility or service any project-level mitigation or control measures which are identified as conditions for NEPA process completion with respect to local CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, or PM<sub>2.5</sub> impacts. *Before a conformity determination is made, written commitments must also be obtained for project-level mitigation or control measures which are conditions for making conformity determinations* for a transportation plan or TIP and are included in the project design concept and scope which is used in the regional emissions analysis required by §§93.118 ("Motor vehicle emissions budget") and 93.119 ("Interim emissions in areas without motor vehicle emissions budgets") *or used in the project-level hot-spot analysis required by §93.116 [emphasis added].*

As noted above, in October 2018, Region 9 sent an email to Caltrans with an attachment with preliminary, staff-level information for a written commitment. In the Caltrans and Metro response letter of October 2019, Caltrans and Metro claimed that the I-710 Clean Truck Program "is not intended to mitigate air quality impacts. Rather, it has been designed in conjunction with the other elements that comprise the entire I-710 project – to improve air quality in general."

EPA does not see any distinction. The purpose of improving air quality in general does not change the fact that the I-710 Clean Truck Program is a mitigation or control measure. In fact, mitigation measures must necessarily improve air quality in order to offset a project's emissions. Section 10 of the PM Hot-Spot Guidance recognizes that there may be other programs not directly related to the project that improve air quality in general that are still mitigation measures. For example, in Section 10.2.5, EPA states: "Controlling emissions from other sources may sufficiently reduce background concentrations in the PM hot-spot analysis" and thus still count as mitigation measures.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> A written commitment can be enforced by EPA directly against project sponsors under section 113 of the Clean Air Act, which authorizes EPA to enforce the provisions of rules promulgated under the Act, and by citizens under section 304 of the Clean Air Act. See 58 FR 62199.

<sup>5</sup> *Transportation Conformity Guidance for Quantitative Hot-spot Analyses in PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas*, EPA-420-B-15-084, November 2015, available on EPA's web site at <https://www.epa.gov/state-and-local-transportation/project-level-conformity-and-hot-spot-analyses#pmguidance>, p. 149.

<sup>6</sup> As defined in 40 CFR 93.101, "Written commitment for the purposes of this subpart means a written commitment that includes a description of the action to be taken; a schedule for the completion of the action; a demonstration that funding necessary to implement the action has been authorized by the appropriating or authorizing body; and an acknowledgment that the commitment is an enforceable obligation under the applicable implementation plan."

<sup>7</sup> Same source, Section 10.2.5, p. 152.

In the October 2019 letter, Caltrans and Metro provided several arguments, such as that the I-710 Clean Truck Program does not need a written commitment because the program is (1) a core element of the broader project, not a mitigation or control measure and (2) dependent upon a multi-agency commitment including agencies outside of Caltrans and Metro. The letter stated that if the I-710 Clean Truck Program is not successful due to future uncertainties that result in significant increases in diesel truck traffic, the program “would be subject to re-evaluation and/or supplemental documentation. Therefore the EIR/EIS is a written commitment that the Clean Truck Program is an integral part of the project.” The September 2020 document describing the Clean Truck Program contains no further discussion of a written commitment to be provided by Metro. Therefore, we assume that Caltrans and Metro’s position continues to be that they do not believe that a written commitment is necessary.

As we described in our March 3, 2020 letter, EPA’s position is that the Clean Truck Program is a mitigation measure and the EIR/EIS does not suffice as a written commitment under the requirements of EPA’s transportation conformity regulations. Caltrans’ and Metro’s proposal that the I-710 project does not need a PM hot-spot analysis depends on the I-710 Clean Truck Program reducing the number of diesel trucks. As explained above, EPA disagrees and believes the project requires a hot-spot analysis under the Clean Air Act and EPA’s implementing regulations. A program to reduce PM emissions that is necessary for a transportation project to demonstrate conformity requires a written commitment, per 40 CFR 93.125.

EPA’s October 2018 email included preliminary information for a written commitment. This paper (“Preliminary Information for the I-710 ZE/NZE Truck Deployment Program Written Commitment, October 23, 2018 – staff draft”) provided staff thoughts about the types of information that a written commitment should include per the regulatory definition in 40 CFR 93.101:

- a description of the action,
- a schedule for completion,
- a demonstration that funding has been authorized by the appropriating or authorizing body (and is surplus to what would be funded in the no-build alternative), and
- acknowledgment that the commitment is an enforceable obligation under the SIP.

We provided this document to help Caltrans consider what would be needed for the I-710 Clean Truck Program, given that at the time, there was just a mention of the program in the I-710 NEPA documentation without any detail.

To date, Caltrans and Metro have not developed a written commitment for this project. In addition, information provided to EPA thus far about the I-710 Clean Truck Program would not be sufficient to meet the regulatory definition of a written commitment as described in the following paragraphs below.

#### A. Description of the Action

A written commitment must contain a description of the program. (40 CFR 93.101). EPA’s October 2018 paper indicated that the written description of the program should be fairly detailed, and include information about the agency implementing the program, identification of potential participants, truck activity, data and assumptions relied upon to estimate VMT, tracking and enforcement and verification of the program parameters, scrappage of replaced vehicles, and information about the number and type of support facilities. Information provided to EPA thus far lacks detail as many aspects of the program are not described and are left to the Steering Committee to design, fund, and implement.

While Metro has authorized \$50 million and started defining the I-710 Clean Truck Program in its September 2020 document, many of the details of the program and the associated funding are undeveloped<sup>8</sup> and are described as evolving as the Steering Committee reviews the program performance and adjusts the program as needed. In order to be considered a mitigation measure to support a hot-spot analysis and CAA conformity determination, the program must be well-defined and fully funded with certainty that the project will not negatively impact the PM NAAQS or interim milestones.

A critical part of the I-710 Clean Truck Program, needed to ensure that the program would reduce truck traffic to levels needed to meet the CAA requirements, is the verification and compliance components of the program. The September 2020 document describes some of the overall compliance activities that Metro anticipates would be needed to support the I-710 Clean Truck Program, for example: developing a website to track trucks deployed, funding sources, funding expenditures, and ZE/NZE VMT data within the corridor. The document also describes how truck VMT data would be collected via a GIS monitoring device, based on geofencing within the I-710 corridor and that if a recipient truck does not meet the annual VMT requirement for one year, the truck owner would be required to reimburse some or all of the funding. However, it is not clear what specific targets would be required for individual truck owners. Metro has stated repeatedly that the program would target 4,000 trucks, at 42.5 VMT per weekday, in aggregate, on average. How this aggregate estimate translates to individual contracts to be verified is unclear at this time.

In addition, an important part of the program description is what technologies are targeted by a diesel truck replacement program. This level of detail is necessary to include in the written commitment to ensure successful program implementation as well as to include the effectiveness of reducing PM emissions for such truck replacements in the PM hot-spot analysis.

