EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ES-1

1.0 BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE SEIS

1.1 Background 1-1
1.2 Purpose and Scope of this Supplemental Environmental Document 1-1
1.3 Environmental Review Process 1-3
1.4 Project Schedule 1-3

2.0 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

2.1 Project Background 2-1
2.1.1 Efforts Leading to the Identification of the Project 2-1
2.1.2 Construction Methods of the Project 2-3
2.1.3 Construction Staging for the Project 2-4
2.2 Development of Alternatives 2-7
2.2.1 Flower Street Existing Conditions 2-7
2.2.1.1 Flower Street Segment Surface Context and Constraints 2-8
2.2.1.2 Flower Street Underground Context and Constraints 2-8
2.2.2 Little Tokyo 2-14
2.2.3 Tunnel Construction Methods 2-14
2.2.3.1 Cut and Cover Method 2-14
2.2.3.2 Earth Pressure Balance Tunnel Boring Machine Method 2-15
2.2.3.3 Sequential Excavation Method 2-18
2.2.3.4 Open-Face Shield Tunneling 2-20
2.2.3.5 Ground Improvement Methods 2-22
2.3 Alternatives Considered in the SEIS 2-28
2.3.1 Construction Methods and Staging for Tunneling Method Alternatives 2-28
2.3.1.1 Construction Staging Areas 2-32
2.3.2 Description of Tunneling Method Alternatives 2-36
2.3.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open-Face Shield/SEM Project Profile Alternative 2-36
2.3.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment Alternative 2-40

3.0 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

3.1 Affected Environment 3-1
3.1.1 Transit 3-1
3.1.2 Traffic Circulation 3-1
3.1.2.1 Roadway Network 3-1
3.1.2.2 Parking 3-2
3.1.2.3 Pedestrians 3-2
3.1.2.4 Bicycles 3-4
3.1.2.5 Operational Impacts 3-4
3.2 Environmental Consequences 3-4
3.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open-Face Shield/SEM Project Profile 3-4
3.2.1.1 Construction Impacts 3-4
3.2.1.2 Operational Impacts 3-12
3.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment Alternative 3-13
3.2.2.1 Construction Impacts 3-13
3.2.2.2 Operational Impacts 3-16
3.3 Mitigation Measures 3-16

4.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1 VISUAL QUALITY

4.1.1 Affected Environment 4.1-1
4.1.1.1 Visual Resources 4.1-1
4.1.1.2 Scenic Vistas 4.1-3
4.1.2 Environmental Consequences 4.1-4
4.1.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open-Face Shield/SEM Project Profile 4.1-5
4.1.2.1.1 Construction Impacts 4.1-5
4.1.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment 4.1-10
4.1.2.2.1 Construction Impacts 4.1-10
4.1.3 Mitigation Measures 4.1-14

4.2 AIR QUALITY

4.2.1 Affected Environment 4.2-1
4.2.2 Environmental Consequences 4.2-1
4.2.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open Face Shield/SEM Project Profile 4.2-2
4.2.2.1.1 Construction Impacts 4.2-2
4.2.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment 4.2-5
4.2.2.2.1 Construction Impacts 4.2-5
4.2.3 Mitigation Measures 4.2-8

4.3 CLIMATE CHANGE

4.3.1 Affected Environment 4.3-1
4.3.2 Environmental Consequences 4.3-2
4.3.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open Face Shield /SEM Project Profile 4.3-2
4.3.2.1.1 Construction Impacts 4.3-2
4.3.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment 4.3-3
4.3.2.2.1 Construction Impacts 4.3-3
4.3.3 Mitigation Measures 4.3-4

4.4 NOISE AND VIBRATION

4.4.1 Affected Environment 4.4-1
4.4.2 Environmental Consequences 4.4-2
4.4.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open Face Shield/SEM Project Profile 4.4-5
4.4.2.1.1 Construction Impacts 4.4-5
4.4.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment 4.4-6
4.4.2.2.1 Construction Impacts 4.4-6
4.4.3 Mitigation Measures 4.4-7

4.5 GEOTECHNICAL, SUBSURFACE, AND SEISMIC HAZARDS

4.5.1 Affected Environment 4.5-1
4.5.1.1 Geology.... ..... 4.5-1
4.5.2 Environmental Consequences 4.5-3
4.5.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open Face Shield/SEM Project Profile 4.5-3
4.5.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment 4.5-4
4.5.3 Mitigation Measures 4.5-5

