

Draft EIR Public Comment Period Summary Memorandum

K LINE NORTHERN EXTENSION



Metro

November 2025

K LINE NORTHERN EXTENSION TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

Contract No. AE64930000

DRAFT EIR PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD SUMMARY MEMORANDUM

Prepared for:



Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Prepared by:



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

November 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

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

APPENDIX

Appendix A Summary of Comments from 2021 Public Scoping for EIR

TABLES

Table 1. Public Review Hearings 2-2

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

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

Table 4. Count of Commenter Types 3-2

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

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

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

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

FIGURES

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

ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

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

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

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

1.1 REPORT PURPOSE

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

1.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

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

The following alignments are under consideration for KNE:

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

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

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

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



Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2024

1.3 DRAFT EIR PUBLIC HEARING AND MEETINGS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4 PUBLIC COMMENT DATA RESULTS SUMMARY

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

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

SECTION 2: DRAFT EIR PUBLIC HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

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

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

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

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

2.1 DRAFT EIR PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

TABLE 1. PUBLIC REVIEW HEARINGS

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

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

2.2 SEPTEMBER 4TH MID-CITY COMMUNITY MEETING

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

TABLE 2. MID-CITY COMMUNITY MEETING

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



SECTION 3: DRAFT EIR PUBLIC COMMENT DATA RESULTS

3.1 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SUBMISSIONS

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

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

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

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

TABLE 3. NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BY SUBMISSION FORMAT

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

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

TABLE 4. COUNT OF COMMENTER TYPES

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

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

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

3.2 SUBMISSIONS BY AFFILIATION

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

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

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

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

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

TABLE 6. KEY STAKEHOLDER DRAFT EIR COMMENT TOPICS

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

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

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

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

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

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

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

3.3 DRAFT EIR SUBMISSION THEMES

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

3.3.1 PROJECT SUPPORT AND ALIGNMENT PREFERENCE

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

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

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

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

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

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

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

3.3.1.1 PROJECT SUPPORT

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

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

3.3.1.2 ALIGNMENT SUPPORT

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

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

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

FOR SAN VICENTE-FAIRFAX ALIGNMENT

Number of submissions: 282

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

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

FOR FAIRFAX ALIGNMENT

Number of submissions: 63

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

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

FOR LA BREA ALIGNMENT

Number of submissions: 63

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

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

FOR HOLLYWOOD BOWL DESIGN OPTION

Number of submissions: 168

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

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

3.3.1.3 OPPOSITION TO MID-CITY ALIGNMENT

Number of submissions: 138

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

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

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

3.3.1.4 PROJECT OPPOSITION

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

3.3.2 KEY THEMES

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

TABLE 8. NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED PER KEY THEME

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

Source: Connect Los Angeles Partners 2025

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

3.3.2.1 REMOVAL OF HISTORIC STRUCTURES AT HOLLYWOOD/HIGHLAND STATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.3.2.2 MID-CITY HISTORIC RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES

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

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

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

3.3.2.3 TUNNELING

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

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

3.3.2.4 PUBLIC OUTREACH AND NOTICING

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

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

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

3.3.2.5 NOISE AND VIBRATION

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

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

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

3.3.2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

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

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

3.3.2.7 PROPERTY VALUES

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

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

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

3.3.2.8 PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE

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

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

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

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

3.3.2.9 OVERENGINEERING/CROSSOVERS

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

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

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

3.3.2.10 ADDITIONAL TOPICS IDENTIFIED

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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