The September 2020 program description identifies transition to ZE trucks as a goal and indicates that the proposed I-710 Clean Truck Program includes a feature that allows for the funding of up to 20 electric charging stations and 10 hydrogen refueling stations between 2022 and 2035. However, the I-710 Clean Truck Program would only provide 4% of the initial \$50 million in funding, i.e., \$2 million, as seed funding for infrastructure and a target of 10% ZE trucks.<sup>9</sup>

While inclusion of these targets is an improvement from previous documents on the I-710 Clean Truck Program, Metro has made no specific commitment to any percentage of ZE trucks.<sup>10</sup> In fact, Metro has stated that NZE trucks satisfy the primary goal of the program to improve air quality and reduce diesel particulate matter. In addition, there is no commitment to fund electric vehicle or hydrogen refueling infrastructure since in Metro's view, it is not essential to meeting the ZE/NZE truck development

---

<sup>8</sup> Page 12 of the September 2020 Program Description describes how the program will be developed in more detail in a I-710 Clean Truck Manual which would be developed by Metro and the I-710 Steering Committee and be updated for each deployment phase.

<sup>9</sup> Pages 7-8 and 26 of September 18, 2020 I-710 Clean Truck Program, Program Description.

<sup>10</sup> Page 3 of July 27, 2020 U-710 Clean Truck Program Responses to Technical Questions.

objectives. Under Metro's proposed program, infrastructure would be funded by partner agencies only after the Final EIR/EIS is deemed valid.

### B. Schedule for Completion

A written commitment must contain a schedule for completion. (40 CFR 93.101). EPA's October 2018 paper indicated that the schedule should include a detailed (month and year) for the Program's start, opening of support facilities, the schedule for program verification, and end date. Information provided thus far lacks detailed milestones by which someone could judge whether or not the project is on schedule. The September 2020 document includes some information on the major milestones for initiation of the three phases of the program and the total number of trucks to be targeted in each phase and the expected criteria for eligibility, program documentation and compliance reporting, but no additional details or milestones are provided, and there are no specific commitments to ensure compliance with planned milestones (600 trucks by 2025, 1,700 additional trucks by 2030, and 1,700 additional trucks) given to the Steering Committee.

### C. Demonstration of Funding

A written commitment must contain a demonstration that funding necessary to implement the action has been authorized by the appropriating or authorizing body (40 CFR 93.101). This criterion has not been met, given that only \$50 million of the estimated \$200 million in program funding has been identified. In addition, since it is not clear if 4,000 trucks would offset the I-710 project's impacts, additional funding may be needed.

Information on funding for the I-710 Clean Truck Program is described in multiple sections throughout the September 2020 document. First, under 2. Program Goals and Milestones, the document states that in March 2017, Metro identified \$200 million as a funding target for the I-710 Clean Truck Program and in April 2020, Metro's Board programmed \$50 million for the first phase of the project.<sup>11</sup> Section 9, Funding for the I-710 Clean Truck Program, also identified the \$200 million target, but indicated that this total may not be needed due a variety of factors related to costs, and indicated that Metro hopes to get the remaining \$150 million by leveraging the initial \$50 million with assistance from the I-710 Steering Committee. The project sponsors for the I-710 Clean Truck Program have not yet identified funding sources for the estimated funding target, haven't committed to the funding sources, and may not have estimated the full funding necessary to mitigate the additional diesel traffic anticipated by implementation of the project. There is no assurance or guarantee that other funding will be obtained.

As stated above, in the fall of 2018, EPA provided draft information on the major components needed to support a written commitment to the I-710 Clean Truck Program. For funding, we indicated that the demonstration of funding should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- the level of funding for the program in each year the program is in effect,
- funding agencies and legal authority, and
- the sources of the funding, including a discussion of how the funding will be documented and enforced over the time that the program operates.

The funding sources that were mentioned in the September 2020 document were only a list of potential sources that Metro would expect the Steering Committee to investigate to leverage the limited funding that Metro has obtained. Funds from these potential sources are uncertain, and therefore, there is currently insufficient commitment that the funding necessary to support the program is available.

---

<sup>11</sup> Page 6 of September 18, 2020 I-710 Clean Truck Program, Program Description.

The project sponsor has the responsibility for implementing the I-710 Clean Truck Program. However, Caltrans and Metro have placed responsibility for obtaining funding with a multi-agency Steering Committee. Metro has assigned this group of representatives from different agencies the task of identifying funding opportunities for the program, though the Steering Committee has no legal responsibility for the I-710 project or the associated Clean Truck Program. The anticipated roles and responsibilities identified only assign the Metro's board responsibility to approve fiscal plans, funding levels and approval of budgets and programming of the initial \$50 million as needed for the Clean Truck Program.

EPA is concerned that \$200 million may not be enough to ensure that the I-710 expansion project would not negatively impact the PM NAAQS and public health. The September 2020 document provides an average incentive estimate of \$45,000 to \$56,000 per NZE truck that is currently being considered for the I-710 Clean Truck Program.<sup>12</sup> If those costs, with the other estimated costs for the Incentive Reserve, Administration and ZE Power Infrastructure, and an assumption of 10% zero emission incentives at \$150,000 to \$188,000 are extended for replacement of the full 4,000 trucks, total costs could be closer to \$300 million. Based on these assumptions, the \$50 million that was programmed by the Metro Board is less than 20% of the total funding anticipated by extension of Metro's proposed budget for the first phase. A higher per truck funding commitment would also likely be needed to provide a realistic incentive.

#### D. Commitment is an Enforceable Obligation

A written commitment must include an acknowledgement that the commitment is an enforceable action. (40 CFR 93.101). The responsibility for the program's implementation belongs to Metro and Caltrans as the project sponsors, per 40 CFR 93.125(b). There has been no acknowledgement thus far that the I-710 Clean Truck Program would be an enforceable commitment by Metro.

The September 2020 document describes the different groups expected to implement the I-710 Clean Truck Program. The groups include the Metro Board of Directors, the I-710 Steering Committee and Metro staff with help from contractors and vendors. The Metro proposal states that the I-710 Steering Committee would be drawn from the Countywide Clean Truck Initiative (CCTI) and representatives from selected agencies and localities with a focused interest in the I-710 corridor. The roles and responsibilities of these groups are discussed in Appendix C of the September 2020 document as well as in the Memorandum of Understanding document that Metro is relying upon to create the I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee to Implement the I-710 Clean Truck Program.

The Steering Committee is tasked with obtaining funding to implement the program and is the main group to make recommendations and suggestions to improve the program, increase program applicants and participation, and optimize NZE/ZE travel within the I-710 corridor. The Metro board can authorize course corrections for the I-710 Clean Truck Program to ensure consistency with program objectives, milestone, and NZE/ZE VMT targets, but the Steering Committee must review, advise, and make the recommendations needed for these corrective actions.

---

<sup>12</sup> The cost breakdown provided the September 2020 document, in section 10.5. Cost Breakdown – Initial Deployment Phase, indicates a low cost breakdown of \$45,000, and a high cost of \$56,000 per low NOx Certified emission truck.



However, the proposed multi-agency Steering Committee does not meet the regulation's requirements for mitigation measures in 40 CFR 93.125(b): "Project sponsors voluntarily committing to mitigation measures to facilitate positive conformity determinations must comply with the obligations of such commitments."


## Conclusion

As described in this document, EPA finds there are significant issues with this proposal that are in conflict with the Clean Air Act and the transportation conformity regulation. EPA continues to support using ZE truck technology on the I-710 freight corridor but does not accept the proposal that the I-710 Clean Truck Program eliminates the need for a PM hot-spot analysis for the I-710 project. It is critical that public agencies develop a program that meets all of the regulatory requirements so that emissions will not increase and negatively impact the PM NAAQS and public health in the future.

We appreciate the opportunity to outline our concerns and hope to continue working with you on a new direction for the I-710 project and I-710 Clean Truck Program.

**Metro**Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan Transportation AuthorityOne Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952213.922.2000 Tel  
metro.net**MAY 25, 2021**

**TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**FROM: PHILLIP A. WASHINGTON**   
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

**SUBJECT: REIMAGINING HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS**

**ISSUE**

On May 20<sup>th</sup> I met with California State Secretary of Transportation David Kim and the Director of the California State Department of Transportation Toks Omishakin to discuss our partnership with respect to the State Highway System. I have issued a statement that we need to reimagine our investment in the highway system and engage all stakeholders, including corridor communities, in an open-minded manner to explore and create a set of principles guiding future highway improvements.

**BACKGROUND**

Recently, there has been significant attention specifically on the 710 South Corridor. The issues discussed are representative of the larger concerns about the oftentimes destructive harms of the highway system, particularly in disadvantaged communities, in Los Angeles County. It is clear that we need a new way of approaching these issues. This process must include a renewed commitment to inclusive and meaningful engagement of communities as well as a steadfast commitment to address the equity, displacement, air quality, congestion and economic concerns that have plagued communities around major freeway corridors.

**NEXT STEPS**

Metro and Caltrans staff, including Metro's Executive Officer for Equity and Race, will develop a charter that outlines how we will engage stakeholders to develop a set of principles that will govern how we address highway projects in Metro's local sales tax measures. These principles must include a thoughtful approach to engaging all stakeholders in the county, especially those who are most impacted, to address congestion, air quality, health, displacement, and equity, among other issues. The intent of this document would be to provide a path forward to gain regional consensus on a viable strategy for our future highway system.

## ATTACHMENT E

### I-710 South Corridor Task Force

*Draft document*

#### **PURPOSE:**

Metro seeks to re-engage vital stakeholders that depend upon and are impacted by the movement of people and goods along Interstate 710 (I-710) between the Ports of LA and Long Beach (San Pedro Bay [SPB] Ports) and State Route 60.

Metro's goal is to identify and work with stakeholders to develop a multimodal, multidimensional investment strategy to improve regional mobility and air quality in concert with fostering economic vitality, social equity, environmental sustainability, and access to opportunity for LA County residents—particularly for the most impacted residents that live adjacent to I-710. These residents are represented by local elected officials who serve on the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (COG). In July 2021 the COG formed an I-710 Ad Hoc Committee (AHC) composed of 14 Board members. Metro intends to work closely with the AHC to ensure locally-supported solutions emerge from the process described here.

The original I-710 project scope approved by the Metro Board (Alternative 5C) in 2018 to advance through the EIS/EIR process comprised highway, active transportation, community benefit, and clean-truck technology elements. The scope also included a recommendation to widen and modernize the freeway, generating great concern from local communities over the impending disparities created by displacement required near major freeway interchange improvements for this alternative.

As the project advanced through the EIS/EIR process over the past three years, the Metro Board and the State of California aggressively advanced new policies and executive orders in support of more equitable, climate friendly, and sustainable outcomes through transportation investment decisions.

US E.P.A.'s decision to halt the EIS/EIR process due to air quality conformity concerns has allowed Caltrans and the Metro Board to re-examine the project through this more advanced equity and environmental policy focus, leading to the withdrawal of support for Alternative 5C and suspension of the EIS/EIR process in recognition of the project's misalignment with current policy objectives.

In response to these developments, the Metro Board and Caltrans have agreed to develop a more comprehensive approach over the next six months to engage local communities and regional stakeholders in a process that will lead to improved mobility, air quality, health outcomes, and other important improvements, particularly for those residents most impacted by the movement of goods and people in, through and around the I-710 corridor.

## **ATTACHMENT E**

This process will first focus on identifying and discussing vital issues to be addressed during this process, including development of a shared understanding of priority areas of focus, with a commitment and plan for leading with equity that will allow the 710 South Corridor Task Force to conduct its work as found in the proposed goals for the task force.

### **PROPOSED GOALS FOR THE 710 TASK FORCE:**

The **I-710 South Corridor Task Force (the 710 Task Force)** will be entrusted with the important task of working collaboratively and constructively to accomplish the following outcomes by March 2022:

1. Review and re-assess the Purpose and Need of improvements to the I-710 corridor between the SPB Ports and SR-60;
2. Develop multimodal strategies to meet the Purpose and Need, in alignment with the existing regional and state policy framework;
3. Identify an array of projects and programs, prioritized in the near-term to long-term, that will realize the goals to meet the needs of stakeholders and corridor users;
4. Create a prioritized investment plan that will allow Metro and Caltrans—in partnership with 710 South Corridor Task Force members and local, regional, state, and federal agencies—to implement these projects and programs; and
5. Report to the Metro Board and State of California with the outcomes of the 710 Task Force work by March 2022.

The **710 Task Force** will also continue to meet on a regular basis (2-4 times per year), in conjunction with the COG, to help Metro and Caltrans deliver the investment plan developed by this group and to provide a recurrent forum for dialogue, input, and support regarding important mobility, air quality, equity, sustainability and economic issues affecting I-710 stakeholders.

### **ENGAGEMENT PROCESS:**

Metro in partnership with Caltrans (District 7) will convene the 710 Task Force over the course of the next six to eight months (September 2021 – February 2022) to accomplish these overarching goals. Metro will work with 710 Task Force members, particularly with the community groups, to determine what inclusive and meaningful engagement looks like.

Concurrent and in parallel to this process, the COG has convened an Ad Hoc Committee (AHC) of its Board Members to create a locally-supported approach to developing recommendations for the future of the I-710 corridor. Metro will work with the COG to share information and will host “joint sessions” at key intervals over the next six months to share discussion and help integrate recommendations from the COG 710 AHC.

## ATTACHMENT E

At the end of the six-to-eight month process, the 710 Task Force will report back to the Metro Board on its findings and make recommendations as to the scope of its investment plan that will realize the reevaluated Purpose and Need of the I-710 South Corridor.

### STAKEHOLDER ROSTER:

The Metro Board and Caltrans have stated that the investment in the I-710 must be reassessed through a process that engages local community stakeholders, especially those most impacted by the freeway corridor, in concert with the key regional stakeholders that depend upon the movement of people and goods along I-710 (i.e., the SPB Ports).

For the 710 Task Force to be effective it must represent a broad set of community and regional voices that will help this group review the Purpose and Need of the corridor and develop multimodal and multipurpose strategies, projects and programs, and investment priorities to advance social equity, environmental sustainability, economic vitality, and access to opportunity for local communities and the region.

Metro also recognizes that additional small-group discussions—particularly with community/equity-focused groups—may be necessary to ensure that the work of the larger 710 Task Force remains focused on and incorporates the needs of the local impacted communities.

### 710 TASK FORCE PROPOSED PARTICIPANTS 43 MEMBERS

Type	Number	Organization
LA County	1	LA County Department of Public Works
MPO	1	Southern California Association of Governments
Ports	2	Port of Los Angeles
		Port of Long Beach
Railroad	3	Alameda Corridor (ACTA)
		Union Pacific RR
		BNSF Railway
Trucking	3	Harbor Trucking Association
		Total Transportation Services (TTSI)
		International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local Union 848
Air Quality	2	SCAQMD
		CARB
Academic	3	METRANS / CSULB
		USC Equity Research Institute (ERI)
		Harbor College

**ATTACHMENT E**

<b>Community Based Organizations, Equity, Health and Environmental Advocacy</b>	<b>9</b>	BREATHE Los Angeles County
		Southeast Los Angeles (SELA) Collaborative
		Communities for a Better Environment
		East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
		Legal Aid Foundation of LA-LB (LAFLA)
		California Endowment
		Coalition for Clean Air
		Environmental Defense Fund
		Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma
<b>Local Jurisdictions</b>	<b>8</b>	LA County Supervisorial District 1
		LA County Supervisorial District 2
		LA County Supervisorial District 4
		City of Bell*
		City of Commerce*
		City of Cudahy*
		City of Long Beach
		LA City Council District 15 (San Pedro)
		<i>*Representing the COG Ad Hoc Committee</i>
Gateway Cities Council of Government <i>(ex officio representation by staff)</i>		
<b>Transit Agencies</b>	<b>2</b>	Long Beach Transit
		Metrolink
<b>Economic, Labor and Workforce Development</b>	<b>5</b>	LA County Economic Development Corporation
		International Longshoremen Workers Union
		Warehouse Workers Union
		Watson Land Company
		BizFed
<b>Freight Industry</b>	<b>2</b>	LA Customs Broker & Freight Forwarders Association, Inc.
		Pacific Merchant Shipping Association (PMSA)
<b>Policy</b>	<b>2</b>	Automobile Club of Southern California (AAA)
		CalStart

Page Break

**SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS:**

Metro and Caltrans will convene the 710 Task Force approximately every three weeks. This schedule will help advance the work of the group over the next six months, while allowing Metro and Caltrans to develop meeting materials, information, and opportunities for additional engagement in between meetings.

## **ATTACHMENT E**

Metro and Caltrans will develop the topics and flow of meetings for the 710 Task Force with its membership and will also work with community representatives to help develop a meaningful public comment and input process to help inform the 710 Task Force's work.



**Planning and Programming Committee**  
Presentation on Items 11 & 12  
*Response to I-710 South Corridor Project Motions 47 & 48*  
September 15, 2021



# Motion 47 Response

Work on the 710 South Corridor Project EIR/EIS has been **suspended**.

Existing Project elements in the EIR/EIS will be examined through the new 710 Task Force process, including additional locally-supported, complementary non-highway projects.

# Motion 48 Response, Item 1

## EPA and Conformity Requirements

EPA re-affirmed to Metro and Caltrans that it intends to require a Particulate Matter (PM) Hot Spot conformity analysis

- **\$50 million commitment from Board for the I-710 Clean Truck Program (CTP) helped - allowed Metro/Caltrans to re-engage EPA on conformity determination**
- Ultimately EPA would not agree to create precedent with Metro/Caltrans proposal to use the CTP as a programmatic feature to reduce diesel emissions
  - CTP would demonstrate reduction in diesel truck trips
  - CTP deemed by EPA to be non-enforceable under CEQA & NEPA
  - **EPA concerned with PM increases caused by entrained road dust and tire/break wear – not just tailpipe emissions**
  - I-710 Project held to higher standard than most highway projects
- Mitigations (e.g. CTP), while allowed as part of the Hot Spot Conformity Analysis, cannot substitute for the analysis
- EPA could not provide acceptable/quantifiable ways to fully mitigate entrained road dust and tire/break wear PM increases
- **Result: No viable way to demonstrate air quality conformity for 710 Project.**

# Motion 48 Response, Items 2 & 3

## Potential for State and Federal Support

### Current Project elements (non-freeway)

- Include the Clean Truck Program, transit enhancements, or active transportation improvements, for example
- Individually would not fully address the Project's original purpose and need
- Are eligible to be considered as part of a re-evaluation of alternatives developed through the 710 Task Force

### Ideas that were not fully vetted during the environmental process

- Some examples include conversion of existing mixed flow freeway lanes to new purposes, priced/managed lanes or dedicating lanes for ZE trucks
- To be considered as part of the 710 Task Force process

State and Federal support for the Project will ultimately require a re-evaluation of the Project, from Purpose and Need to Project Elements

# 710 Task Force: Re-envisioning the Project

The Metro Board via Motions 47 & 48 called for a new process for examining how to make improvements within the 710 Corridor that focused on collaboration with affected communities and local stakeholders.

In response, Metro and Caltrans will convene a robust set of 710 Corridor stakeholders to review the Purpose and Need for investment within the corridor.

- **Focus:** Bringing Community Based Organizations to the table
- Work together to develop effective community outreach strategies.
- Modeled after Goods Movement Strategic Plan engagement process

**Equity:** Metro will lead the reimagining of the 710 Corridor project with equity by seeking engagement with impacted communities, understanding disparities experienced, and developing multimodal approaches to delivering benefits for these communities while improving regional mobility, safety and air quality.

# 710 Task Force: Re-envisioning the Project

**Partnership:** Partner with the Gateway Cities COG to develop and deliver an investment plan developed through the 710 Task Force process that implements projects and programs designed to realize multimodal strategies that address the re-established purpose and need.

**Ultimate goal:** Develop a collaborative engagement process where local stakeholders, impacted communities and regional partners can work together to develop a new approach to investing in the 710 Corridor that will reduce disparities, increase benefits and improve mobility and safety within the corridor for local residents and the regional movement of people and goods.

**First meeting:** Took place on Monday, September 13, 2021 @ 6pm (Zoom)

# 710 Task Force: Community Outreach

Central to the 710 Task Force's work will be a **commitment to community outreach and public engagement**

**Community-Based Organizations (CBOs)** will have a seat at the table

- Metro will partner with CBOs to develop an effective strategy to inform and engage residents from impacted communities as part of process


Re-engage residents **previously contacted** through the prior 710 Project process

Employ innovative outreach methods


Bring outreach into local communities to meet residents where they are

Public encouraged to attend and provide comment at 710 Task Force meetings

# 710 Task Force: Stakeholder Engagement



# 710 Task Force: Process and Goals





# 710 Task Force: Meeting #1 Recap

**Attendance:** Excellent turnout – approximately 150 participants

**Topics:** Introductions and Keynote Addresses  
History of the 710 Corridor and Lessons Learned  
How the 710 Task Force Can Come Together  
How to Build an Effective Community Engagement Strategy

**What We Heard:** Build stronger outreach effort to engage corridor residents  
Create longer lead times for notices, agenda and materials  
Overcome the digital divide  
Translation services for meetings and materials  
Eliminate “jargon” and provide clear information

**Next Meeting:** Equity Assessment Tool  
Charter and Terms of Engagement  
Review Purpose and Need

# 710 Task Force: Next Steps

Work with community-based organizations to develop public engagement strategies, identify resources and plan events

Engage Task Force members to link outreach network opportunities to coordinate / build on existing engagement structures

Finalize webpage and public-facing information to meet transparency goals

- Post meeting recording, summary, additional information

Evaluate and finalize Task Force membership

Identify opportunities to create focus groups and community input opportunities before Meeting #2

Coordinate with Gateway Cities COG Ad Hoc Committee on joint meetings



## Board Report

---

**File #:** 2021-0566, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response

**Agenda Number:**

---

### PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 15, 2021

### CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 16, 2021

**SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO MOTION 18.1 BY DIRECTORS HAHN, GARCETTI, MITCHELL, BUTTS, AND DUTRA**

**ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE this report on funding, financing, and limiting the impact to the project delivery schedule while minimizing the use of toll revenue bonds for the I-105 ExpressLanes Project while meeting state grant requirements with the goal of delivering the project ahead of the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles.

#### **ISSUE**

On May 19, 2021, the Board passed Motion No. 18.1 (Hahn, Garcetti, Mitchell, Butts, and Dutra, Attachment A) directing the Chief Executive Officer to report back in September 2021 with recommendations to fully fund the I-105 ExpressLanes with funding sources that minimize the use of the corridor's future net toll revenues, in order to maximize available resources from the project for future capital improvements to the Metro C (formerly, Green) Line. This Receive and File Board Report provides an overview of the ExpressLanes financing plan and outlines potential revenue to operate the ExpressLanes, fund eligible transit, active transportation, and other mobility projects in the corridor. A funding plan should be developed by December 2023 to meet state grant requirements and to initiate revenue service prior to the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Among many issues and constraints surrounding major project delivery is reliable funding dedicated to the project. The capital cost estimate for the Interstate 105 (I-105) ExpressLanes project is \$676 million. The funding profile for this project includes Measure M, state grants, federal funding, and toll backed revenue loans. For the project to meet SB1 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) requirements and begin revenue operations to support the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles. Any debt associated with this project will not need to be drawn down until 2024 and will be repaid exclusively using toll revenue without impacting other Metro projects or

---

funding commitments. Prior to project completion, Metro staff will continue to pursue all available grant and funding opportunities that can be used for this project.

## **DISCUSSION**

### I-105 ExpressLanes

As part of Measure M in 2016, Los Angeles County Voters approved development of ExpressLanes on I-105 allocating \$175 million to the project. In December 2020, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) awarded a SCCP grant in the amount of \$150 million -- the highest amount awarded to any project. To receive this \$150 million grant, a construction award -- notice to proceed - must be issued by December 2023.

The current funding plan allocates \$325 million in Measure M and SCCP funding, leaving a funding gap of \$351 million to complete delivery of the project. To bridge that gap, staff submitted grant applications for two rounds of Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) funding grants which were unfortunately unsuccessful in 2017 and 2019. Staff has also evaluated the project's potential to receive Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) grants, formerly known as BUILD and TIGER. Metro Grant's staff has determined that other Metro projects (e.g., SR-57/60, I-5 North HOV Truck Climbing Lanes) are better positioned to be awarded future INFRA or RAISE grants and are currently pursuing those opportunities. Staff has also worked with various congressional offices for allocation of project earmarks as part of a potential federal reauthorization with no commitments made to date. Staff will continue to assess grant opportunities as part of the federal reauthorization process in FY22 and in future federal fiscal years.

Staff is working with the LA Olympic Committee on the Games Route Network (GRN) to ensure this project is eligible for funds identified to support the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic games. Staff continues to work with the California Transportation Commission to identify eligible state grants under Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) once final guidelines and guidance are issued relative to those programs. While the SCCP funding has been fully committed, staff will continue to evaluate grant opportunities that may arise in future state budget cycles.

Locally, staff has been working with Metro's Strategic Financial Planning group to identify eligible funding in Metro's Short Range Financial Plan model. After a thorough review of the model and Metro's other funding sources, no eligible highway funding was identified. Staff has pursued discussions relative to an inter-corridor borrowing program that would enable borrowing net toll revenues from one corridor to provide funds towards construction of another ExpressLanes project. Any borrowed funds would be returned to the originating corridor inclusive of an agreed-upon interest rate over a period of 30 years. While this method of financing has been utilized on other Metro projects, the local Councils of Government (COGs) and Board offices representing the I-10 and I-110 ExpressLanes expressed reluctance in pursuing this alternative in 2017. In the absence of grant funding or the opportunity to use existing net toll revenues, consideration to accelerate project development is also being given to use debt to finance the remaining \$351 million by using future toll revenues, paid by users of the I-105 ExpressLanes, to finance the project.

Metro uses debt financing for nearly all its major transit and highway capital projects. The anticipated revenue and debt profile for the I-105 ExpressLanes covers all Metro costs and obligations for the

---

term of the loan and affords an additional \$2.9 billion to other eligible mobility projects, including the Metro C Line. Without timely completion of the I-105 ExpressLanes project no toll revenues will be available for the C Line or for any additional eligible projects along the corridor.

### C (Green) Line

Staff will continue to explore various state and federal grant and funding opportunities to address Station Platform Expansion and Traction Power Substations (TPSS). Eligible funding and grant opportunities related to the SCCP and Local Partnership Program (LPP) continue to be developed. Likewise, grant requirements related to the State Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) are evaluated along with other new transit programs. To ensure Metro's ongoing commitment to our existing system's State of Good Repair, Metro will advance C Line improvements to receive funding as part of any future state programs.