4.6 ENERGY RESOURCES

4.6.1 Affected Environment 4.6-1

4.6.2 Environmental Consequences 4.6-1
4.6.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open Face Shield/SEM Project Profile 4.6-2
4.6.2.1.1 Construction Impacts 4.6-2
4.6.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment 4.6-3
4.6.2.2.1 Construction Impacts 4.6-3
4.6.3 Mitigation Measures 4.6-3

4.7 HISTORIC RESOURCES

4.7.1 Affected Environment 4.7-2
4.7.1.1 SEIS Study Area 4.7-2
4.7.1.2 Built Environment Resources 4-7-2
4.7.2 Environmental Consequences 4-7-3
4.7.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open Face Shield/SEM Project Profile 4.7-8
4.7.2.1.1 Construction Impacts 4.7-8
4.7.2.1.2 Section 106 Effects Analysis for Historic Properties 4.7-9
4.7.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment 4.7-9
4.7.2.2.1 Construction Impacts 4.7-9
4.7.2.2.2 Section 106 Effects Analysis for Historic Properties 4.7-10
4.7.3 Mitigation Measures 4.7-11

4.8 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.8.1 Affected Environment 4.8-1
4.8.2 Environmental Consequences 4.8-5
4.8.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open Face Shield/SEM Project Profile Alternative 4.8-5
4.8.2.1.1 Construction Impacts 4.8-5
4.8.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment 4.8-8
4.8.2.2.1 Construction Impacts 4.8-8
4.8.3 Summary of Impacts of Tunneling Method Alternatives versus the Project 4.8-10

4.9 CUMULATIVE

4.9.1 Affected Environment 4.9-1
4.9.1.1 Project Time Frames 4.9-2
4.9.1.2 Current and Reasonably Foreseeable Related Actions 4.9-2
4.9.1.3 Projects Anticipated to be Completed prior to 2014 ..... 4.9-4
4.9.1.4 Projects Potentially Under Construction 2014 to 2020 ..... 4.9-6
4.9.1.5 Projects Potentially Under Construction post-2020 ..... 4.9-9
4.9.2 Environmental Consequences 4.9-10
4.9.2.1 Alternative A – EPBM/Open Face Shield/SEM Project Profile 4.9-11
4.9.2.2 Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment 4.9-11
4.9.3 Mitigation Measures 4.9-11

5.0 COMPARISON OF THE TUNNELING METHOD ALTERNATIVES VERSUS THE PROJECT

5.1 Introduction 5-1
5.2 Description of the Project and Tunneling Method Alternatives 5-1
5.3 Effectiveness in Meeting Purpose and Need 5-2
5.4 Construction and Risk Considerations 5-2
5.5 Summary of Impacts of Alternatives versus the Project 5-4
5.6 Operational Considerations 5-6
5.7 Schedule Impacts 5-7
5.8 Cost and Funding Considerations 5-9

5.9 Environmental Consequences 5-13
5.10 Summary of Findings 5-14

6.0 PUBLIC AND AGENCY OUTREACH

6.1 Introduction 6-1
6.2 Highlights of Previous Outreach Efforts 6-1
6.3 Public Participation Plan (PPP) 6-2
6.4 Agency Coordination 6-2
6.4.1 Mailings, Flyers, and Electronic Mailings 6-3
6.4.2 Website and Media Outreach 6-3
6.5 Public Review Period 6-3
6.5.1 Public Hearings 6-4
6.5.2 Public and Agency Comment 6-4

FIGURES

Figure 2.1-1: Project Area from the Final EIS for the Locally Preferred Alternative 2-2
Figure 2.1-2: Flower Street Segment Construction Methods of the Project 2-5
Figure 2.1-3: The Project – Construction Staging Areas 2-6
Figure 2.2-1: Flower Street Segment Existing Conditions 2-7
Figure 2.2-2: Overview of Flower Street Tie-back Locations 2-9
Figure 2.2-3: Flower Street Segment Cross Section at Tunnel Cavern before Transition to Twin Tunnels (South of 5th Street) showing Tie-backs 2-10
Figure 2.2-4: Flower Street Segment Ground Conditions 2-11
Figure 2.2-5: Flower Street Segment: 4th Street Bridge Foundations Looking South from 3rd Street 2-13
Figure 2.2-6: Cut and Cover Construction Method Stages 2-16
Figure 2.2-7: EPBMs Used for Construction of Los Angeles Eastside LRT Tunnels 2-17
Figure 2.2-8: Cross-section of Typical EPBM 2-17
Figure 2.2-9: SEM Construction Technique 2-18
Figure 2.2-10: SEM Construction Through Flower Street Tie-backs Looking North 2-20
Figure 2.2-11: Open-Face of Digger Shield used to Construct Metro Red Line Contract A146 Tunnels 2-21
Figure 2.2-12: Open-Face Shield Tunnel Construction Through Flower Street Tie-backs (at SEM Cavern Interface with Twin Tunnels) 2-22
Figure 2.2-13: Possible Grouting Impacts Related to SEM Construction 2-22
Figure 2.2-14: Grouting Equipment and Impacts 2-26
Figure 2.2-15: Grouting Equipment and Impacts (San Francisco, MUNI LRT Tunneling, 2013) 2-27
Figure 2.3-1: Grout Holes Required on Flower Street for Alternatives A and B 2-31
Figure 2.3-2: Alternatives A and B – Grouting Activities Phase 1 2-33
Figure 2.3-3: Alternatives A and B – Grouting Activities Phase 2 2-34
Figure 2.3-4: Alternative A – EPBM/Open-Face Shield/SEM Project Profile Alternative 2-38
Figure 2.3-5: Alternative B – EPBM/SEM Low Alignment Alternative 2-42
Figure 3.1: Driveway Access, Traffic Circulation Impacts, and Staging Areas during Construction – The Project 3-6
Figure 3.2: Driveway Access, Traffic Circulation Impacts, Construction Staging, and Grouting Areas (Phase I) – Alternatives A and B 3-7
Figure 3.3: Driveway Access, Traffic Circulation Impacts, Construction Staging, and Grouting Areas (Phase II) – Alternatives A and B 3-8
Figure 3.4: Flower Street LOS for Each Alternative (During Construction, 2014-2017) 3-9
Figure 3.5: Little Tokyo LOS for Each Alternative (During Construction, 2014-2017) 3-10

Figure 4.1-1: Historic Properties and Scenic Resources along Flower Street 4.1-2
Figure 4.1-2: Historic Properties and Scenic Resources in Little Tokyo 4.1-3
Figure 4.1-3: Location of Flower Street Key Observation Points (KOPs) 1 and 2 ..... 4.1-6
Figure 4.1-4: Before View of Flower Street Facing East Between 5th and 6th Streets 4.1-7
Figure 4.1-5: After View of Flower Street with Construction and Grouting Equipment Facing East Between 5th and 6th Streets 4.1-7
Figure 4.1-6: Before View of Flower Street Facing West Between 5th and 6th Streets 4.1-8
Figure 4.1-7: After View of Flower Street with Construction and Grouting Equipment Facing West Between 5th and 6th Streets 4.1-8
Figure 4.1-8: Location of Flower Street KOP 3 ..... 4.1-11
Figure 4.1-9: Before View of Flower Street Facing Southeast North of 5th Street 4.1-12
Figure 4.1-10: After View of Flower Street Facing Southeast North of 5th Street 4.1-12
Figure 4.4-1: Noise Measurement Locations Evaluated in the Final EIS and this SEIS 4.4-2
Figure 4.4-2: Representative Sensitive Receptors and Grouting Areas along Flower Street – Alternatives A and B 4.4-4
Figure 4.4-3: Representative Sensitive Receptor at the Staging Area in Little Tokyo 4.4-5
Figure 4.5-1: Flower Street Subsurface Conditions 4.5-4
Figure 4.7-1: SEIS Study Area – Flower Street 4.7-4
Figure 4.7-2: SEIS Study Area – Little Tokyo 4.7-5
Figure 4.8-1: Minority Populations in the Study Area by Census Block, 2008 to 2012 ..... 4.8-3
Figure 4.8-2: Low-Income Households in the Study Area by Census Block, 2008 to 2012 ..... 4.8-7
Figure 4.9-1: Projects Anticipated to be Completed Prior to 2014 ..... 4.9-3
Figure 4.9-2: Year 2035 Rail Transit Projects 4.9-5
Figure 4.9-3: Projects Potentially Under Construction 2014 to 2020 ..... 4.9-9

TABLES

Table ES.1: Overview of Environmental Impacts Due to Construction of the Tunneling Method Alternatives ES-5
Table 2.3-1: Comparison of Project and Tunneling Method Alternatives 2-30
Table 2.3-2: Flower Street Construction and Grouting Staging and Grouting Activity Areas for the Project and Tunneling Method Alternatives 2-35
Table 2.3-3: Comparison of Flower Street Segment Excavation Materials Handling 2-36
Table 2.3-4: Construction Duration Comparison 2-40
Table 3.1-1: Level of Service (LOS) Categories and Criteria 3-2
Table 3.1-2: Existing Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Analysis (2014) 3-3
Table 3.2-1: Alternative A – Level of Service Analysis (During Construction, 2014-2017) 3-11
Table 3.2-2: Alternative B – Level of Service Analysis (During Construction, 2014-2017) 3-15
Table 4.2-1: Estimated Construction Equipment, Soil Excavation, and Vehicle Trips for Alternative A 4.2-3
Table 4.2-2: Peak Daily Construction Emissions (Mitigated), lb/day – Alternative A 4.2-4
Table 4.2-3: Estimated Construction Equipment, Soil Excavation, and Vehicle Trips for Alternative B 4.2-5
Table 4.2-4: Peak Daily Construction Emissions (Mitigated), lb/day – Alternative B 4.2-6
Table 4.3-1: Existing (2014) Conditions – GHG Emissions from Regional Traffic 4.3-1
Table 4.3-2: Alternative A – Construction GHG Emissions (2014-2017) 4.3-2
Table 4.3-3: Alternative B – Construction GHG Emissions (2014-2017) 4.3-3
Table 4.4-1: Summary of Construction Impacts 4.4-4
Table 4.5-1: Summary of Benefits and Challenges of Alternative A and B 4.5-7
Table 4.6-1: Estimated Energy Consumption from Construction for Alternatives A and B 4.6-2
Table 4.7-1: Historic Properties within the SEIS Study Area 4.7-6
Table 4.8-1: Racial and Ethnic Character by Census Block, 2008 to 2012 ..... 4.8-2

Table 4.8-2: Low-Income Households by Census Block, 2008 to 2012 ..... 4.8-4
Table 4.9-1: Major Renovation Project Anticipated to be Constructed Prior to 2014 ..... 4.9-4
Table 4.9-2: New Construction Estimated to be Completed Prior to 2014 ..... 4.9-6
Table 4.9-3: Institutional and Public Facility Projects to be Completed Prior to 2014 ..... 4.9-6
Table 4.9-4: Institutional and Public Facility Projects Potentially Under Construction 2014-2020 ..... 4.9-7
Table 4.9-5: Major Renovation Projects Anticipated Potentially Under Construction 2014-2020 ..... 4.9-8
Table 4.9-6: New Construction Projects Potentially Under Construction 2014-2020 ..... 4.9-8
Table 5.2-1: Comparison of Project and Tunneling Method Alternatives 5-3
Table 5.6-1: Operational Summary of the Project and the Tunneling Method Alternatives – Flower Street Segment 5-7
Table 5.7-1: Comparison of Schedules for the Project and Tunneling Method Alternatives 5-7
Table 5.7-2: Overview of Construction and Risk Factors Impacting the Construction Schedules for the Project and Tunneling Method Alternatives 5-8
Table 5.8-1: Year of Expenditure Dollar Cost Estimate for the Flower Street Segment for the Tunneling Method Alternatives ($Million) 5-12
Table 5.9-1: Comparison of Environmental Effects During Construction in Little Tokyo 5-14
Table 5.10-1: Overview of Environmental Impacts Due to Construction of the Tunneling Method Alternatives 5-16
Table 6-1: Agency Distribution for the Draft SEIS 6-3

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Final Flower Street Tunneling Method Alternatives Report
Appendix B: Regulatory Framework
Appendix C: Air Quality
Appendix D: Greenhouse Gases
Appendix E: Energy Resources
Appendix F: Noise and Vibration Prediction Model Outputs
Appendix G: Engineering Drawings
Appendix H: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Appendix: I: Notifications and Collateral Materials
Appendix J: Public Comments
Appendix K: Supplemental ROD