BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

821 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles CA 90012
PHONE: 213-974-3333 | FAX: 213-625-7360

LINDSEY P. HORVATH
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
THIRD DISTRICT

November 20, 2026

Stephanie Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project – Request to Remove MSF Options 1 and 5 from Further Consideration in Their Current Form

Dear Ms. Wiggins:

I am writing to express serious concerns with two of the potential Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF) locations recently introduced as part of the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project (STCP) environmental scoping process: **Option 1, at Westfield Fashion Square in Sherman Oaks, and Option 5, at The Plant in Panorama City.** I am requesting that Metro remove both options from further consideration in their current form and undertake a more collaborative effort with the affected communities to identify alternative locations, footprints, and/or designs that better serve the long-term interests of the project and the neighborhoods it is intended to benefit.

Let me begin by reiterating my strong support for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project, the tremendous opportunity it represents for Los Angeles County, and the need to deliver on our commitment to the region as quickly as possible. Connecting the San Fernando Valley and the Westside with fast, reliable, high-capacity rail service is a generational investment that will transform mobility, expand access to jobs and educational opportunities, reduce dependence on automobiles, and help address some of the region's most persistent transportation challenges. The Metro Board's unanimous approval of the Locally Preferred Alternative was an important milestone in advancing this vision. We have worked hard to get here, and it is imperative that we maintain the momentum necessary to deliver this project.

That progress, however, did not happen in a vacuum. Ahead of the LPA decision, our office made a deliberate and sustained effort to build relationships with the communities along the proposed alignment, particularly those with legitimate technical and neighborhood concerns about the project. We spent considerable time listening to residents, engaging neighborhood and homeowner associations, facilitating conversations with regional partners, and working to ensure that community feedback was understood and meaningfully elevated throughout the decision-making process. This included working directly with the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association (SOHA) and the San Fernando Valley Council of

Governments to understand and address concerns regarding alignment, tunneling feasibility, construction impacts, and the project's long-term implications for surrounding neighborhoods.

These were not always easy conversations. Residents invested significant time reviewing technical documents, identifying shortcomings, and raising questions about the project's potential impacts. Our office took those concerns seriously, remained accessible, and worked to demonstrate that community participation could make a meaningful difference in shaping the project. The eventual support for the Modified Alternative 5 reflected, in part, the confidence we worked hard to establish that the project could move forward while remaining responsive to community input.

That trust is now at risk. The introduction of Options 1 and 5 during the current scoping process has understandably raised significant concerns among residents and businesses. While Metro characterizes this process as an opportunity to refine the LPA and gather additional input, the manner in which these MSF locations have been introduced risks creating the perception that communities are being presented with consequential land-use decisions before meaningful engagement has occurred. The scoping presentation identifies Westfield Fashion Square and The Plant as potential locations but provides little detail regarding the anticipated facility footprint, configuration, operational requirements, or how the surrounding properties and businesses could be affected. The presentation further acknowledges that site locations, sizes, and configurations remain subject to refinement.

Asking communities to meaningfully evaluate proposals of this magnitude without sufficient information, while simultaneously introducing locations that could fundamentally alter established community resources, is not a recipe for building confidence. It risks undoing much of the relationship-building that our office and community partners worked so hard to accomplish ahead of the LPA decision. Residents who were encouraged to participate in good faith now feel that their trust and willingness to engage have been misplaced.

There are also substantive reasons why these locations warrant reconsideration. Westfield Fashion Square is more than a collection of retail properties. It is an established community destination in Sherman Oaks that provides residents with convenient access to shopping, restaurants, personal services, fitness, health, neighborhood businesses, and other everyday amenities. Its mix of national retailers and smaller businesses contributes to the economic vitality and character of the surrounding community. The center serves as a gathering place and an important part of the neighborhood's commercial identity. Placing a major rail maintenance and storage operation on this site, or in a manner that compromises its long-term viability, risks sacrificing an existing community asset without first exhausting alternatives that could better accommodate the project's operational needs.