### Federal Funding

As Metro pursues federal funds to ease traffic on the I-105 by instituting ExpressLanes, there are a number of existing grant programs that can be used to help fund the high occupancy toll lanes that will - once constructed - serve to improve travel times. Under current law (FAST Act), there are two prominent grant programs that could serve to fund, in part, our I-105 ExpressLanes project. The RAISE program provides grants in the range of \$25 million for projects, according to the U.S. Department of Transportation that "create high-quality jobs, improve safety, protect our environment, and generate equitable economic opportunity for all Americans." The INFRA grant program provides an opportunity for grants that can be larger than RAISE grants for highway and rail projects of regional and national economic significance. In the past, Metro has pursued an INFRA grant for the I-105 ExpressLanes during prior administration - but that grant request was not favorably considered. Looking to the future, the Senate's bi-partisan infrastructure bill which may be adopted by the House later this month and signed into law by President Biden - includes similar grant programs as embedded in the FAST Act - though funded at higher levels. For example, the Senate bill includes \$8 billion for the Nationally Significant Multimodal Freight and Highway Program (also known as INFRA Grants) and a National Infrastructure Project Assistance Program funded at \$10 billion. If the Senate bi-partisan infrastructure bill were to become law, both of these grant programs could be used to pursue federal funds for the I-105 ExpressLanes project. Staff will continue to keep the Board apprised of our aggressive efforts to seek federal funding for the I-105 ExpressLanes project.

## **EQUITY PLATFORM**

ExpressLanes does not anticipate any impact or burdens to marginalized drivers, riders, or residents tied to the use of debt financing. Existing tolls on the ExpressLanes are based on congestion density and not revenue needs. Given the current congestion on the corridor, no changes to the existing toll policy are anticipated due to using TIFIA or other debt instruments to develop this project.

Debt financing does provide mobility improvements to the corridor sooner than might otherwise be possible. This acceleration provides benefits to ExpressLanes users and allows Metro to advance

---

additional funding to transit services along the corridor, including the C Line and other active transportation modes through direct payments, and the ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Grant program. Additionally, tolls and fees collected from ExpressLanes users can support the current Low-Income Assistance Plan (LIAP) program while providing a reliable funding source should the Board decide to expand the program in the future.

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

Strategic Goal 1: Provide high quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling. ExpressLanes provides drivers and transit users with the option of a more reliable trip while improving the overall operational efficiency of the freeway network.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

Delaying the project until additional grant monies are identified was evaluated. This alternative is not recommended because it would jeopardize Metro's \$150 million SB1 SCCP grant award and risk project completion in time for the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Moreover, any additional project delay is likely to increase project costs as construction awards, and local economic conditions have historically shown that construction costs increase faster than underlying consumer prices (CPI-U). This cost escalation pressure could potentially increase the forecasted project costs by tens of millions of dollars and render the project financially infeasible.

### **NEXT STEPS**

As traffic volumes return to pre-COVID-19 levels and projects funded in prior Net Toll Revenue Grant rounds are completed, Staff anticipates initiating a new round of Net Toll Revenue grants in summer of 2022. Attachment C provides an overview of Net Toll Revenue Grant funding to date. Staff will continue evaluating future funding and grant opportunities to build the I-105 project as outlined in this Board report and must pursue debt financing to finalize the funding plan by December 2023 to meet grant timelines and initiate revenue service prior to the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games.


### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Board Motion 18.1

Attachment B - Overview of Net Toll Revenue Grants

Prepared by: Mark Linsenmayer, DEO, Congestion Reduction, (213) 922-5569

Reviewed by: Shahrzad Amiri, EO, Congestion Reduction Initiative, (213) 922-3061



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer



# Metro

## Board Report

**File #:** 2021-0341, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response

**Agenda Number:** 18.1.

**REVISED**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE**  
**MAY 19, 2021**

**Motion by:**

**DIRECTORS HAHN, GARCETTI, MITCHELL, BUTTS, AND DUTRA**

Related to Item 18: Metro ExpressLanes Program Management Support Contract Modification

The I-105 is the last major freeway constructed in LA County, and the Metro Green Line was included in this project to mitigate its impacts to communities of color in South LA. Any changes to the capacity on this 30-year-old freeway need to also improve the operations of the Metro Green Line, nearby transit services, and first/last-mile connections.

The I-105 freeway is now next in line for ExpressLanes which will add vehicle travel lanes and provide enhanced mobility for those who can pay a toll to avoid traffic congestion.

When Metro first created ExpressLanes on the I-10 and I-110, a key goal was that toll revenues would go to improve mobility for people walking, biking, and taking transit along these corridors. The ExpressLanes Strategic Plan identifies numerous potential funding sources for the program's expansion, of which future net toll revenues is just one.

The Metro Green Line needs major capital improvements to its existing infrastructure, including platform extensions, to be brought up to a state of good repair and to ensure seamless interoperability with the Crenshaw/LAX Line. Additionally, the Green Line needs to address long-standing issues with station platform ambient noise, transit transfer connectivity, and first/last-mile connections.

**SUBJECT: I-105 EXPRESSLANES PROJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**



APPROVE Motion by Directors Hahn, Garcetti, Mitchell, Butts, and Dutra that the Board direct the Chief Executive Officer to report back in September 2021 with recommendations to fully fund the I-105 ExpressLanes with funding sources that minimize the use of the corridor's future net toll revenues, in order to maximize available resources from the project for future capital improvements to the Metro Green Line.



# Overview of Net Toll Revenue Grants

Total: **\$47.7 Million** Awarded to **41 projects**

- **16 projects completed**
- 25 projects started with **\$26.1 Million remaining**
- Round 1 in 2014 awarded **\$19.76 Million** to 20 projects.
  - 62% spent
- Round 2 in 2016 awarded **\$27.85 Million** to 21 projects.
  - 33% spent










# Where Net Toll Revenue Grants Are Provided

---

\$7.9 million annual transit funding in addition to the Grants listed below

## Transit Funding – Round 1




	Sponsor	Project Name	Funding	Remaining
	Access Services	ExpressLane CNG-Fueled MV-1 Program	\$408,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	City of Baldwin Park	Baldwin Park Commuter Connector Express Line	\$700,395	\$671,075
	Access Services	Express-Lane CNG-Fueled MV-1 Program	\$408,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	City of Gardena	Line 1X-Expand Transit Bus Service on I-110 Freeway	\$842,482	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	City of Los Angeles	Commuter Express Service Expansion to Alleviate Harbor Fwy Congestion	\$724,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	LACMTA	Dodger Stadium Express-Harbor Gateway	\$1.29M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Torrance Transit	Torrance Transit Expansion of Line #1 & #4 HOT Lane Service	\$2.23M	\$2.22M

= Complete

# Where Net Toll Revenue Grants Are Provided

---

## Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding -- Round 1






	Sponsor	Project Name	Funding	Remaining
	City of Baldwin Park	Frazier Street Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Improvements	\$895,288	\$839,382
	City of El Monte	Santa Anita Ave Active Transportation for El Monte Station	\$ 633,782	\$631,784
	City of Los Angeles	My Figueroa Marketing and Safety	\$ 150,000	\$13,281
	City of Monterey Park	Monterey Park Bike Corridor Project	\$ 233,034	\$51,639
	City of El Monte	I-10 Active Commute, Healthy Communities Project	\$440,000	\$76,193
	City of Los Angeles	Cesar Chavez Great Street	\$435,000	\$334,200
	City of Carson	Dominguez Channel Bike-Ped Path	\$1.26M	\$1.22M
	City of Los Angeles	Active Streets LA Budlong Avenue	\$1.18M	\$1.08M
	LACMTA	Bikeshare-Downtown Los Angeles	\$3.80M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	LACMTA	Union Station Metro Bike Hub	\$700,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

= Complete

# Where Net Toll Revenue Grants Are Provided

---












## Roadway and Arterial Performance -- Round 1

	Sponsor	Project Name	Funding	Remaining
	Caltrans	Express Lanes Corridors Incident Management Improvements Project	\$480,000	\$306,106
	City of Los Angeles	Cesar Chavez Great Street	\$435,000	\$ 334,200
	Caltrans	I-110 HOT/Express Lanes Improvements	\$1.02M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	City of Los Angeles	ATSAC Infrastructure Communication Systems Enhancement along I-110 Freeway	\$1.43M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	County of Los Angeles	South Bay Arterial Performance Measurement Project	\$504,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

= Complete

# Where Net Toll Revenue Grants Are Provided

## Transit Funding – Round 2

	Sponsor	Project Name	Funding	Remaining
	Long Beach Transit	LA Galaxy Express Shuttle Bus	\$600,000	\$298,752
	City of Carson	Carson Rapid Bus Priority System	\$584,150	\$584,150
	Torrance Transit	Torrance Transit Express & Vehicles	\$960,000	\$960,000
	City of Los Angeles	DASH Improve. with Harbor Freeway	\$1.77M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Gardena Transit	Gardena Transit Innovative ITS Rollout	\$1.38M	\$1.16M
	LACMTA	BRT Freeway Station Enclosure	\$1.83M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	County of LA	Vermont Green Line Intersection Improvement Project	\$1.63M	\$1.19M
	Foothill Transit	Two Electric Double Decker Buses	\$1,458,00	\$1.08M
	Access Services	CNG-Fueled Vehicles for Access Services	\$1.13M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	City of LA	On Demand Mobility Center	\$992,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	County of LA	Whittier Blvd Transit Priority Project	\$516,600	\$476,684

= Complete

# Where Net Toll Revenue Grants Are Provided

## Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding -- Round 2






	Sponsor	Project Name	Funding	Remaining
	County of LA	Firestone Blue Line Station Intersection and Bikeway Improvements Project	\$1.86M	\$1.27M
	City of Carson	Dominguez Channel Bike Path Improvements	\$1.3M	\$1.3M
	City of Los Angeles	Downtown LA on Demand Mobility Connectivity Center	\$992,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	City of Arcadia	City of Arcadia Transit & Pedestrian Mobility Enhancement Project	\$470,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	LACMTA	Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Station	\$2.00M	\$2.00M
	County of Los Angeles	Eaton Wash Bike Path - Phase 1	\$3.10M	\$1.81M

= Complete

# Where Net Toll Revenue Grants Are Provided

---

## Roadway and Arterial Performance -- Round 2

	Sponsor	Project Name	Funding	Remaining
	City of Carson	I-110 Freeway Arterial Improvements	\$1.76M	\$1.76M
	County of Los Angeles	South Bay Arterial ITS Congestion Relief Project	\$717,360	\$509,317
	City of Los Angeles	I-110 Corridor Revitalization - Grand Avenue/Flower Avenue	\$1.23M	\$1.08M
	City of Los Angeles	Vision Zero I-10 Corridor Area Traffic Signal Improvements	\$776,000	\$239,283
	City of Los Angeles	Sixth Street Viaduct Mission/Myers Roundabout Project	\$1.80M	\$1.17M

= Complete

# Item 18.1 – Response to May 2021 Board Motion

---

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 15, 2021

CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 16, 2021

Related to Item 18: Metro ExpressLanes Program Management Support Contract Modification

## **Interstate 105 Funding and Financing -- Grant and Funding Alternatives**

*CEO to report back in September 2021 with recommendations to fully fund the I-105 ExpressLanes with funding sources that minimize the use of the corridor's future net toll revenues, in order to maximize available resources from the project for future capital improvements to the Metro Green Line.*



**METRO  
EXPRESSLANES**





# Grants Background

---

- **What we have done to date**
    - Voters Approved Measure M to build ExpressLanes on the 105 (\$175 million, 2016)
    - Pursued Interfund loans in 2017/2018; denied by COGs
    - Pursued INFRA grants in 2017 & 2019 without an award
    - RAISE/TIGER/BUILD denied (other Metro projects advanced)
    - Pursued State SCCP Funding (Awarded \$150 million, 2020)
    - Federal Legislative Earmarks, none anticipated
  - **Future Funding Pursuits**
    - Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI)
    - State LA Olympics funding pending State budget process
- Senate Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021:**
- Federal Congestion Relief Program; National Infrastructure Project Assistance; and future INFRA and RAISE rounds



**METRO  
EXPRESSLANES**




# Grant Alternatives for Metro C (Green) Line

---


- **Station Platform Expansion and Traction Power Substation (TPSS):**
  - State SB1 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) and Local Partnership Program (LPP)
  - State Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP)
  - LA Olympics funding pending State Budget process
  - Federal RAISE and other new transit programs
- **State of Good Repair:**
  - Federal Core Capacity Program



**METRO**  
**EXPRESSLANES**



# Where ExpressLanes Customers Live



**77%**  
of Metro ExpressLanes  
accountholders  
are LA County residents

**20.5%**  
of Metro LA County  
ExpressLanes  
live within 3 miles of I-105

**11%**  
Reduction in GHG  
emissions. Decreases in  
CO and NOx as well.



**METRO  
EXPRESSLANES**



# I-105 Risk – Phase 1 Completion

- Phase 1 – section from 405 to 110 can be built using SCCP funds -- \$150 million
- Phase 2/3 -110 to 605 can be built with Measure M, TIFIA (toll revenues) – Funding Plan Needed by **Dec. 2023**



**METRO**  
**EXPRESSLANES**



# Continue to Pursue Grants

---

## 1. First Approach: Continue to Pursue Grants Through December 2023

- Federal Grants
- State Grants
- Funding opportunities around LA Olympics

## 2. Fall back: Any remaining funding gap identified by December 2023 can be funded by debt financing using TIFIA and other capital market financing

(Conversations with TIFIA and USDOT will continue as grant opportunities are identified.)



**METRO**  
**EXPRESSLANES**



## TIFIA is Well Suited for Express Lanes

- Nearly all Express Lane projects built in the US have used TIFIA for financing, including:
  - I-405 (OCTA)                      -- SR-91 (RCTC)
  - I-15 (RCTC)                        -- I-10 (SBCTC)
  - Also Toll Roads in Colorado, Texas, North Carolina, Florida, et al.
- TIFIA provides flexible loan terms with a low cost of capital, up to 33% of project cost or \$227 million
- Allows user fees to fund the project
- Debt to be repaid through future toll revenues
- Excess Revenue can be used to fund C Line



**METRO**  
**EXPRESSLANES**



# I-105 Funding Proposal

## Project Costs by Phase and Funding

Source	(\$000s)
<b>COST BY PHASE</b>	
PAED	\$13,121
PS&E	\$46,883
ROW	\$3,081
CON	\$626,036
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$689,121</b>
<b>FUNDING BY SOURCE</b>	
<b>Federal</b>	
CMAQ	\$2,607
<b>State</b>	
SB1 - SCCP	\$150,000
<b>Local</b>	
Funding Gap	\$361,514
Measure M - Preconstruction	\$60,478
Measure M - Construction	\$114,522
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$689,121</b>

- SCCP Funds predicated on December 2023 construction start
- Measure M construction funding available beginning in FY27
- Need commitment by Dec 2023
- TIFIA draws can be designed to match anticipated construction schedule beginning in FY24




**METRO  
EXPRESSLANES**



# I-105 Revenue Forecast with Debt Service

I-105 Revenue and Expense Forecast - Including Roadway O&M  
(40 Years)



■ Gross Revenue    ▨ Major O&M    ■ Routine O&M    ■ Debt Financing

	millions
Revenue	\$5,960
Major Maintenance	\$474
Annual O&M	\$1,900
Debt Service	\$619
Remaining Cashflow	<b>\$2,967</b>







---

File #: 2021-0602, File Type: Oral Report / Presentation

Agenda Number: 14.

---

**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 15, 2021**

**SUBJECT: COUNTYWIDE PLANNING MAJOR PROJECT STATUS**


**ACTION: RECEIVE ORAL REPORT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE oral report on the Countywide Planning Major Project Status.

Prepared by: David Mieger, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3040

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



Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer

# Countywide Planning Monthly Project Updates

## Sept 2021 Monthly Update

### > Major Pillar Projects

- West Santa Ana Branch
- C (Green) Line Ext to Torrance
- Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2
- Sepulveda Transit Corridor


Pillar Projects Measure M Baseline Schedules

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Measure M Opening Dates 3-Year Window
West Santa Ana Branch			Draft EIS/EIR Board selects LPA Final EIS/EIR Board certifies EIR FTA issues ROD							FY 2028 - 2030 (Initial Segment Board Selected LPA)  FY 2041 - 2043 (Second Segment)
C (Green) Line Extension to Torrance			Draft EIR Board selects LPA Final EIR Board certifies EIR							FY 2030 - 2032
Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2			Draft Supplemental EIR Board selects LPA Final EIR Board certifies EIR							FY 2035 - 2037
Sepulveda Transit Corridor		Board awards Environmental contract	EIS/EIR Board selects LPA Board certifies EIR FTA issues ROD							FY 2033 - 2035 (Initial Segment)  FY 2057 - 2059 (Second Segment)

Schedules are subject to change based on funding and environmental review



# West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor



## Recent Activities


- July 30: Draft EIR/S released (60 day comment period)
  - 3 public hearings
  - 3 community information sessions
  - 15+ "pop-up" information booths
  - 18 stakeholder/agency briefings to date
- Sept 28: Public Comment Period closes

## Next Actions

- Oct/Nov: Compile Public Comments
- December 2021/January 2022 (anticipated): Board selects Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and Final EIR/S begins



# C (Green) Line Extension to Torrance




## Recent Activities


- July 13–Aug 24: Stakeholder engagement w/ BNSF, CalSTA, Torrance, LACPW, Lawndale
- Virtual "neighborhood walks" on Metro website to gather community input
- Utility surveys initiated (Lawndale, BNSF, Caltrans)

## Next Actions

- Developing advanced conceptual engineering (15% design) to inform Draft EIR
- Spring 2022 (anticipated): Draft EIR release



# Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2



## Recent Activities

- Aug 30-Sept 10: CBO Presurvey for the project's Roundtable Meetings
- Station specific studies for Atlantic/Pomona and Atlantic/Whittier
- Systems Engineering preliminary results-Load Flow and Operations Analysis




## Next Actions

- Incorporate System Engineering outputs in the ACE and environmental analysis
- Meet and Greet with CBOs in anticipation of Fall outreach activities
- Share Atlantic/Pomona Station options with stakeholders
- Spring 2022 (anticipated): Draft EIR release



# Sepulveda Transit Corridor



## Recent Activities

- August 3: Notice to Proceed (NTP) issued for Pre-Development Agreement (PDA) teams
- Preparation underway for environmental scoping meetings

## Next Actions

- PDA Team submittals for Environmental Scoping
- Pre-scoping outreach in response to community requests



# Countywide Planning Dashboard

Pillar Projects								
	Project Name	Env Completion (FY)	Measure M Opening (FY)	Project Phase			Date	Action/Status
				Prelim Studies	Draft Env	Final Env		
1	West Santa Ana Branch LRT	2022	2028-2030		X		December 2021	Selection of LPA
2	C (Green) Line Extension to Torrance LRT	2023	2030-2032 (accelerated to 2028)		X		Spring 2022	Receive Draft EIR and Select Locally Preferred Alternative
3	Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2	2024	2035-2037 (accelerated to 2028)		X		Spring 2022	Release of Draft EIS/EIR
4	Sepulveda Transit Corridor	2025	2033-2035	X			Fall 2021	Environmental Scoping



# Countywide Planning Dashboard

Other Measure M Projects								
	Project Name	Env Completion (FY)	Measure M Opening (FY)	Project Phase			Date	Action/Status
				Prelim Studies	Draft Env	Final Env		
5	East San Fernando Valley Shared Right-of-Way	TBD	N/A	X			Early 2022	Award contract for Supplemental Study
6	North San Fernando Valley BRT	2021	2023-2025		X		Fall 2021	Approve Proposed Project
7	North Hollywood - Pasadena BRT	2022	2022-2024			X	Fall 2021	Return to the Board with further review of design options in Burbank and Eagle Park
8	Crenshaw Northern Extension LRT	2023	2047-2049		X		Fall 2021	Post-Scoping Alternatives Report.
9	LA River Path (central gap)	2024	2025-2028		X		Fall 2022	Receive Draft EIR and Select Locally Preferred Alternative
10	Vermont Transit Corridor	2026	2028-2030	X			TBD	Award Environmental Contract



# Countywide Planning Dashboard

Non-Measure M Projects			Project Phase				Date	Action/Status
Project Name	Env Completion (FY)	Opening/ Completion (FY)	Prelim Studies	Draft Env	Final Env			
11	Centinela Grade Separation	2021	2025			X	Fall 2021	Approve funding and project delivery plan
12	Rio Hondo Confluence Station Feasibility Study	TBD. Feasibility Study anticipated to be completed in 2022	TBD	X			TBD	Receive Feasibility Study Report and determine next steps for the potential Rio Hondo Confluence Station
13	Rail-to-River ATC (Segment A)	2017	2025	Project has completed Environmental Phase			Sept 2021	Board to authorize Life of Project (LOP) budget
14	Rail-to-River ATC (Segment B)	TBD	TBD	X			Fall 2021	Receive Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Select Revised Locally Preferred Alternative
15	Arts District/ 6th Street Station HRT	TBD	TBD		X		Summer 2022	Receive Draft EIR