

## 8-4.16 OTHER IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS

### 8-4.16.1 Indirect/Secondary Impacts

Indirect (secondary) effects may include those impacts which are induced by a project or project alternative, but which tend to occur at some physical distance or future time. Indirect effects may also include those impacts that occur as a result of interrelationships between different resource systems in the environment. For example, the effects of water pollution on sensitive biological resources could constitute an indirect effect. As discussed in detail below, the RB-3 Alternative, RB-5 Alternative, and RB-Network Alternative would not be expected to result in significant indirect effects on the environment since few modifications to the existing conditions in the study area would occur.

#### 8-4.16.1.1 Transportation

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would potentially have indirect effects related to transportation. Daily vehicle trips on highways would decrease as Rapid Bus ridership increases (see Table 8-3-8 in Section 8-3), resulting in indirect benefits to local and regional air quality and traffic congestion. Although new Rapid Bus stops would result in the displacement of some on-street parking spaces for stops or layovers, which could generate an indirect adverse effect to area businesses and residences, incorporation of mitigation measures to control spillover parking would lessen potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not generate indirect adverse effects related to transportation. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to transportation would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. Direct effects are described in Section 8-3.

#### 8-4.16.1.2 Land Use and Development

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be unlikely to have indirect effects related to land use and development. The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be located in existing developed areas where many other factors besides transit service contribute to future new development. Thus, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not independently result in future new development. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to land use and development would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. Direct effects are described in Section 8-4.1.

#### 8-4.16.1.3 Acquisitions and Displacements

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be unlikely to have indirect effects related to acquisitions and displacements. The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be located in an existing substantially developed area where many other factors besides transit service contribute to future



new development. Thus, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not independently result in new acquisitions or displacements. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to acquisitions and displacements would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. Direct effects are described in Section 8-4.2.

#### 8-4.16.1.4 Demographics and Neighborhoods

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be unlikely to have indirect effects related to demographics and neighborhoods. Population density, distribution, and growth would not be expected to change from forecast projections since the three Rapid Bus alternatives would be located in a substantially developed area where many other factors besides transit service contribute to demographic change. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to demographics and neighborhoods would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. Direct effects are described in Section 8-4.3.

#### 8-4.16.1.5 Community Facilities and Services

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be unlikely to have adverse indirect effects related to community facilities and services. (Note that no significant noise impacts to community facilities and services such as schools, libraries and churches were identified. See Section 8-4.9 for additional discussion.) Conversely, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would potentially have a beneficial indirect effect related to community facilities and services in that the three Rapid Bus alternatives would increase transit access to public facilities. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to community facilities and services would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. Direct effects are described in Section 8-4.4.

#### 8-4.16.1.6 Fiscal and Economic Conditions

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be unlikely to have adverse indirect impacts related to fiscal and economic conditions. Businesses in the study area would be served by a more efficient transit system, and no businesses would be acquired or experience significant limitations on access. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to fiscal and economic conditions would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. Direct effects are described in Section 8-4.5.

#### 8-4.16.1.7 Visual and Aesthetic Conditions

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be unlikely to have indirect effects related to visual and aesthetic conditions because the three Rapid Bus alternatives would be along existing developed streets and sidewalks and would be in keeping with the visual characteristics of the existing land use. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to visual and aesthetic



conditions would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 8-4.6.

#### 8-4.16.1.8 Air Quality

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be unlikely to have indirect adverse effects related to air quality. Air emissions from construction and operation of the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not be significant under CEQA; thus, air emissions would not generate have an indirect significant impact under CEQA on biological resources, public health, or other sensitive systems. In fact, as persons would chose to make trips on public transit rather than by automobiles, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would result in a decrease in certain emissions, which would result in indirect benefits to biological resources, public health, and the local and regional economy. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to air quality would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 8-4.7.

#### 8-4.16.1.9 Energy

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would result in indirect reductions in the consumption of fossil fuels as persons choose to use public transit rather than automobiles. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to energy would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 8-4.8.

#### 8-4.16.1.10 Noise and Vibration

The RB-5 Alternative would generate a potentially significant noise impact to 18 single-family residences and 12 multifamily residences; however, incorporation of the mitigation measures listed in Section 8-4.9.4.2 would lessen impacts to a less-than-significant level. In addition, all three Rapid Bus alternatives would potentially have indirect effects related to noise and vibration during the period of construction activities. During the minor construction necessary to establish new on-street RB stops, some residences and other sensitive noise receptors in the community may experience temporary, short-term disruptions. Compliance with contractor specifications and construction standards for noise and vibration are expected to minimize these indirect disruptions to sensitive receptors. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to noise and vibration would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 8-4.9.

#### 8-4.16.1.11 Geotechnical Considerations

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be unlikely to have indirect effects related to geotechnical issues as they would not impact soil stability or slopes or otherwise result in an increase in geotechnical-related risks at some other location or at some point in the future. Any



other potential effects of the proposed project related to geotechnical considerations would be deemed direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 8-4.10.

#### 8-4.16.1.12 Biological Resources

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be unlikely to have indirect effects related to biological resources. The three Rapid Bus alternatives would utilize existing roads and would not result in new crossings of the Los Angeles River or its tributaries. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to biological resources would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 8-4.11.

#### 8-4.16.1.13 Water Resources

The three Rapid Bus alternatives are unlikely to have indirect effects related to water resources. Because the three Rapid Bus alternatives would utilize existing streets and would not construct new impervious surfaces, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not contribute substantial new contaminants to water resources or impact storm drain facilities. Furthermore, because the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not construct residences or businesses, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not require additional water supplies or deplete groundwater. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to water resources would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 8-4.12.

#### 8-4.16.1.14 Safety and Security

Three aspects of safety and security pertain to the three Rapid Bus alternatives: accident prevention, crime prevention, and emergency response. The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be unlikely to have indirect effects related to safety and security because the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not significantly increase accident rates, crime rates, or emergency response time or access. Thus, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not generate indirect impacts such as requiring additional police and fire protection services, health care facilities, or other additional community services or facilities. Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to safety and security would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 8-4.13.

#### 8-4.16.1.15 Cultural Resources

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would not generate significant noise and vibration impacts or other indirect impacts to cultural resources. (Potentially significant noise impacts would be limited to residences located on Burbank Boulevard, and none of these residences is listed in **Table 8-4.14.1** (Historic-Cultural Monuments) of Section 8-4.14). Any other potential effects of the three Rapid Bus alternatives related to cultural resources would be considered direct effects,



since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 8-4.14.

## 8-4.16.2 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative effects typically are caused by the aggregate effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions. These are the effects (past, present and future) of a proposed action on a given resource *and* the effects (past, present and future), if any, caused by all other related actions that affect the same resource. The scope of cumulative effects analyses can usually be limited to reasonable geographic bounds and time periods. These boundaries should extend only so far as the point at which a resource is no longer substantially affected or where the effects are so speculative as to no longer be truly meaningful. Cumulative effects can include the effects (past, present and future) on a given resource caused by similar types of actions (e.g., air emissions from several individual highway projects) *and/or* the effects (past, present and future) on a given resource caused by different types of actions (e.g., air emissions from a highway project, a solid waste incinerator and a mining facility).

The analysis that follows addresses the potential cumulative effects that could result from the construction and operation of the three Rapid Bus alternatives combined with construction and operation of other transit projects and other related but non-transit projects.

### 8-4.16.2.1 Related Transit and Transportation Projects

Related transit and transportation projects that have been identified as part of this cumulative impacts analysis include:

- Development of other portions of the *MTA Long Range Plan* described in Appendix I, including transit extensions in the Eastside and Mid-City (Wilshire and/or Exposition) Corridors;
- Recommendations in the *San Fernando Valley Transit Restructuring Study*, including transit centers in Sylmar, Burbank, Chatsworth, Warner Center, and Universal City;
- Multimodal capital improvements, including park and ride transit centers and regional bikeway improvements;
- Continued operation of the Metrolink commuter rail system;
- Planned highway capital improvements, including freeway interchanges and high occupancy vehicle lanes at various locations; and
- Traffic signal system improvements throughout the Valley such as ATSAC.



8-4.16.2.2 Other Related Projects

In addition to the transit and transportation projects described above, there are several other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development projects in the vicinity of the three Rapid Bus alternatives. **Table 8-4.16.1** (Related Projects) summarizes these related projects.

<b>Table 8-4.16-1: Related Projects</b>		
<b>Project</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>GENERAL DEVELOPMENT</b>		
New storage facility (202,877 sq. ft.)	Victory Boulevard/Variel Avenue	1999
New commercial development - 9 office buildings, 3 parking structures (800,202 sq. ft.)	Erwin Street/Canoga Avenue	1999
New fast food restaurant/laundry (7,912 sq. ft.)	Vanowen Street/De Soto Avenue	1999
New hotel/commercial development (117,255 sq. ft.)	Topham Street/Corbin Avenue	1998
New 16-unit condominium (28,800 sq. ft.)	Hatteras Street/Yolanda Avenue	1998
New Target retail store w/ 6-level parking structure (180,1133 sq. ft.)	Sepulveda Boulevard/Oxnard Street	1999
New parking structure (82,888 sq. ft.)	Hatteras Street/Van Nuys Boulevard	1999
New storage facility (59,000 sq. ft.)	Lankershim Boulevard/Erwin Street	1998
<b>SCHOOLS</b>		
Convert office to 160 student private high school (14,156 sq. ft.)	Chandler Boulevard/Whitsett Avenue	1998
New 615 student school (18,390 sq. ft.)	Laurel Canyon Boulevard/Chandler Boulevard	1999
New 150 student private elementary school (16,000 sq. ft.)	Oxnard Street/Hazeltine Avenue	2000
East Valley New High School #1B	Chandler Boulevard/Lankershim Boulevard	2000
East Valley New Middle School #1	Victory Boulevard/Laurel Canyon Boulevard	2000
North Hollywood New Elementary School #4	Area between Sherman Way, Laurel Canyon Boulevard, Victory Boulevard, and Bellaire Avenue	2000
Van Nuys New Elementary School	Columbus Avenue/Vanowen Street	2000
<b>PUBLIC WORKS</b>		
New sewer (Chandler/Lankershim GID #13)	Magnolia Boulevard, Colfax Avenue, Oxnard Street, and Clybourn Avenue	2002

Sources: City of Los Angeles, 2000; Los Angeles Unified School District, 2000.



8-4.16.2.3 Impacts

*a. Operational*

Transportation

Once they would be operational, any of the three Rapid Bus alternatives would be an integral part of the local and regional transit system, including the other related transit improvements identified above. The effects of any of the three Rapid Bus alternatives, in conjunction with the other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable transit projects would largely be beneficial given increasing transit ridership and a corresponding decrease in automobile usage, as shown in Table 8-3-8 of Section 8-3. Overall, therefore, implementation of any of the three Rapid Bus alternatives would have beneficial cumulative effects on transit and transportation in both the Valley and the County as a whole.

Land Use and Development

Each of the three Rapid Bus alternatives would require amendments to plans that call for the construction of a transit system and/or stations in the MTA ROW. Amending these numerous plans would severely alter their objectives without any substitute objective that will curtail widespread growth. Accordingly, there are no feasible mitigation measures to eliminate, or substantially reduce, the significant land use impact. Therefore, the Rapid Bus alternatives would potentially contribute to a significant adverse cumulative impact to land use and development.

Acquisitions and Displacements

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would not involve any property acquisitions or displacements and would not induce any additional acquisitions and displacements beyond those that might otherwise occur as a result of the other individual related projects. Thus, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not contribute to a significant cumulative effect under CEQA.

Demographics and Neighborhoods

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would not be expected to result in significant impacts on population, housing, neighborhood character, access, or community security. Viewed in conjunction with other potential related projects, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not contribute to any cumulative effects since none of the related projects appears to be of a type, size, or location that might result in cumulative effects with any of the three Rapid Bus alternatives.

Community Facilities and Services

Compared to the No Build Alternative, the three Rapid Bus alternatives in conjunction with other transit projects would result in new transit riders that would potentially access community facilities and services. Since the addition of new transit service would broaden the range of community accessibility at the system level, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would contribute to a beneficial cumulative effect on community facilities and services.

Fiscal and Economic Conditions

Because the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not acquire any property, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not contribute to the displacement of any jobs or the loss of tax and fee revenues. Therefore, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not contribute to a cumulative effect on fiscal and economic conditions.

Visual and Aesthetic Conditions

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would utilize existing streets and sidewalks and would only require minor construction necessary to establish new on-street Rapid Bus stops. Although the three Rapid Bus alternatives would establish a number of new Rapid Bus stops in front of residential land uses, these new Rapid Bus stops would not generate a significant visual or aesthetic impact to residences. New Rapid Bus stops would be designed to be generally compatible with their surroundings, including other related projects in the area. Furthermore, the other projects do not seem to have any peculiar characteristics that, when viewed along with the three Rapid Bus alternatives, would cause any significant cumulative effects under CEQA on the visual quality of the study area.

Air Quality

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would reduce emissions of between 1 and 3 criteria pollutants, depending on which alternative. The various other related transportation and transit projects should result in additional emissions reductions corresponding to increases in public transit ridership, HOV usage, and travel speeds. The related non-transportation projects would generally attract travel, most of which would be by automobile, and therefore these projects would contribute to increased emissions along the corridor. Because the three Rapid Bus alternatives would contribute to reduced emissions and would not produce substantial additional exceedances of state or federal standards, they would have a beneficial cumulative effect on air quality under CEQA.

Energy

The three Rapid Bus alternatives and related projects would all consume varying amounts of energy. This additional energy consumption would only marginally burden existing and future energy sources in light of current projections of adequate supplies for the foreseeable future. Furthermore, the additional energy consumption would be offset to some extent by the energy





savings caused by decreases in automobile travel that would occur alongside increases in public transit ridership. The energy savings produced by the three Rapid Bus alternatives would constitute a beneficial cumulative effect.

Noise and Vibration

Potential noise impacts from the RB-3 and RB-Network alternatives would be less-than-significant; however, significant noise impacts are anticipated for the RB-5 Alternative. With incorporation of the mitigation measures listed in Section 8-4.9.4.2, potential noise impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Presumably, any noise effects generated by the other related projects would also be mitigated; therefore, the net result would be no significant cumulative noise effects under CEQA.

Geotechnical Considerations

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would utilize existing streets and would not improve undeveloped land. Thus, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not contribute to cumulative effects related to risks from an incident such as an earthquake.

Biological Resources

No sensitive plant or animal species are in the study area, and there are no indications that such species would be found in the vicinity of other related projects. Construction of new Rapid Bus stops for each of the Rapid Bus alternatives would require the removal of a number of ornamental street trees; however, these trees would be replaced as necessary, and it is assumed that any trees removed as a result of other related projects would also be replaced as necessary. Thus, no cumulative effects related to biology are expected to occur.

Water Resources

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would utilize existing streets, would maintain existing land uses, and would not construct new residences or businesses; therefore, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not contribute to a cumulative effect on surface water or groundwater. However, the three Rapid Bus alternatives cross into 100-year flood hazard areas, and the related projects may do so as well. The study area is highly urbanized, though, and little or no encroachment is expected beyond what has already occurred. Thus, no significant cumulative effects under CEQA related to water resources are expected to occur.

Safety and Security

Three aspects of safety and security pertain to the three Rapid Bus alternatives: accident prevention, crime prevention, and emergency response. The three Rapid Bus alternatives would not significantly increase crime rates or emergency response times. The three Rapid Bus alternatives would generate some additional traffic around RB stop sites that could slightly increase the number of accidents, although the accident rate would not be increased in the



context of background growth. Furthermore, increased transit service is expected to yield a mode shift away from automobiles toward public transportation, and this effect would arguably reduce cumulative accident potential rather than add to it. Implementation of the three Rapid Bus alternatives would have no effect on the safety and security of the other related projects, and none of those projects would have any effect on the safety and security of the three Rapid Bus alternatives. The safety and security characteristics of each are mutually exclusive. Thus, on balance, no significant cumulative effects under CEQA would occur.

❑ Cultural Resources

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would maintain existing land uses, be consistent with the historical uses of the routes for transportation, and would require only minor ground disturbance necessary to establish new Rapid Bus stops; therefore, the three Rapid Bus alternatives would not contribute to a cumulative effect on cultural resources.

*b. Construction*

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would require only minor construction necessary to establish a number of on-street RB stops and to establish transit signal priority. Thus, even if the three Rapid Bus alternatives and the other projects in the region would proceed within a similar period of time or in close geographic proximity, it would be unlikely that cumulative effects would result from their construction.

8-4.16.2.4 Conclusion

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would result in significant effects to land use and development that do not have feasible mitigation measures to eliminate, or substantially reduce, the significant impacts. Therefore, there would be potential cumulative impacts to the land use and development.

8-4.16.3 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts After Mitigation

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would result in adverse impacts to land use and development that do not have feasible mitigation measures, and thus, are unavoidable. In addition, if quieter buses could not be placed in service, residual noise impacts would remain at 18 single-family residences and 12 multifamily residences. Therefore, unavoidable adverse land use and development impacts, and possibly also noise impacts, would remain after mitigation.

#### 8-4.16.4 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance of Long-Term Productivity

This section is not required under CEQA. However, it may be noted that the three Rapid Bus alternatives would generate few modifications to the existing conditions in the area and would not substantially affect either short-term use of the environment or long-term productivity.

#### 8-4.16.5 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would be expected to involve the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of a limited range of natural, physical, human and fiscal resources. Non-renewable fossil fuel resources would be necessary to power construction equipment, electrical devices, and buses. Small amounts of other types of resources would also be expended, including metals and other construction materials. Additionally, labor and natural resources would have to be committed to the fabrication and preparation of these construction materials. This commitment of resources would be considered irretrievable, except for the possible recycling of raw materials in the event that the Rapid Bus stops were ever dismantled. These resources are generally not in short supply and their use would not have a significant effect under CEQA on their continued availability. Given the commitment of these resources well into the foreseeable future, however, their use should be considered irreversible and irretrievable.

For each of the three Rapid Bus alternatives, a one-time expenditure of public funds would also be necessary to construct the Rapid Bus stops and implement the signal priority. This expense would be offset to some extent by the direct and indirect benefits to the local and regional economy from purchases of construction materials and services and long-term economic development opportunities resulting from an enhanced transit system in the San Fernando Valley.

The commitment of resources to construct and operate the three Rapid Bus alternatives is based on the belief that residents, employees, and visitors would benefit from the improved efficiency, accessibility, and environmental quality of the transportation system in the San Fernando Valley. These benefits are anticipated to substantially outweigh any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources.

#### 8-4.16.6 Growth Inducement

The three Rapid Bus alternatives would not be likely to induce any substantial growth in the study area or the region in the absence of more intensive physical improvements, though they could redirect or focus some of the already anticipated growth to those areas in the vicinity of certain Rapid Bus stops. Some stops areas may become more attractive given the improved accessibility provided by the three Rapid Bus alternatives, but would only be feasible for new



development where other conditions besides transit service support that development (i.e., where existing commercial centers exist, community support is present, and land use and zoning requirements are satisfied).

#### 8-4.16.7 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The three Rapid Bus alternatives, when compared to the BRT Alternative, would result in no adverse effects in the areas of property acquisitions and displacements, aesthetics, noise and vibration, and general construction impacts. In the BRT Alternative, these impacts are reduced to less-than-significant, except for construction impacts. Also, the BRT Alternative would have several beneficial environmental effects when compared to the three Rapid Bus alternatives. Among these are:

- *Greatest increase in transit patronage* – The BRT Alternative would result in between 2,700 and 6,100 more new daily person trips made by transit than would the three Rapid Bus alternatives.<sup>1</sup>
- *Greatest decrease in energy consumption* – Compared to No Build, the Full BRT Alternative would decrease energy consumption by 108 billion BTUs while the three Rapid Bus alternatives would decrease energy consumption by between 63 and 72 billion BTUs.
- *Reliability* – The BRT Alternative would be constructed primarily in an exclusive right-of-way. Consequently, bus operations under the BRT Alternative tend to be more reliable than under the three Rapid Bus alternatives, particularly as the population grows and traffic on local arterials and freeways continues to worsen over time.
- *Consistency with local plans* – The BRT Alternative would provide a higher level of support to local land use and redevelopment plans. Each of the three Rapid Bus alternatives would be inconsistent with plans such as the SCAG 2001 Regional Transportation Plan and the City of Los Angeles General Plan Transportation Element, which describe construction of a transit system and/or transit stops in the MTA ROW.
- *Employment opportunities* - The BRT Alternative would generate between 21,440 and 22,350 total jobs during construction.

The adverse effects of the BRT Alternative and the three Rapid Bus alternatives, though mitigated, would not be completely eliminated by the proposed mitigation measures. In this situation, a clearly preferable alternative with respect to environmental issues is not obvious.

---

<sup>1/</sup> The BRT Alternative would result in between 13,000 to 15,300 more daily person trips made by transit in Los Angeles County, and the RB-3, RB-5, and RB-Network would result in 10,100, 9,200, and 10,300, respectively, more daily person transit trips. See Table 8-6.5 for details.