Similarly, The Plant is an important commercial and economic resource for Panorama City and the broader East San Fernando Valley. Developed through the revitalization of the former General Motors manufacturing site, The Plant represents an important chapter in the community's economic redevelopment. Its transformation helped restore commercial activity and investment to an area that had experienced the loss of major manufacturing employment. Today, it remains an established destination for shopping, dining, services, and employment. The community should not be asked to put another important commercial resource at risk without a much more deliberate examination of alternative locations and opportunities to deliver infrastructure in a way that complements, rather than displaces, existing neighborhood assets.

I recognize that an MSF is an essential component of any rail system and that identifying an appropriate location is a necessary part of advancing the STCP. I also appreciate the engineering, operational, and financial considerations that must inform that decision. However, those considerations should not be viewed in isolation from the surrounding land uses, community priorities, and opportunities to create lasting public value. The question should not simply be where Metro can fit a maintenance facility, but how Metro can meet its operational requirements while making the most responsible and beneficial use of public and private land.

Metro should also approach MSF site selection with an openness to public-private partnership (P3) opportunities. Rather than viewing these facilities solely as standalone transportation infrastructure, Metro should explore whether partnerships with private property owners and developers could facilitate more creative site configurations, shared-use opportunities, and integrated development. This could include incorporating MSF facilities into larger mixed-use or commercial developments, leveraging private investment to help offset project costs, and creating opportunities for new housing, retail, employment, and public amenities. A willingness to explore these models could expand the universe of viable sites while delivering greater value to Metro and the surrounding communities.

Accordingly, I am requesting that Metro take the following actions:

1. **Remove Options 1 and 5 from further consideration in their current form.** Neither Westfield Fashion Square nor The Plant should continue to be advanced as a potential MSF location absent a fundamentally different approach that is developed collaboratively with the affected communities and demonstrates clear, meaningful community benefits.
2. **Proactively identify and evaluate alternative MSF locations in partnership with community members.** Metro should engage directly with neighborhood and homeowner associations, local businesses, property owners, the City of Los Angeles, and other relevant stakeholders to identify potential sites that can meet the project's operational needs while minimizing impacts to established commercial centers and residential neighborhoods. This should be a genuine collaborative effort, not simply another opportunity to comment on a predetermined list of locations.
3. **Bring forward additional options that create opportunities for joint development, public-private partnerships, and community investment.** Metro should prioritize locations and configurations that lend themselves to joint development and P3 opportunities, including partnerships with existing property owners and private developers. Metro should explore opportunities to integrate MSF facilities into larger development concepts, leverage private investment, and incorporate complementary uses that enhance the built environment. Where feasible, these opportunities should include improved pedestrian and bicycle connections, landscaping, open space, new housing and commercial activity, and other tangible neighborhood benefits. A project of this scale should be an opportunity to leave communities better than we found them, not simply introduce a new piece of infrastructure.
4. **Ensure meaningful community participation before advancing a revised set of alternatives.** Residents and stakeholders should have an opportunity to help shape the range of locations being considered, understand the operational and physical requirements of the facility, and evaluate potential trade-offs before Metro settles on a preferred approach. Transparency regarding site footprints, operational characteristics, potential impacts, and opportunities for mitigation and community investment will be essential to restoring confidence in this process.

The Sepulveda Transit Corridor is too important to allow the process surrounding one of its necessary components to undermine the broader project. We have an opportunity to deliver a transformative

transportation investment while demonstrating that major infrastructure and community priorities do not have to be competing interests. In fact, the most successful projects are those that recognize the value of the communities they serve and work with them to create shared benefits.

Our office remains committed to working with Metro, community stakeholders, and our regional partners to advance the STCP. But that commitment must be matched by a process that respects the time, trust, and meaningful contributions of the people who will live with this project for generations. I urge Metro to remove Options 1 and 5 in their current form from further consideration and work collaboratively with our communities to develop a path forward. A path that meaningfully engages community stakeholders, develops options for potential MSF sites that incorporates community needs, reimagines potential MSF sites that incorporate joint uses that benefit surrounding communities, and incorporates those sites into Metro's ongoing P3 deliberations for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to continuing this work together and please feel free to reach out to my Director of Infrastructure and Community Services, Justin Orenstein, and my Metro and Transportation Deputy, Emily Ellison, with any questions.

Sincerely,



Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor, Third District
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors