

DRAFT FINDINGS OF FACT
AND
DRAFT STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING
CONSIDERATIONS

SAN FERNANDO VALLEY
EAST-WEST TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

December 2004

I. INTRODUCTION

On February 28, 2002, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (“MTA”) Board certified a Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor and approved of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), now named the Orange Line, together with the Transportation Systems Management (TSM) as the “Project.” In addition to the Orange Line and the TSM, the Final EIR also considered the following alternatives: No Build, Lankershim/Oxnard Alignment (including a variation of weekend only operation); and the Minimum Operable Segment (MOS).

On July 19, 2004, the Court of Appeal rendered a “Decision,”¹ finding that the MTA should have considered the additional alternative of multiple Rapid Bus routes to the Project and requiring MTA to vacate its certification of the Final EIR and approval of the Project. The Decision upheld the Final EIR in connection with numerous other challenges, including a finding that the Final EIR adequately discussed pedestrian and traffic safety impacts, adequately responded to comments, there was no need to separately evaluate a fare reduction alternative, and did not improperly segment environmental consideration of a City of Los Angeles bikeway.

The Revised Final Environmental Impact Report (Revised FEIR) for the San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor was prepared to comply with the Decision by considering and analyzing the following three multiple-route Rapid Bus alternatives (“RB Alternatives”) as additional alternatives to the Project:

- Three East-West Rapid Bus Routes Alternative (RB-3 Alternative)
- Five East-West Rapid Bus Routes Alternative (RB-5 Alternative)
- Rapid Bus Network Alternative (RB-Network Alternative)

These findings have been prepared to comply with requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Pub. Resources Code, ' 21000 *et seq.*) and the *State CEQA Guidelines* (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, ' 15000 *et seq.*) and reflect the information obtained and analyses conducted in the Revised Final EIR.

^{1/} *Citizens Organized for Smart Transit v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority* California Appellate Court Case No. B164434.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project History and Background

The San Fernando Valley has been growing steadily and is expected to continue growing at a rapid pace well into the future. It will experience an increase in population, especially minority population, and will play host to a large economy. The Ventura Freeway, the primary freeway paralleling the East-West Transit Corridor, is generally a 10-lane freeway. The freeway is congested in both directions for much of the day and is one of the most congested freeways in southern California. The freeway corridor serves a large number of activity centers and provides connections to Hollywood and downtown Los Angeles. The Ventura Freeway is used by local traffic as well as long-distance commuters.

Only two major arterials, Sherman Way and Victory Boulevard, and one secondary arterial, Vanowen Street, are continuous throughout the entire length of the study corridor. Other east-west arterials are mostly continuous in the East Valley (east of the I-405) but become discontinuous in the West Valley. This is due to a number of natural and/or constructed barriers, including I-405, Van Nuys Airport, the Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area, and the Ventura Freeway. These obstructions, together with traffic from the freeway system, force east-west travel in the San Fernando Valley onto a limited number of congested arterials in the area.

Transportation planning in the Southern California region is the responsibility of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the six-county region that includes Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Imperial counties. Under federal law, SCAG must prepare a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and update that plan periodically.

The MTA, as the state-designated planning and programming agency for Los Angeles County, submits recommended projects and programs to SCAG for inclusion in the RTP. The MTA identifies transportation needs and challenges that the county will face over a 25-year planning horizon through the development of its Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), which becomes the blueprint for implementing future transportation improvements in Los Angeles County. Individual transportation projects identified for implementation by MTA and the other SCAG counties are incorporated into the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP), which is also administered by SCAG. The MTA submits projects under its jurisdiction for listing in the RTIP. The RTIP has a 6-year near-term implementation horizon and is aimed at identifying projects approaching the construction phase of development. Projects listed in the RTIP, which must also be referenced in the RTP, are then eligible for state and federal funding. The Locally Preferred Alternative (Full BRT Alternative) is included in the adopted 2001 SCAG RTP and the 2001-2007 RTIP.

Rail transit planning for the San Fernando Valley began in earnest in 1980, when Los Angeles County voters approved a one-half cent sales tax increase dedicated to funding a regional rail system. Among the alignments studied over the next several years were Sherman Way, Victory

Boulevard, Ventura Boulevard, the Los Angeles River, the Southern Pacific (SP) Coast Mainline, the SP Burbank Branch, and the Ventura Freeway. Technologies under consideration ranged from at-grade and aerial light rail to deep-bore heavy rail (subway). Route refinement and environmental assessment activities continued until 1990, when the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC, now MTA) certified the San Fernando East-West Rail Transit Project Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and adopted a predominantly deep-bore subway alternative following the SP Burbank Branch right-of-way (SP ROW, now MTA ROW) from North Hollywood to the Warner Center area, a distance of roughly 14 miles (9 miles subway and 5 miles aerial). In 1992, a Supplemental EIR was completed, documenting the costs, expected ridership, and environmental impacts of the previously adopted SP Burbank Branch subway and a newly considered Ventura Freeway median aerial alignment. Pre-preliminary engineering studies for both of these alternatives were undertaken and after reviewing revised cost estimates, the Board of Directors of the MTA endorsed the SP Burbank Branch East-West Corridor in October 1994.

In 1995, a Major Investment Study (MIS) was initiated that was intended to proceed through the preparation of an environmental document and subsequent implementation of a project in the San Fernando Valley. An *MIS Alternatives Screening Report*, which outlined the alternatives to be carried forward into the environmental process, was presented to the MTA Board on May 22, 1996. A draft Major Investment Study/Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (MIS/DEIS/SEIR) was prepared and review of that document was initiated with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The process was halted during a review of overall planning activities of the MTA, and the project was suspended.

In 1997 and 1998, MTA undertook several planning efforts related to the regional bus system, and this activity led to the publication of several planning documents, including the May 1998 *Restructuring Plan*, the August 1998 *RTP Transit Restructuring for Use in the MTA Re-evaluation Study*, the November 1998 *Regional Transit Alternatives Analysis*, and the 1999 *Los Angeles Metro Rapid Bus Demonstration Program Implementation Plan*.

In June 1999, the MTA initiated a second Major Investment Study (MIS) for the San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor. This MIS relied heavily on work previously done and considered a range of alternatives including rapid transit, heavy and light rail, dual-mode rail, and diesel multiple unit technology. A range of profiles was also considered.

On February 18, 2000, the *San Fernando Valley East/West Transit Corridor Major Investment Study* was published and presented to the Board. On February 24, 2000, the MTA Board approved the MIS document and directed staff to proceed with work on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (Draft EIS/EIR) for the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project in the San Fernando Valley, as recommended in the MIS document. The MTA Board action of July 26, 2001, identified the Full BRT as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The Board recommended moving forward with Preliminary Engineering on the Full BRT Alternative.

B. Project Description

The following sections describe alternatives that were carried forward into the Revised FEIR, and these descriptions are unchanged from the Final EIR (see Section S-4 of the Final EIR). The RB Alternatives are then described.

No Build Alternative

The No Build alternative reflects the conditions anticipated for the year 2020, based on SCAG's growth forecast, if no major transit improvement investments are made within the Valley's East-West Transit Corridor. This scenario would mean that the MTA ROW would not be used for a transit project. All existing highway and arterial facilities are assumed to be in place, but no new roadways or major widening of arterial highways in the San Fernando Valley are anticipated in this alternative. The transit network would include existing routes and rail-bus interfaces, as applicable.

The urban rail network in the No Build Alternative definition would include the following components: Metro Blue Line from Long Beach to 7th and Flower Streets; Metro Gold Line from Union Station to Pasadena; Metro Green Line from Norwalk to El Segundo; Metro Red Line segments from North Hollywood to Union Station and from Wilshire Blvd/Western Avenue to Union Station; the current Metrolink system, plus any funded improvements in the RTIP, STIP, and MTA Call for Projects.

MTA routes reflect the implementation of the Metro Red Line bus-rail interface plans. The No Build Alternative is also required by federal and California Environmental law and serves as a baseline for comparing the costs and performance of the other transit alternatives.

TSM Alternative

The TSM Alternative would improve mobility within the San Fernando Valley in general, and the East-West Transit Corridor in particular, through enhancement of the existing bus system rather than construction of an exclusive busway transit project. Major capital expenditures for street widening that would require property displacement, land takings, and relocation of homes and businesses are not included in this alternative. The TSM Alternative is defined as the optimal level of bus service that could be provided on the existing highway and roadway network.

The TSM alternative route network would be essentially the same as the No Build Alternative; however, the TSM Alternative would improve basic transit service levels across much of the Valley. Selected recommendations of the *San Fernando Valley Transit Restructuring Study* are assumed to be implemented. Headways (the length of time between arrivals at bus stops) would be significantly reduced on numerous bus routes. Base period headways on many routes would be reduced from 60 minutes to 30 or 40 minutes, an improvement of between 33 and 50 percent.

Both east-west and north-south routes would be improved, giving the Valley a comprehensive grid of higher frequency bus service. Major transit corridors would continue to be improved, with headway reductions along Sherman Way, Vanowen Street, Van Nuys Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, and Reseda Boulevard to 10 minutes or less during peak periods.

Bus Rapid Transit Alternative (BRT)

The Bus Rapid Transit Alternative represents an improvement over conventional on-street bus service. This alternative is similar to the one described in the February 2000 MIS document, with some modifications. Exclusive bus lanes would remove buses from street traffic, eliminating queuing and congestion delays. BRT would also increase travel speed by limiting stops and implementing signal priority at intersections. The BRT Alternative would be entirely at grade. The design of the busway would support either typical 40- to 45-foot buses or single articulated 60-foot buses with increased capacity. Three variations of the BRT were included in the FEIR: Full BRT (running from North Hollywood to Warner Center), a Lankershim/ Oxnard On-Street Alignment as an option to the Chandler Boulevard portion of the corridor, and a Minimum Operable Segment (MOS), which would be the shortest meaningful busway that could be constructed, if funding became constrained to that level. In July 2001, the MTA Board selected the Full BRT Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative, and directed that the Lankershim/Oxnard On-Street Alignment be studied for potential weekend service. This decision is being revisited via the preparation of this Revised FEIR that will study three RB alternatives.

Full BRT

The Bus Rapid Transit Alternative consists of primarily exclusive bus lanes on the MTA ROW between the North Hollywood Metro Rail station and the planned Warner Center Transit Hub. An on-street alternative alignment along Oxnard Street in the East Valley is described in Section RS-1.3.2.

In the East Valley, the alignment extends west from the North Hollywood Metro Red Line station at Chandler and Lankershim Boulevards. The alignment continues westward in the median of Chandler Boulevard, crossing the intersection of Fulton Avenue and Burbank Boulevard diagonally near Valley College. The route then parallels Oxnard Street to Sepulveda Boulevard. The alignment crosses under the I-405 in an existing underpass, entering the West Valley.

In the West Valley, the alignment continues along the northern perimeter of the Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area, crossing the Los Angeles River before White Oak Avenue. The alignment continues west in the MTA ROW, paralleling Topham Street and then Victory Boulevard after passing Winnetka Boulevard. Near the intersection of Victory Boulevard and Variel Avenue, the busway leaves the MTA ROW and continues on-street in mixed traffic to a terminus at the planned Warner Center Transit Hub. The Warner Center Transit Hub is located along Owensmouth Avenue between Erwin and Oxnard Streets, adjacent to the Promenade Shopping Mall.

The 26-foot wide, at-grade busway is typically located in the center of the MTA ROW, which is typically 100 feet wide. The wide right-of-way provides an opportunity to take the busway beyond conventional bus network design. The busway would be more like a typical rail alignment in terms of its exclusive right-of-way and stations. Furthermore, this width provides adequate space for landscaped treatment such as berms, trees, fences/walls, and shrubs to buffer the busway from adjacent homes and businesses.

The route would be landscaped, including trees, defining the busway and softening the view from residential areas. The busway concept has also been designed for flexibility. The wide right-of-way will accommodate a bikeway/pedestrian path.

Between Variel and Coldwater Canyon Avenues, except through the Sepulveda Basin, a Class I bike path/pedestrian path is to be constructed within the MTA ROW adjacent to the busway. This path has been developed in conjunction with the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation. Through the Sepulveda Basin (between White Oak and Haskell Avenues), the proposed bicycle/pedestrian alignment would diverge from the MTA ROW and make use of existing bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Cyclists would rejoin the MTA ROW at either end of the Basin. The path would be provided with lighting along most of its length, and cyclists and pedestrians would cross streets at signalized crossings. Along Chandler Boulevard east of Coldwater Canyon, Class II bike lanes would be designated along the North and South Chandler roadways. The bike lanes would continue to the eastern terminus of the BRT at Lankershim Boulevard. Separate environmental documentation has been prepared for this bicycle/pedestrian facility.

Along Chandler Boulevard in the East Valley, the MTA ROW is in the median, typically 60-foot wide, but 100-foot wide west of Whitsett Avenue. As a part of the Full BRT Alternative, a number of pedestrian amenities would be constructed within the Chandler Boulevard median. Along Chandler Boulevard, as well as along the entire alignment, all existing crossings of the MTA ROW would be retained. On the Jewish Sabbath and Jewish holidays, pedestrian signals would operate on a timer and would not need to be manually engaged. Two signalized mid-block crossings of the MTA ROW would be constructed along Chandler Boulevard, one at Agnes Avenue and the other at Goodland Avenue. Pedestrian paths would be constructed where feasible and where sidewalks do not currently exist.

Station platforms would be designed to accommodate three low-floor 40- to 45-foot buses or two 60-foot single-articulated buses. Buses would be powered by Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) or other clean fuel. Canopies, for shade and shelter, would partially cover the platforms. The station design would establish a unifying theme throughout the line, giving the busway corridor a clear visual and functional impression in the context of the Valley. Site amenities such as seating, lighting, bicycle racks/lockers, and ticket vending machines, would be included at each station. Every station may be equipped with an Advanced Travelers' Information System (ATIS), electronic signage that would inform travelers of the wait time until the next bus and provide other real-time transitway operating information.

Park-and-ride facilities at six stations would provide commuters with approximately 2,900 to 3,200 new parking spaces in addition to the existing parking spaces at the Metro Red Line station and at Balboa Boulevard, for a total of approximately 4,000 to 4,300 spaces. Pedestrian amenities and landscaping would be provided at the stations and park-and-ride lots. Thirteen stations would be provided in the following locations: North Hollywood Transit Center, Laurel Canyon Boulevard, Valley College (Fulton-Burbank), Woodman Avenue, Van Nuys Transit Center, Sepulveda Transit Center, Woodley Avenue, Balboa Boulevard, Reseda Boulevard, Tampa Avenue, Pierce College at Winnetka Avenue, De Soto Avenue, and Warner Center Transit Hub.

Lankershim/Oxnard On-Street Alignment and Weekend Service

To respond to potential community concerns in the Chandler Boulevard area, an alternative alignment was under consideration that would operate in mixed traffic flow on Lankershim Boulevard from the North Hollywood Metro Red Line station to Oxnard Street, and on Oxnard Street from Lankershim Boulevard to Woodman Avenue. In July 2001, the MTA Board directed that the Lankershim/Oxnard On-Street Alignment be studied as potential weekend service only for the Full BRT Alternative. In February 2002, the Board adopted (certified) the Full BRT Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative.

Minimum Operable Segment (MOS)

In the event funding was not available immediately for the full length of the busway, construction could have commenced in phases. The first phase would be called a “Minimum Operable Segment,” or MOS. The MOS integrates a shorter exclusive busway segment with bus transit projects already planned by LADOT along Oxnard Street and Victory Boulevard in the San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor. The result would be a transit corridor from North Hollywood to Warner Center, running partially on exclusive lanes and partially on-street. The MOS variation was not pursued because a funding shortfall did not materialize.

As a part of the MOS, an at-grade busway would be constructed on the MTA ROW between Woodman Avenue and Balboa Boulevard with the same characteristics as the full project busway described above. This section of the right-of-way traverses some of the most congested areas in the Valley, crossing Van Nuys Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, and the I-405. The traffic is particularly congested near Victory Boulevard and I-405. Buses, however, would still make the full North Hollywood to Warner Center trip, simply running on-street at either end of the busway.

From east to west, buses would leave the North Hollywood Metro Red Line station and head north, on-street, along Lankershim Boulevard to Oxnard Street. Buses would continue on-street west along Oxnard to Woodman Avenue. At Woodman, buses would enter the exclusive busway and continue west to Balboa, passing under the I-405 in an existing underpass. At Balboa, buses would again leave the busway and continue west on-street along Victory Boulevard. At Owensmouth Avenue in Warner Center, buses would head south to the planned Warner Center Transit Hub near the Promenade Shopping Center.



The MOS would have 13 stations, 4 along the busway and 9 on-street, located at the same north-south arterials as the full project busway stations. However, some stations would be shifted north or south of their full project locations in order to fall along Oxnard Street in the East Valley or Victory Boulevard in the West Valley. Five stations would have park and ride facilities (two existing). Busway stations would be similar in design to the stations described for the full busway.

Bus Maintenance Facilities

MTA Bus Divisions 8 and 15 are the logical locations for housing and maintaining the buses used for the busway. Division 8 is located in Chatsworth about 3.2 miles from the western terminus of the proposed busway. Division 15 is located in Sun Valley, about 6.8 miles from the North Hollywood terminus. Both divisions have CNG fueling capabilities. The need for expansion of bus maintenance facilities is based on the number and size (articulated vs. standard) of new buses required by an alternative.

Some excess capacity is available at both Divisions 8 and 15. This would accommodate the increase of 38 buses for the TSM alternative over No Build. Enough capacity is also expected to be available in these divisions to accommodate the number of new buses required by the BRT alternative and its variations. However, some modifications would be necessary at the divisions to accommodate articulated buses. Maintenance of articulated buses would be consolidated in one division, shifting standard buses to other divisions.

Three Rapid Bus Alternatives

The three RB Alternatives would place Rapid Buses in mixed flow traffic on the existing highway and roadway network. Unlike the BRT Alternative, the three RB Alternatives would not construct an exclusive busway or involve street and station improvements that would require property displacement, acquisition or relocation of homes and businesses. Rapid Bus decreases end-to-end travel time by limiting stops and implementing signal priority at intersections. Rapid Bus stops would be designed similar to those on the Ventura Boulevard Metro Rapid Bus route, would be located approximately one-mile apart, and would be located on the far side of the intersection, if feasible. Rapid Bus stop design includes a curved, translucent canopy supported by two poles that create a gate that marks the spot where the door of a Rapid Bus will arrive. Rapid Bus stops would also include an illuminated sign, a kiosk for advertising and system-wide information, and trash receptacles.

The particular multiple Rapid Bus routes analyzed in this Revised FEIR were identified based on information contained in the Decision, which mentioned comments suggesting a series of three or five east-west routes, which includes the network alternative proposed by COST.



Three East-West Rapid Bus Routes (RB-3) Alternative

The RB-3 Alternative consists of three new east-west Rapid Bus lines on Sherman Way, Vanowen Street, and Victory Boulevard. The North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station and the Warner Center Transit Hub would serve as the terminus Rapid Bus stops for each route.

Five East-West Rapid Bus Routes (RB-5) Alternative

The RB-5 Alternative consists of five new east-west Rapid Bus lines on Sherman Way, Victory Boulevard, Oxnard Street, Burbank Boulevard, and Chandler Boulevard. The North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station would serve as the eastern terminus layover stop for each route, except for the Sherman Way route. The Warner Center Transit Hub would serve as the western terminus stop for the Victory Boulevard route; each of the other four routes would have their own western terminus layover stops.

Rapid Bus Network (RB-Network) Alternative

The RB-Network Alternative consists of a network of nine Rapid Bus routes that would function as a grid by having a series of three east-west routes and six north-south routes. The three new east-west Rapid Bus lines would be on Devonshire Street, Roscoe Boulevard, and Victory Boulevard. The six new north-south Rapid Bus lines would be on San Fernando Road, Laurel Canyon Boulevard, Van Nuys Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, Reseda Boulevard, and Topanga Canyon Boulevard.

III. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the Project consists of the following documents, at a minimum:

- San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor Major Investment Study (2000);
- The Notice of Preparation and all other public notices issued by the MTA in conjunction with the Project;
- San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor Draft EIS/EIR;
- The San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor Final EIR, comprised of Volume 1, Volume 2 (consisting of all comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public comment period on the Draft EIS/EIR), Volume 3, and the Technical Appendices;
- The San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor Revised Final EIR;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the MTA Board in connection with the Project, and all documents cited or referred to therein;

- Any documents expressly cited in the foregoing documents, in addition to the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations; and
- Any other materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The custodian of the documents comprising the record of proceedings is Ms. Kathleen Sanchez, Metropolitan Transportation Authority, One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, California, 90012.

IV. FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would *substantially lessen* the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” (Emphasis added.) The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will *avoid* or *substantially lessen* such significant effects.” (Emphasis added.) Section 21002 goes on to state that “in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof.”

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Pub. Resources Code, ' 21081(a); CEQA Guidelines, ' 15091(a) and 15096(h).) For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The first such finding is that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (CEQA Guidelines, ' 15091(a)(1).) The second permissible finding is that “[s]uch changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.” (CEQA Guidelines, ' 15091(a)(2).) The third potential conclusion is that “[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.” (CEQA Guidelines, ' 15091(a)(3).) Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors.” CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: “legal” considerations.

The concept of “feasibility” also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (City of Del Mar vs. City of San Diego (1982), 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417.) “[F]easibility” under CEQA

encompasses “desirability” to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” (*Ibid.*; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn (1983)*, 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.)

Neither CEQA itself nor the CEQA Guidelines define the difference between “avoiding” a significant environmental effect and merely “substantially lessening” such an effect. The MTA must therefore glean the meaning of these terms from the other contexts in which the terms are used. Public Resources Code section 21081, on which CEQA Guidelines section 15091 is based, uses the term “mitigate” rather than “substantially lessen.” The CEQA Guidelines therefore equate “mitigating” with “substantially lessening.” Such an understanding of the statutory term is consistent with the policies underlying CEQA, which include the policy that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects.” (Pub. Resources Code, ' 21002.)

For purposes of these findings, the term “avoid” refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level. In contrast, the term “substantially lessen” refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a less than significant level. These interpretations appear to be mandated by the holding in *Laurel Hills*, *supra*, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521, in which the Court of Appeal held that an agency had satisfied its obligation to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects by adopting numerous mitigation measures, not all of which rendered the significant impacts in question (e.g., the “degradation to air quality”) less than significant.

Although CEQA Guidelines section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is “avoid[ed] *or* substantially lessen[ed],” these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been reduced to a less than significant level, or has simply been substantially lessened but remains significant.

Moreover, although section 15091, read literally, does not require findings to address environmental effects that an EIR identifies as merely “potentially significant,” these findings will nevertheless fully account for all such effects identified in the Final EIR and the Revised FEIR.

In short, CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, ' § 15091(a) and (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened either through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or a feasible environmentally superior alternative, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the

specific reasons why the agency found that the project’s economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits “rendered acceptable” its unavoidable adverse environmental effects.” (CEQA Guidelines, ' ' 15093, 15043(b); see also Pub. Resources Code, ' 21081(b).) The California Supreme Court has stated that, “[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any . . . development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (*Citizens of Goleta Valley vs. Board of Supervisors* (1990), 52 Cal.3d 553, 576.)

These findings constitute the MTA’s best efforts to set forth the rationales and support for its decision under the requirements of CEQA.

V. LEGAL EFFECTS OF FINDINGS

To the extent that these findings conclude that various proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR and Revised FEIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded, or withdrawn, MTA hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when MTA Board decisionmakers formally approve the Project.

The mitigation measures are also referenced in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted concurrently with these findings, and will be effectuated through the process of constructing and implementing the Project.

VI. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the BRT Project and has been adopted concurrently with these Findings. (See Pub. Resources Code, ' 21081.6(a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, ' 15097.) MTA uses the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period.

VII. SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The Revised Final EIR identified several significant environmental effects (or “impacts”) that the three RB Alternatives will cause as additional alternatives to the BRT Project. Some of these significant effects are lessened or made not significant by implementation of feasible mitigation measures. Others cannot be avoided by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternatives; however, these effects are outweighed by overriding considerations set forth in Section IX below. This Section (VII) presents in greater detail the MTA=s findings with respect to the environmental effects of the Project.

For each of the impacts associated with the Project, the following information is provided:

Description of Effects – A description of each environmental impact identified in the FEIR and Revised FEIR.

Proposed Mitigation – Mitigation measures or actions that are proposed for implementation as part of the Project.

Finding – The findings are those allowed by Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code. The findings are made in two parts. In the first part, a conclusion is made regarding the significance of the impact or effect. In the second part, which pertains only to those impacts found to be significant, one of three specific findings is made, in direct response to Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Rationale – A summary of the reasons for the conclusion.

Reference – A notation on the specific section in the FEIR and/or Revised FEIR that includes the evidence and discussion of the identified impact.

A. Transportation

Effects During Operation

1. *Effects on the Transportation System*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line or any RB Alternative would increase mode share on the MTA=s regional transportation system. They would increase transit ridership and decrease daily vehicle trips made by automobiles. These are all beneficial effects.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – None is required.



c. *Finding* – The impact(s) is/are found to be:

[X] Beneficial

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Increased transit ridership and decreased daily vehicle trips made by automobiles as a result of the Orange Line or any RB Alternative would result in slightly higher average travel speeds in the Valley, thereby relieving congestion of the Valley’s transportation system.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 3-1 and Section 8-3.2.2.

2. *Effects on San Fernando Valley Corridors*

a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line or any RB Alternative would result in a reduction in daily vehicle trips in the San Fernando Valley, thereby promoting improved travel along established corridors in the San Fernando Valley.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – None required.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) is/are found to be:

[X] Beneficial

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Any project that promotes a reduction in daily vehicle trips and improved travel along established corridors in the San Fernando Valley would have a beneficial effect.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 3-2 and Section 8-3.2.3.

3. *Localized Orange Line Crossings and Station Area Traffic Impacts*

a. *Description of Effects* – Implementation of the Orange Line would result in some local street intersections experiencing reductions in levels of service exceeding impact significance thresholds specified by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT). The following intersections would be so affected: Laurel Canyon Blvd./Chandler Blvd.; De Soto Ave./Victory Blvd.; Tampa Ave./Topham St.; Lankershim Blvd./Burbank Blvd.; Haskell St./Victory Blvd.; Sepulveda Blvd./Victory Blvd.; Sepulveda Blvd./Oxnard St.; Woodman Ave./Oxnard St.

None of the RB Alternatives would result in significant impacts to local street intersections.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – At each of the affected intersections, either additional turn lanes will be added to the intersection, or signal phasing will be adjusted, or retiming of the signal will be done. The selection of appropriate treatment for each intersection is identified in the FEIR.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Impacts at the affected intersections would largely result from distribution of station access traffic to the roadway system for each station area. The mitigation measures provided for the affected intersections are designed to facilitate movement of traffic at the intersections, thereby increasing the level of service. The following intersection impact thresholds were adopted by MTA in consultation with LADOT:

“An intersection is considered to be adversely affected if project traffic is projected to cause a deterioration in level of service to E and/or worse, or results in an increase in the average vehicle delay of 5.0 seconds or more at an intersection projected to operate at LOS E or worse under No Build conditions.”

After implementation of the proposed mitigation measures at each of the affected intersections, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level when measured against the impact threshold.

e. *FEIR Reference* – Section 3-3.

4. *Parking*

a. *Description of Effects* – Parking is provided at a number of Orange Line stations to facilitate access for park-and-ride patrons. Although not expected based on current supply-demand analyses, it is possible that excess parking demand could occur at some locations that could result in spill over parking into adjoining neighborhoods. The North Hollywood, Pierce College, and Oxnard/Reseda stations have been identified as such potential locations.



The three RB Alternatives do not include park-and-ride lots, so the traffic impacts around Rapid Bus stop areas would be minimal. However, some on-street parking spaces will be lost to accommodate the new bus stops. The new bus stops would generally be located on the far sides of intersections, separated from the local bus stops. It was determined that a total of 65 on-street spaces are likely to be removed as a result of the RB-3 Alternative, a total of 80 on-street spaces would be removed as a result of the RB-5 Alternative, and that a total of 150 on-street spaces would be removed as a result of the RB-Network Alternative. The Rapid Bus stops do not provide parking, so there is also the potential that some Rapid Bus patrons may attempt to park on nearby residential streets. Parking was not provided at these Rapid Bubs stops in order to reduce the potential for traffic impacts in the neighborhoods.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – MTA, in cooperation with LADOT, will monitor parking usage at selected BRT stations and RB stops 1 year after completion of the project and every 5 years as needed, and, if necessary, prepare parking management strategies to address spillover parking. If necessary, MTA will provide additional parking on MTA property.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The potential for spillover parking demand cannot be assessed until the project is operational. The mitigation proposed by MTA is designed to address the actual conditions that result from project operations, and MTA has committed to make MTA property available as part of the solution, if necessary. Potential impacts should therefore be reduced to a level of insignificance.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 3-4 and Section 8-3.3.



Effects During Construction

- a. *Description of Effects* – Construction of the Orange Line will result in temporary disruptions to local area traffic and congestion at varying locations along the corridor where construction activities are occurring. There will be temporary lane closures and possibly street closures, the location of which will be determined prior to construction. There may also be some loss of on-street parking at some locations, as yet undetermined, in the immediate vicinity of construction activities.

Constructing the three RB Alternatives would not require significant construction activities. The three RB Alternatives would only require putting additional Rapid Buses on the existing urban streets in the Valley, installing loop detectors prior to major intersections to provide transit priority, and establishing a number of new on-street curbside Rapid Bus stops. However, where new Rapid Bus stops would be established, a number of parking spaces would be temporarily displaced to enable workers to access the curbside sites. In addition, construction vehicles and workers' vehicles would temporarily occupy a number of parking spaces. Due to the very short-term nature of the construction activities, however, the loss of on-street parking would not constitute a significant impact.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – MTA will prescribe and construction contractors will carry out several mitigation measures (identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan) during the construction period, including: (a) implementation of work site traffic control and traffic circulation plans, (b) constraining or minimizing the number of street closures, (c) defining and adhering to preferred haul route plans, (d) coordinating BRT construction with other construction projects in the area, and (e) developing and adopting parking plans (including off-street parking for construction workers). In addition, LADOT will provide the latest versions of applicable contractor guidance regarding its requirements, signs, and traffic control plans.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:



[] Significant [X] Not Significant

- d. *Rationale for Finding:* The mitigation measures provided have been shown to be effective in managing and reducing temporary construction impacts. In combination, the measures are designed to address the issues that are most disruptive to local traffic flow and parking needs and reduce impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-2 and Section 8-5.

B. Land Use and Development

1. *Effects on Land Use and Bicycle Plan Consistency*

- a. *Description of Effects* – Implementation of the Orange Line would not result in the loss of a major land use in any specific area along the corridor. The Orange Line would be generally consistent with local land use and zoning. The *Bicycle Plan*, a portion of the *Transportation Element*, designates: 1) a Class I bikeway in the vicinity of the MTA ROW east of Balboa Boulevard, with the exception that a Class II bikeway or a commuter bikeway facility is allowable where there are physical or other constraints that preclude a Class I bikeway, and 2) a Class II bikeway along portions of Victory Boulevard (Laurel Canyon to I-405 and White Oak to De Soto) as a parallel alignment to provide flexibility in implementation of the MTA ROW and Los Angeles River Class I bikeways.

The RB Alternatives would not result in the partial or full loss of land use in a specific area. As such, no significant land use impact under CEQA would occur.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required. Both Class I and II bikeways were explored as part of Preliminary Engineering done for the project.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[X] No Effect

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Both Class I and II bikeways were explored as part of Preliminary Engineering done for the project. A right-of-way sufficient for a Class I bikeway has been provided, except in areas where there are physical or other constraints. In such areas, a Class II bikeway has been provided.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-1 and Section 8-4.1.

2. *Station Effects on Land Use Consistency*

- 1. *Description of Effects* – The siting of a Orange Line station on the campus of Pierce College at Winnetka Avenue would result in an inconsistency with an existing land use

designation; however, existing uses are already inconsistent at this site and the college has identified this site as its preference for the station location.

All three RB Alternatives would be inconsistent with portions of the following relevant plans because they would either be inconsistent with policies that encourage high-capacity transit corridors and stations as focal points for future development in the San Fernando Valley or with policies encouraging the construction of a transit system and/or transit stations specifically in the MTA ROW:

- SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide
- SCAG 2001 Regional Transportation Plan
- City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework
- City of Los Angeles General Plan Transportation Element
- Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan
- Reseda-West Van Nuys Community Plan
- Encino-Tarzana Community Plan
- Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan
- Warner Center Specific Plan

The three RB Alternatives would be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the above-mentioned plans. There are no feasible mitigation measures to eliminate, or substantially reduce, the significant land use impact.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required for the Pierce College station BRT siting. There are no feasible mitigation measures to eliminate, or substantially reduce, the significant land use impact.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.
- The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant



- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The current, nonconforming land use at the location of the Pierce College Winnetka station is a commercial use, which is consistent with a parking lot use at this location. The nearest residentially zoned properties are approximately 100 feet north of the proposed parking lot, just north of the MTA right-of-way. Pierce College has requested the siting of a station at Winnetka, and the current use is commercial, so no adverse, significant impact would occur.

The RB Alternatives are inconsistent with the Los Angeles General Plan Framework, its Transportation Element, the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, and a number of community plans, which would create a significant land use impact. Due to the overwhelming number of planning documents that set the policy direction of the region to concentrate future growth around along high-capacity transit corridors, it is unlikely that each of the plans' authors would abandon this central policy theme. Thus, mitigating the inconsistency impact is infeasible.

- e. FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference – Section 4-1 and Section 8-4.1.

3. *Effects on Development*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line would not, in and of itself, result in a large increase in development. No specific development projects are proposed in conjunction with the Project. Some station locations may be suitable for development projects, as yet undefined, and such projects may or may not occur, depending upon market conditions and other factors. The Sepulveda Orange Line station park-and-ride site has been identified as one potential location for such a development. At such time as development projects are identified, MTA may or may not participate in joint development proposals utilizing MTA-owned property connected with the Orange Line. Separate environmental clearance documents would be needed for such projects at the time they are identified.

The RB Alternatives would not result in substantial changes to existing land use patterns or future development of the area. Bus service is not incompatible with adjacent land uses, and would not result in the partial or full loss of land use in a specific area.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Should joint development proposals be identified, MTA will ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated to protect neighboring residential areas. With regard to the Orange Line's Sepulveda station site, such measures will be specifically identified to address the adjoining neighborhoods.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[] Significant [X] **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Definite joint development proposals have not been identified at the time of this writing and as such, no impacts would occur. However, measures have been incorporated to address potential impacts to neighborhood residents, should joint development proposals materialize in the future.



- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-1 and Section 8-4.1.

4. *Acquisitions Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line would result in the acquisition of 6 residential units.

The RB Alternatives would not require any full or partial acquisition of property or affect any lease agreements. No residences or businesses would be displaced.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Compensation will be provided in accordance with applicable state and federal law (see Section C, Acquisitions and Displacements).
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Since just compensation and relocation assistance will be provided in accordance with applicable state and federal law, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Sections 4-1 and 4-2; and Section 8-4.2.

5. *Proximity To Sensitive Land Uses Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – Some Orange Line stations will be located in close proximity to residential areas and in those locations there may be the potential for effects to be experienced by nearby residents, including noise and visual intrusion.

The RB Alternatives will not generate significant proximity affects.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – In addition to the installation of noise barriers (see Section J, Noise and Vibration) landscaping will be provided as a buffer where stations are close to residential-zoned areas.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Given the distance to and orientation of residential-zoned areas relative to the station areas in question, noise barriers will be effective in reducing noise impacts and landscaping will be effective in reducing visual impacts to below significant.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Sections 4-1.2 and Section 8-4..1.2

C. Acquisitions and Displacements

Effects During Operation

a. *Description of Effects* – Implementation of the Orange Line will require termination of an estimated 109 MTA lease agreements resulting in the displacement of an estimated 14 businesses and 16 outdoor advertising signs. Full acquisition of an estimated 7 parcels of private property will also be needed resulting in the displacement of an estimated 9 additional businesses. Six residential properties will also be displaced.

The RB Alternatives would not require any full or partial acquisition of property or affect any lease agreements. No residences or businesses would be displaced.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Property owners and businesses subject to acquisition that are outside the MTA ROW will be compensated and/or relocated in accordance with the provisions of the *Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies*

Act of 1970 and the *California Relocation Act*. Businesses displaced through termination of MTA leases may receive relocation assistance under both federal and state law, depending upon the terms of the individual lease agreement.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – MTA will adhere to all applicable state and federal laws with regard to providing just compensation and relocation assistance; therefore, impacts would be reduced to below significant.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-2 and Section 8-4.2.

Effects During Construction

a. *Description of Effects* – A limited number of temporary construction easements may be required for the Orange Line; the precise number and location of which have not as yet been determined. Such determination will be made as the design of the project moves forward in the Design/Build process.

For the RB Alternatives, no temporary construction easements are required.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Businesses displaced by either the termination of MTA leases or the acquisition of privately owned property outside of the MTA ROW, for construction easement purposes, will be compensated in the same manner as full acquisitions.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:



[] Significant [X] **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Since only a limited number of temporary construction easements would be required and eligible businesses would receive relocation assistance under the *Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act of 1970* and the *California Relocation Act*, impacts would be fully mitigated to below significant.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-3 and Section 8-5.3.

D. Demographics and Neighborhoods

Effects During Operation

1. *Mobility Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and the RB Alternatives would improve transit services for minority and low-income populations.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[X] **Beneficial**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Improved transit services offer a beneficial effect for populations that tend to be transit dependent.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-3 and Section 8-4.3.

2. *Neighborhood Access Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – Orange Line Stations would not eliminate legal street crossings and would add three new signalized crossings, including two mid-block crossings in the Orthodox Jewish community along Chandler Boulevard, and add pedestrian paths in the median where none currently exist.

For the RB Alternatives, no impairment of access to and from the neighborhoods adjacent to the routes and surrounding Rapid Bus stops will result because all existing legal crossing points (i.e. crosswalks and signalized intersections) would be maintained and no substantial facilities would be constructed.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[X] No Effect

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – No impacts would occur; the measures provided are intended to maintain and enhance pedestrian mobility in the adjoining neighborhoods.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-3 and Section 8-4.3.

3. *Demographic and Neighborhood Character Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – There would be no significant shift (gain or loss) in population, and the Project and RB Alternatives would be compatible with previous transportation uses of the corridor and neighborhood character. The Project and RB Alternatives would not affect neighborhood security, no new views into adjoining neighborhoods would be created, and security against crimes would be maintained through existing law enforcement practices and passive measures.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Landscaping gaps will be filled so that back yards and second stories are shielded from views and a sense of perceived security is restored to adjacent residential neighborhoods.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

The following additional finding is made:

[X] Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Since the project would not result in a substantial change to the neighborhood compared to existing conditions, and since mitigation is provided to maintain a sense of perceived security in neighborhoods and shield residents from views of the project from back yards, no impacts would occur.

- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-3 and Section 8-4.3.

Effects During Construction

1. *Employment Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – For the Project and RB Alternatives, some additional construction jobs would be generated; however, additional workers would likely commute from surrounding areas.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:
[X] Beneficial (Project only, for RB Alternatives “Not Significant”)
- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Since additional jobs are likely to be filled from the region, the project would essentially have no impact on the housing market within the project area.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-4 and Section 8-5.6.

2. *Nuisance Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – For the Project and RB Alternatives, there would be a temporary, localized, intermittent nuisance from changes in air quality, noise, vibration, glare, or reduced access associated with construction activities in small areas along major roadways.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required beyond measures related to transportation and parking, community facilities and services, visual and aesthetic conditions, air quality, noise and vibration, and safety and security.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:
[] Significant [X] Not Significant
- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Since effects would be temporary and intermittent and limited to small areas primarily along major roadways, they are not considered to be significant. Therefore no mitigation is required beyond measures related to transportation and parking, community facilities and services, visual and aesthetic conditions, air quality, noise and vibration, and safety and security.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-4 and Section 8-5.7.

E. Community Facilities and Services

Effects During Operation

1. Access to Facilities Effects

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and RB Alternatives would improve access to schools, libraries, and some religious facilities.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required or proposed.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Beneficial

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Increased access to community facilities is considered to be a beneficial effect.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-4 and 8-4.4.

2. Emergency Services Effects

- a. *Description of Effects* – The BRT, RB-3, RB-5 and RB-Network would not substantially increase demand for police and fire services or affect emergency response times.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required or proposed.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* - When no impacts occur, no mitigation is required.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-4 and Section 8-4.4.

Effects During Construction

1. Air Quality and Noise Effects

- a. *Description of Effects* – Earthwork during construction of the Orange Line may potentially generate localized dust in excess of permissible regulatory levels. Construction of the Orange Line may also potentially generate noise greater than the impact thresholds set forth in the FEIR.

For the RB Alternatives, there would be a potential marginal increase in accidents due to the increased Rapid Bus service, which would be offset as the number of automobiles on the road decreases with increasing public transit ridership. As Rapid Buses would only marginally affect traffic conditions, it would not negatively affect emergency access or evacuation routes.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Mitigation for temporary impairment of access will include implementation of Best Management Practices, adherence to local and state ordinances, and approval of a traffic management plan. Construction plans will be reviewed with emergency services personnel prior to construction and emergency vehicle access will be included in construction specifications. School officials will be consulted for their input in developing the least intrusive feasible construction process and to ensure maintenance of safe student walk routes and access for passenger vehicles and school buses. Crossing guards or flag men will be provided at construction sites in proximity to schools and where school pedestrian routes cross construction areas. Construction scheduling and haul routes will be sequenced to minimize conflicts with pedestrians, school buses, and vehicular traffic during school day arrivals and dismissals.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Impacts related to access, emergency response times, noise and air quality, and student safety have all been thoroughly addressed by the mitigation measures, which include a commitment to consult and coordinate with school officials on these matters. The resulting impacts are therefore anticipated to be below significant.
- e. FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference – Section 4-4 and Section 8-4.13.



F. Fiscal and Economic Conditions

Effects During Operation

1. *Employment Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project would generate approximately 1,078 FTE jobs.

The RB-3 Alternative would generate approximately 1,207 FTE jobs; the RB-5 Alternative would generate approximately 1,269 FTE jobs; and the RB-Network Alternative would generate approximately 1,745 FTE jobs.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.

- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Beneficial

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Generation of employment is considered to be a beneficial effect.

- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-5 and Section 8-4.5.

2. *Tax Revenue and Employment Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project would result in the loss of approximately 53 jobs and the annual loss of \$19,080 in tax revenue.

The RB Alternatives would not require any property acquisitions and therefore, would not result in the loss of jobs or tax revenue.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Relocation assistance will be provided. Once the businesses are relocated, it is anticipated that jobs may be restored to employees who may have lost their jobs during the relocation process. With regard to the loss of tax revenue, the loss is considered to be minor and no mitigation is available.

- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The loss of jobs is associated with the acquisition of 11 businesses that generate an estimated 53 jobs. Relocation assistance would be provided to displaced businesses. Once relocated, such businesses would once again provide employment for the individuals who may have lost their jobs. The temporary loss of jobs is not considered to be a significant impact. The small annual loss of tax revenue is not considered to be significant because it would be distributed among the county cities,



special districts, and school districts, and the actual loss to any one entity would not be substantial.

- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-5 and Section 8-4.5.

Effects During Construction

1. *Employment Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project would result in approximately 21,440 to 22,350 FTE jobs generated.

For the RB Alternatives, as only minor construction activities would be required, a very small number of construction jobs would be generated.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Beneficial For the Project

Not Significant For the RB Alternatives

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Generation of minor levels of employment is considered to be a beneficial effect.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-6 and Section 8-5.6.

2. *Nuisance Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The RB Alternatives would result in temporary, intermittent, localized construction-related impacts on air quality, noise, vibration, safety risks, aesthetics, visibility, and accessibility of businesses in the project area.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required for construction-related impacts beyond those provided in other subject areas.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Since they would be temporary, intermittent, and localized, impacts are considered to be not significant.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-6 and Section 8-5.

G. Visual and Aesthetic Conditions

Effects During Operation

- a. *Description of Effects* – For the Project, visual impacts would be minimal. The existing abandoned rail corridor would be landscaped, industrial leases would be terminated, and a busway and aesthetically designed stations would be constructed. Some mature trees would be removed.

For the RB Alternatives, the visual impacts would be minimal, as these alternatives would utilize the existing street system and construct visually and aesthetically unobtrusive Rapid Bus stops. Some street trees would be removed but would be replaced, as necessary.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – A certified arborist was retained to conduct an inspection of potentially affected eucalyptus trees. Removed trees shall be replaced with trees of similar qualities (evergreen, vertical, fast growing) consistent with Preliminary Engineering specifications. During design and construction, the busway alignment and placement of elements such as soundwalls, fences, and berms will avoid removing existing mature trees, where possible. The following Metro Art policies (based on FTA circular 9400.1A) will be applied: 1) Metro Art staff will form a Metro Art Advisory group to generate ideas, establish and monitor the budget, and select design teams; 2) design excellence will be an important criterion for selection of design team members; and 3) graphic signage and wayfinding elements will be designed to be logical and easy-to-read.

- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[] Significant [X] **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Since visual impacts are minimal they are not considered to be significant. The measures provided are intended to enhance the visual character of the existing abandoned rail corridor and create a pleasant visual context for the busway.

- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-6 and Section 8-4.6.

Effects During Construction

- a. *Description of Effects* – For the Project, there would be short-term visual impacts due to the presence of construction equipment and fences.

For RB Alternatives, only minor short-term visual impacts would occur due to the minor construction necessary to establish new RB stops and install loop detectors.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required or proposed.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[] Significant [X] **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – The visual effects would be short term and temporary and an enhanced transit corridor would be restored once construction is completed.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-7 and Section 8-5.7.

H. Air Quality

Effects During Operation

1. *Regional Effects*

a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and RB-3 Alternative would reduce daily regional emissions of three out of four criteria pollutants. The RB-5 Alternative would reduce daily regional emission of two out of four criteria pollutants. The RB-Network Alternative would reduce daily regional emissions of one out of four criteria pollutants.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation measures are required.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[X] **Beneficial**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Because the proposed Project would contribute to reduced emissions and would not produce substantial additional exceedances of state or federal standards, it would have a beneficial cumulative effect on air quality.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-7 and Section 8-4.7.

2. *State and Local Effects*

a. *Description of Effects* – The Project would result in a decrease in CO, NO_x, and PM₁₀ and a negligible increase in ROG concentrations. Criteria pollutants would not violate CFR 40 Part 51. The Project and RB Alternatives would not exceed the State one- or eight-hour CO standards.

The RB-3 Alternative would result in a decrease in CO, NO_x, and ROG and a negligible change in PM₁₀ emissions. The RB-5 Alternative would result in a decrease in CO and ROG and negligible change in NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions. The RB-Network Alternative would result in a decrease in CO and negligible change in NO_x, ROG and PM₁₀ emissions.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation measures are required.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – The air quality effects of the Project and RB Alternatives are to a large extent positive, in that production of a number of criteria pollutants are anticipated to decrease. The increase in ROG emissions would be de minimus. Air quality impacts are therefore considered to be not significant.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-7 and Section 8-4.7.

Effects During Construction

a. *Description of Effects* – Construction of the Orange Line would result in temporary increases in emissions and localized concentrations, at varying locations. CO, ROG, NO_x, and SO_x are not anticipated to exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds. Overlapping of construction phases would not increase these four criteria pollutants to a significant level. However, PM₁₀ emissions would exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold of 150 pounds per day (ppd), which would result in a short-term significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce PM₁₀ emissions to 235.26 ppd during the excavation/aggregate base placement phase of construction. However, the Full BRT would still exceed the SCAQMD threshold for PM₁₀ during the excavation/aggregate base placement phase. This is considered a significant short-term impact.

The RB Alternatives would result in very minor temporary increases in emissions generated by the construction of new on-street Rapid Bus stops and establishment of transit priority.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Mitigation measures designed to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants, and in particular PM₁₀ emissions, during construction include: minimizing use of diesel equipment, coordinating haul routes and staging areas with LADOT, using site wetting to reduce dust, covering haul trucks, sweeping streets in areas of dust production, following SCAQMD Rule 403 for dust control, suspending grading in high winds, applying water to disturbed surface areas to maintain a stabilized surface, applying chemical stabilizers to disturbed surface areas within 5 days of grading completion, applying water to all unpaved roads every 2 hours of construction activity, and reducing vehicular speeds to 15 mph on unpaved roads.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant For the Project

Significant **Not Significant** For the RB Alternatives



For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.
- The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – For the Project, although the proposed feasible mitigation measures would lessen the temporary and localized construction air quality impact, they may not be able to reduce the resultant impact at all times to less than significant.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-8 and Section 8-5.8.

I. Energy

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project would decrease energy consumption compared to the No Build Alternative by 108 billion BTUs and compared to the TSM Alternative by 48 billion BTUs.

The RB-3 Alternative would decrease energy consumption compared to No Build by 72 billion BTUs and compared to TSM, by 12 billion BTUs. The RB-5 Alternative would decrease energy consumptions compared to No Build by 63 billion BTUs and compared to TSM by 3 billion BTUs. The RB-Network Alternative would decrease energy consumption compared to TSM by 9 million BTUs.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Beneficial

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – A decrease in energy consumption results in less energy production emissions that contribute to the impairment of air quality. Further, a reduction in energy consumption reduces the demand on limited energy supplies. Thus, a reduction of energy consumption is desirable and is considered to be a beneficial environmental effect.



- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-8 and Section 8-4.8.

J. Noise and Vibration

Effects During Operation

1. Noise

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project would affect an estimated 454 noise-sensitive receptors.

The RB-3 Alternative would affect 198 noise-sensitive receptors. The RB-5 Alternative would affect 848 noise-sensitive receptors. The RB-Network Alternative would affect 984 noise-sensitive receptors.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – The following mitigation measures would be implemented: 1) Quieter Vehicles. Include noise limits in the vehicle specifications to minimize vehicle noise emissions and 2) Sound Barriers. Install soundwalls and/or berms along the alignment to block the sound path. (See Preliminary Engineering drawings for locations.) The following measure will be implemented if the first two mitigation measures do not reduce noise impacts to below significant. 3) Sound Insulation. Noise control would be used at the receivers, including replacing or improving windows, weather stripping doors, and installing central air-conditioning systems.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**



- d. *Rationale for Finding* – With implementation of all mitigation measures, including sound insulation, no sensitive receptors would experience residual impacts and all impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-9 and Section 8-4.9.

2. *Vibration*

- a. *Description of Effects* – Operation of the Project would potentially cause vibration impacts exceeding FTA vibration criteria at one sound studio.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Vibration Reduction Measures. If an adverse significant impact materializes after construction of the sound studio and the Orange Line, MTA will employ appropriate mitigation measures to reduce the resultant impact to a level of insignificance. Among the measures that may be employed are a vibration reduction trench and a reduction in bus speed.

For the RB Alternatives, no potentially significant vibration impacts would occur.

- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – In the vibration reduction measures, MTA has made a commitment to use appropriate measures to reduce vibration impacts to the sound studio resulting from operation of the project to below significant.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-9 and Section 8-4.9.

Effects During Construction

1. *Noise*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project would result in noise exceeding annoyance levels at locations nearby to construction activities. This effect would be temporary and intermittent.

Construction of new curbside Rapid Bus stops and establishment of transit priority would generate temporary, intermittent increases in noise levels for the RB Alternatives.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Proposed mitigation includes: 1) installing temporary soundwalls and using property line noise limits in construction specifications and 2) requiring the contractor to adhere to site and equipment specifications.

- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Even with strict adherence to mitigation measures, during construction there would be the potential for noise levels to reach the annoyance level at nearby locations.

- e. *FEIR Reference* – Section 5-9.

2. *Vibration*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The BRT, RB-3, RB-5 and RB-Network Alternatives would result in the potential for localized vibration exceeding annoyance levels.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Construction specifications for vibration limits will be used. Vibration monitoring at affected residences will be conducted and limitations will be placed on areas of high-vibration activity.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Vibration monitoring at affected residences and limitation of high-vibration activities are expected to reduce construction vibration levels to below significant.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-9 and Section 8-5.9.

K. Geotechnical Considerations

Effects During Operation

1. *Landform, Mineral, Subsidence, and Contaminated Soils Effects*

a. *Description of Effects* – No major landform alterations or mineral loss would occur as a result of the Project or RB Alternatives. There is no evidence that subsidence is currently occurring within the project area. The Project and RB Alternatives would not result in public exposure to contaminated soils.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

No Effect



- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The BRT, RB-3, RB-5 or RB-Network Alternatives were found not to have an effect on the subject areas.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-10 and Section 8-4.10.

2. *Earthquake Fault Zone Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – For the Project, no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones cross the proposed corridor. A fault may cross between the Laurel Canyon and North Hollywood stations.

For the RB Alternatives, a fault may cross Chandler Boulevard in the southeastern portion of the Valley. However, no major structures designed for human occupancy would be built.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – A comprehensive fault rupture hazard investigation will be performed and appropriate design changes will be made during final design.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The mitigation measures proposed, in combination with further details to be developed during the final design phase, have been proven to be effective in reducing the potential impacts of fault rupture to below significant.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-10 and Section 8-4.10.

3. *Seismic Settlement and Liquefaction Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and the RB Alternatives would not substantially increase the level of risk of seismic settlement. Soils in the project area are potentially liquefiable and could affect structures during earthquakes.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – A detailed geotechnical investigation will be performed to delineate specific areas of potential liquefaction or settlement. Further details will be developed during the final design phase.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

The following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – The mitigation measures proposed, in combination with further details to be developed during the final design phase, have been proven to be effective in reducing the potential impacts of seismic settlement and liquefaction to below significant.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-10 and Section 8-4.10.

Effects During Construction

1. *Soil Stability Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – For the Project, the construction of an underpass under Interstate 405 may require excavation into sloped embankments underneath the freeway, thereby requiring slope stability considerations to be incorporated into the project.

For the RB Alternatives, no improvement would occur on undeveloped land. Only superficial subsurface work would be required.



- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[X] No Effect

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Design slopes will be approved by a geotechnical engineer; therefore no effect on slope stability is anticipated.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-10 and Section 8-5.10.

2. *Hazardous Materials Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and RB Alternatives may encounter subsurface hazardous materials during construction. Hazardous materials will also be present onsite during construction.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Remediation and cleanup will be conducted as required by applicable regulations.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

The following additional finding is made:

[X] Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Since remediation and cleanup will be conducted according to applicable laws and regulations that are protective of the public from harmful exposure, no significant impacts are anticipated.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-10 and Section 8-5.10.



L. Biological Resources

Effects During Operation

1. *Habitat, Wildlife Corridor, and Habitat Conservation Plan Effects*

a. *Description of Effects* – The routes of the Project and RB Alternatives do not support habitat for protected species; does not include any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or native nursery sites; and is not part of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan. The Project and RB Alternatives would not indirectly affect wildlife, wildlife dispersion corridors, or sensitive species.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[X] No Effect

d. *Rationale for Finding* – The project would have no effect on the specified resources.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-11 and Section 8-4.11.

2. *Riparian Habitat and MBTA-Related Effects*

a. *Description of Effects* – For the Orange Line, runoff could marginally affect riparian habitat and other vegetation downstream of the Los Angeles River crossing. Removal of active bird nests is not expected to occur during operation of the Project. The discussion of the effects on the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in Section 4-11.4.4 of the Final EIR was in error. See Final EIR Section 5-11 for a discussion of this topic.

The RB Alternatives would not conflict with established policies and would not remove active bird nests.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – The Project will be required to comply with applicable provisions of sections 401 and 402 of the Federal Clean Water Act.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[] Significant [X] **Not Significant**

The following additional finding is made:

[X] Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

- The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.
- Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Although the potential impacts are considered to be not significant, the specified measures will be implemented to ensure that effects to biological resources are minimized and therefore below significant.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-11 and Section 8-4.11.

Effects During Construction

- a. *Description of Effects* – Construction of the Orange Line would result in the potential for removal of trees containing nesting birds, subject to Migratory Bird Treaty Act requirements. It would also create the potential for construction runoff to enter subsurface waters having downstream biological value.

For RB Alternatives, although some ornamental street trees would be removed where new Rapid Bus stops would be established, the trees would be replaced, as necessary.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – An ornithologist will be used to survey the construction zone and provide guidance with regard to preconstruction procedures and practices, including the removal of trees outside the nesting season, such that both avoidance of occupied nests and a straightforward construction process can be maintained. A separation distance of at least 100 feet will be maintained between active nests and construction activity. With regard to construction runoff affecting downstream surface waters, the project will comply with Section 404 and 1601 requirements, as applicable.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

- The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

- Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The mitigation measures that will be implemented have been shown to be effective in other transportation projects in southern California in reducing the potential impacts to below significant.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-11 and Section 8-5.11.

M. Water Resources

Effects During Operation

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line would create a relatively minor increase in impervious surfaces resulting in a small increase in runoff. The Orange Line would be separated from the water table and would not substantially affect groundwater resources or beneficial uses. The Orange Line would include new bridges across flood control channels that either span the channel or would be compatible with the hydraulic design capacity of the channel.

The RB Alternatives would not increase impervious surfaces and would not affect groundwater resources. These alternatives would use existing roads and bridges to cross flood hazard zones.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Runoff will be managed by Best Management Practices and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan under NPDES permit requirements. Consideration will be given in final design to alternative methods to collect and discharge runoff that foster conservation. Piezometers will be installed, as necessary, and monitored to better establish groundwater conditions. Final design of the bridge across the Los Angeles River and other water crossings will be reviewed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and L.A. County Flood Control District to ensure adequate hydraulic capacity. Site-specific design accommodations will be made to structures and drainage facilities within the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin. Design/build specifications will require consultation with the U.S. Army Corps.

- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

The following additional finding is made:



Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Although impacts are not significant, the specified measures will be implemented in accordance with applicable state and federal laws to ensure that effects remain below significant.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-12 and Section 8-4.12.

Effects During Construction

a. *Description of Effects* – Construction of the Orange Line would create the potential for runoff containing construction contaminants to flow into surface waters.

The RB Alternatives would require only very minor construction and would not deplete or contaminate groundwater or surface water. These alternatives would not place new development in areas susceptible to 100-year flooding.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – The project will comply with regulatory and permit requirements regarding runoff. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Best Management Practices will be implemented.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

[] Significant [X] **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Regulatory and permit requirements substantially limit construction contaminants in surface water runoff. The measures that have been proposed will ensure that impacts to water resources resulting from construction of the project are below significant.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-12 and Section 8-5.12.

N. Safety and Security

Effects During Operation

1. *Emergency Response Effects*

a. *Description of Effects* – The Project would not affect emergency response times.

The RB Alternatives would only marginally affect traffic conditions, and thus, would not negatively affect emergency access or evacuation routes.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[X] **No Effect**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Because existing street crossings will not be eliminated and current routes will be maintained, emergency response times would be the same with or without the project and thus the project would have no effect.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-13 and Section 8-4.13.

2. *Effects Related to Bus Accidents and Crime*

a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line would have the potential to result in a marginal increase in bus accidents; however, net benefits are likely due to improved signalization, additional warning signs, standard and conspicuous intersections with curbing and crosswalk markings, and use of the exclusive busway. The Project may result in an extremely small increase in crime, or crime may remain unchanged or be reduced as a result of added surveillance, monitoring equipment, or communications devices. Security against crimes would be maintained through both existing law enforcement practices and passive measures.

The RB Alternatives have the potential for a marginal increase in bus accidents due to the additional number of revenue vehicle-miles per year. However, these alternatives would enhance existing transit service in the Valley, and by attracting new riders from automobiles, would offset the marginal increase for potential accidents.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Improvements in safety associated with enhanced signalization are expected to offset any marginal increases in bus accidents. It is anticipated that any marginal increase in crime would be offset by security features built into the project.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-13 and Section 8-4.13.

Effects During Construction

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line would result in the potential for public exposure to hazardous construction activities.

The RB Alternatives would result in very minor construction and would not result in significant exposure to hazardous construction activities.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – The following measures will be implemented: (1) consult with emergency and school officials, (2) maintain safe walking areas to/from schools, (3) use flag men and crossing guards where appropriate, and (4) arrange the construction schedule to minimize conflicts with pedestrians, as practicable.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

- The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.
- Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:



Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The mitigation measures have been shown to be effective in other construction projects in southern California. Implementation of the indicated measures is expected to reduce impacts to below significant.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-13 and Section 8-5.13.

O. Cultural Resources

Effects During Operation

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and RB Alternatives would not result in any significant direct or indirect effects to cultural resources.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The project would not affect cultural resources.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-14 and Section 8-4.14.

Effects During Construction

- a. *Description of Effects* – Construction of the Orange Line would create the potential for encountering archaeological and human remains.

For the RB Alternatives, construction would require only minor subsurface disturbance on existing streets and sidewalks that would be highly unlikely to unearth archeological or scientific resources.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – If buried archaeological remains are encountered during construction activities, the activities will cease until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the significance of the site and made a determination of eligibility for listing in the National Register and a treatment plan has been implemented. If human remains are exposed during construction, pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Code 5097.98.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Implementation of the specified mitigation measures will protect archaeological and human remains and reduce potential impacts to below significant.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 5-14 and Section 8-5.14.

P. Other Impact Considerations

Indirect Effects

1. *Local and Regional Air Quality Effects*

a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and RB Alternatives may result in indirect effects related to transportation through benefits in local and regional air quality and congestion as transit ridership increases and daily vehicle trips on highways decrease.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Beneficial

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Improvements in air quality are considered to be a beneficial effect.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 and Section 8-4.16.1.8.

2. *Land Use Effects*

a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line may result in indirect effects related to land use through joint-use development opportunities at station areas and along the right-of-way.



The RB Alternatives would be located in existing developed areas and would not independently result in future new development. The three RB alternatives would unlikely create indirect effects related to land use and development.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – None required, other than following local planning policies.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Development that is consistent with applicable local land use plans and objectives is considered not to have a significant impact and may have some indirect benefits to the community, particularly with respect to economic development potential, new employment, and new housing.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 and Section 8-4.16.1.2.

3. *Community Facilities and Services Effects*

a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and RB Alternatives would result in indirect effects related to community facilities and services through increased transit access.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Beneficial

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Increased transit access to public facilities would represent a beneficial indirect effect of the proposed project.

e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 and Section 8-4.16.1.5.

4. *Fiscal and Economic Conditions Effects*

a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and RB Alternatives would result in indirect effects to fiscal and economic conditions as businesses would be served by a more efficient transit system with regional links.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.

c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Beneficial

d. *Rationale for Finding* – Businesses in the project area would be served by a more efficient transit system with links to the entire region. The resulting improvements in the

business climate would be a beneficial indirect effect of the proposed project. The proposed project would also have indirect effects on employment and economic output as described in Section 4-5 and Section 5-6.

- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 and Section 8-4.16.1.6.

5. *Biological Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line may potentially result in minor indirect biological effects from pollutants entering the Los Angeles River, but the design of the storm water conveyances prevent significant degradation in water quality.

The RB Alternatives would utilize existing roads and would not result in new crossings of the Los Angeles River or its tributaries. The three RB alternatives would be unlikely to have indirect effects related to biological resources.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – See Section L, Biological Resources, Effects During Operation.

- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

The following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – Mitigation has been proposed that is expected to minimize any indirect significant effects.

- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 and Section 8-4.16.1.12.

6. *Noise and Vibration Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line would result in short-term indirect noise and vibration effects associated with construction activities potentially affecting neighborhoods outside the project area, which could include sensitive receptors.



The RB Alternatives would result in minor construction necessary to establish new on-street RB stops, and some residences and other sensitive noise receptors in the community may experience temporary, short-term disruptions.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – See Sections A, Transportation and J, Noise and Vibration, Effects During Construction.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

Potentially Significant Not Significant

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

- The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.
- Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant **Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – By adhering to preferred haul route plans and construction contract specifications, indirect impacts to sensitive receptors will be reduced to below significant.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 and Section 8-4.16.1.10.

Cumulative Effects

1. Transportation, Land Use and Development, Community Facilities and Services, Fiscal and Economic Conditions, Air Quality, and Energy Effects

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Orange Line would not result in adverse cumulative effects and would result in some beneficial cumulative effects related to transportation, land use and development, community facilities and services, fiscal and economic conditions, air quality, and energy.



The RB Alternatives would result in cumulative significant effects to land use and development that do not have feasible mitigation measures to eliminate, or substantially reduce, the significant impacts.

- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[X] Beneficial for the Project

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The effects of the proposed project, 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. Daily countywide bus boardings would increase, countywide daily vehicle trips would decrease as a result of transit improvements, and daily vehicle miles of travel would also decrease. Average speeds on the countywide roadway system would improve from a No Build speed of just under 25 miles per hour to as much as 27 miles per hour. Overall, therefore, implementation of the proposed busway project would have beneficial cumulative effects on transit and transportation in both the Valley and the County as a whole.

The BRT Alternative would support existing land use plans. This would represent a beneficial cumulative effect of the proposed project on land use. The RB-3, RB-5 and RB-Network Alternatives would require amendments to plans that call for the construction of a transit system and/or stations within 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.

Transit access to these community facilities and services would be improved as the proposed project and other transit improvements are implemented. Since the addition of new transit service would broaden the range of community accessibility at the system level, this would be a beneficial cumulative effect of the BRT, RB-3, RB-5 or RB-Network Alternatives.

It is reasonable to conclude that a beneficial cumulative effect on tax and fee revenues would occur because the BRT, in conjunction with other projects (e.g., Warner Center phased development) would likely add significantly to the revenue base in the corridor and the region. Such beneficial effects would almost certainly outweigh the losses due to property acquisition as a result of the BRT Alternative. As the RB-3, RB-5 and RB-Network Alternatives would not acquire any property, these alternatives would not contribute to the displacement of any jobs or the loss of tax and fee revenues.

The BRT would reduce daily regional emissions of 3 out of 4 criteria pollutants in the corridor. The various other related transportation and transit projects should result in

additional emissions reductions, corresponding to the increase in public transit ridership, HOV usage, and travel speeds that would occur. 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 proposed project would contribute to reduced emissions at the corridor level and would not produce substantial additional exceedances of state or federal standards, it would have a beneficial cumulative effect. The three RB alternatives would reduce emissions of between 1 and 3 criteria pollutants, depending on which alternative, and would similarly result in a beneficial cumulative effect on air quality.

The BRT, RB-3, RB-5 and RB-Network 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. Insofar as automobile travel may be decreased as a result of the proposed project, there may be some savings in energy consumption by the proposed project. This would be considered a beneficial cumulative effect.

Significant Not Significant For the RB Alternatives

For those impacts that are found to be significant, the following additional finding is made:

Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project that avoid or lessen the effect.

The lead agency lacks the jurisdiction to make the changes, but another agency does have such authority.

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives.

The impact(s) subsequent to mitigation is/are found to be:

Significant Not Significant For the RB Alternatives

d. *Rationale for Finding* – The RB Alternatives are inconsistent with the Los Angeles General Plan Framework, its Transportation Element, the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, and a number of community plans would create a significant land use impact. The RB Alternatives would not provide high-capacity transit corridors that would attract concentrated growth in the City of Los Angeles and its communities. Thus, the RB Alternatives would cause a cumulative impact of unfocused growth and its resultant indirect impacts, such as traffic identified in the General Plan Framework. Due to the overwhelming number of planning documents that set the policy direction of the region to concentrate future growth around along high-capacity transit



corridors, it is unlikely that each of the plans' authors would abandon this central policy theme. Thus, mitigating the inconsistency impact is infeasible.

- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 Section 8-4.16.2.3.

2. *Productivity and Quality of Life Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and RB Alternatives would maintain and enhance productivity and general quality of life in San Fernando Valley and greater Los Angeles.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[X] Beneficial

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – See the discussion under Cumulative Effects (above) related to transportation, land use and development, community facilities and services, fiscal and economic conditions, air quality, and energy.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 and Section 8-4.16.

3. *Construction Effects*

- a. *Description of Effects* – Short-term uses of the environment include temporary, localized traffic obstructions, air emissions, noise, vibration, light, and glare near construction activities.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[] Significant [X] Not Significant

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – To the extent that the Project and the other projects in the region may proceed within a similar period of time or in close geographic proximity, there may be some cumulative effects resulting from their construction. A coincidence of construction activities would tend to exacerbate the effects of each project. In other words, individually limited effects could, through an additive or synergistic process, become cumulatively considerable. The most probable cumulative effects would be expected in air quality and traffic. The relative intensity of these effects would depend on such factors as time, location, and duration.

To some degree, the potential cumulative effects of the proposed busway and other projects have already been considered in the analyses of local and regional traffic and air quality. The assessments of air quality and traffic impacts take into account that, even

with some level of anticipated development, a net improvement in the background environmental setting would result from the implementation of regional transportation and air quality plans (i.e., the RTP and AQMP). In fact, as Section H (Air Quality) indicates, the proposed busway would tend to cumulatively contribute to a reduction in regional emissions as transit ridership increases and automobile use decreases.

- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 and Section 8-4.16.

Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources Effects

- a. *Description of Effects* – The Project and RB Alternatives would involve the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of a range of natural, physical, human and fiscal resources, primarily for construction.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[X] Beneficial

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The commitment of resources to construct and operate the proposed project 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.
- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 and Section 8-4.16.5.

Growth Inducement Effects

- a. *Description of Effects* – The project would not cause any significant unplanned growth.
- b. *Proposed Mitigation* – No mitigation is required.
- c. *Finding* – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

[] Significant **[X] Not Significant**

- d. *Rationale for Finding* – The Project would not be expected to cause any significant unplanned growth within the proposed project corridor or the region, though it may tend to redirect or focus some of the already anticipated growth in the corridor to those areas in the vicinity of certain busway stations. Some stations areas may become more attractive given the improved accessibility provided by the proposed project, 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).

Additional development in the Warner Center area is anticipated; however, this development will be phased according to the *Warner Center Specific Plan*. The phases

of development at Warner Center depend on certain transportation-related criteria, including a transit system such as the proposed busway project. Thus, any development in Warner Center that is encouraged by the proposed busway would only occur in accordance with specified planning regulations.

The Project may also provide opportunities for joint development along the Orange Line. While no specific plans for such development are included as part of the proposed project and would depend on many factors outside the scope of the MTA's authority, development could potentially include surface and/or airspace improvements at stations, at locations within the remaining right-of-way, or at any other property in the vicinity that is owned by or otherwise under the control of the MTA. Under a joint use or joint development project, the MTA could develop uses that are compatible with the proposed transit use and are consistent with local land use plans and objectives (e.g., Warner Center Specific Plan, and planned activities in the North Hollywood Arts and Entertainment District).

The three RB 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).

- e. *FEIR and Revised FEIR Reference* – Section 4-16 and Section 8-4.16.6.



VIII. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

A. Alternatives Considered in the Final EIR

The Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor considered five alternatives. These five alternatives were described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR. The five alternatives considered were:

1. **No Build** - The “No Build” Alternative reflects conditions in the San Fernando Valley if no new transit improvements are made in the next twenty years. The No Build would include existing commitments, such as the Metro Rapid Bus demonstration project along Ventura Boulevard and High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes along some freeways in the Valley. This alternative is used in comparison with “build” alternatives in order to better understand their impacts.
2. **Transportation System Management (TSM)** - The TSM Alternative is a federally mandated “basic improvements” alternative. In other words, the TSM is composed of low-cost, non-capital intensive enhancements to transit service in the Valley. The San Fernando Valley TSM Alternative is largely composed of increasing the frequency of transit service along major arterials.
3. **Full Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) (Now, the Orange Line)** - The Full BRT Alternative under consideration is a bus rapid transit system along an exclusive busway between the North Hollywood Metro Red Line station and the Warner Center Transit Hub along the former Southern Pacific Burbank Branch right-of-way (SP ROW; now known as the MTA ROW). This BRT alternative also includes the Valley-wide bus service improvements of the TSM alternative, plus additional transit service improvements along some north-south arterials that intersect the busway.
4. **Lankershim/Oxnard On-Street Alignment and Weekend Service** – This alternative was a response to potential community concerns in the Chandler Boulevard area. This alternative alignment would operate in mixed traffic flow on Lankershim Boulevard from the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station to Oxnard Street, and on Oxnard Street from Lankershim Boulevard to Woodman Avenue. In July 2001, the MTA Board directed that the Lankershim/Oxnard On-Street Alignment be studied as potential weekend service only for the Full BRT Alternative.
5. **Minimum Operable Segment (MOS)** – This alternative was studied in the event that funding would not be available immediately for the full length of the BRT busway. This alternative would allow construction to commence in phases. The first phase would have been called a “Minimum Operable Segment,” or MOS. The MOS integrates a shorter exclusive busway segment with bus transit projects already planned by LADOT along Oxnard Street and Victory Boulevard in the San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor. The result would be a transit corridor from the North Hollywood Metro Red

Line Station to the Warner Center Transit Hub, running partially on exclusive lanes and partially on-street. The MOS variation was not pursued because a funding shortfall did not occur.

In July 2001, the MTA Board selected the Full BRT Alternative including the alignment along the Chandler Boulevard median as the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Final EIR. In addition, the Board directed staff to study the Lankershim/Oxnard On-Street Alignment variation for potential weekend service should the Board choose to not operate on Chandler Boulevard on weekends.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE REVISED FEIR

Three RB Alternatives considered in the Revised FEIR are (1) the Three East-West Rapid Bus Routes, (2) the 5 East-West Rapid Bus Routes, and (3) the Rapid Bus Network. The following is a detailed description of these alternatives considered:

1. **Three East-West Rapid Bus Routes (RB-3)** – This alternative consists of three new east-west Rapid Bus lines on Sherman Way, Vanowen Street, and Victory Boulevard. The North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station and the Warner Center Transit Hub would serve as the terminus stops for each route. The following are descriptions of the RB-3 routes that comprise this alternative:
 - **Sherman Way** – The total length of this route would be approximately 16.5 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - The route would start at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station and travel north on Lankershim Boulevard;
 - Turn west on Sherman Way;
 - Turn south on Topanga Canyon Boulevard;
 - Turn east on Oxnard Street; and
 - Turn north on Owensmouth Avenue and immediately stop at the Warner Center Transit Hub for layover.
 - From the Warner Center Transit Hub layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn west on Erwin Street,
 - Turn north on Topanga Canyon Boulevard,
 - Turn east on Sherman Way,
 - Turn south on Lankershim Boulevard, and
 - Turn east into the Rapid Bus parking lot at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station where it would layover.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.



- **Vanowen Street** – The total length of this route would be approximately 15.5 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - ❑ The route would start at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station and travel north on Lankershim Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn west on Vanowen Street;
 - ❑ Turn south on Owensmouth Avenue; and
 - ❑ Layover at the Warner Center Transit Hub.
 - ❑ From the Warner Center Transit Hub layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn west on Oxnard Street,
 - ❑ Turn north on Topanga Canyon Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn east on Erwin Street;
 - ❑ Turn north on Owensmouth Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn east on Vanowen Street,
 - ❑ Turn south on Lankershim Boulevard, and
 - ❑ Turn east into the Rapid Bus parking lot at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station where it would layover.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Victory Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 14.5. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - ❑ The route would start at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station and travel northwest on Lankershim Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn west on Victory Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn south on Owensmouth Avenue; and
 - ❑ Layover at the Warner Center Transit Hub.
 - ❑ From the Warner Center Transit Hub layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn west on Oxnard Street,
 - ❑ Turn north on Topanga Canyon Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn east on Erwin Street;
 - ❑ Turn north on Owensmouth Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn east on Victory Boulevard,
 - ❑ Turn southeast on Lankershim Boulevard, and
 - ❑ Turn east into the Rapid Bus parking lot at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station where it would layover.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

2. **Five East-West Rapid Bus Routes (RB-5)** – This alternative consists of five new east-west Rapid Bus lines on Sherman Way, Victory Boulevard, Oxnard Street, Burbank Boulevard, and Chandler Boulevard. The North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station



would serve as the eastern terminus layover stop for each route, except for the Sherman Way route. The Warner Center Transit Hub would serve as the western terminus stop for the Victory Boulevard route; each of the other four routes would have their own western terminus layover stops. The following are descriptions of the RB-5 routes that comprise this alternative:

- **Sherman Way** – The total length of this route would be approximately 13.5 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - The route would start at the intersection of Sherman Way and Vineland Avenue and travel west on Sherman Way;
 - The western layover stop would be at the intersection of Sherman Way and Topanga Canyon Boulevard.
 - From the western layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn north on Topanga Canyon Boulevard;
 - Turn east on Wyandotte Street;
 - South on Vassar Street;
 - East on Sherman Way;
 - North on Vineland Avenue;
 - East on Saticoy Street;
 - South on Clybourn Avenue, and
 - West on Sherman Way to its layover stop at Vineland Avenue.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Victory Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 14.5. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - The route would start at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station and travel northwest on Lankershim Boulevard;
 - Turn west on Victory Boulevard;
 - Turn south on Topanga Canyon Boulevard;
 - Turn east on Oxnard Street, and
 - Turn north on Owensmouth Avenue and layover at the Warner Center Transit Hub.
 - From the Warner Center Transit Hub layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn west on Erwin Street;
 - Turn north on Topanga Canyon Boulevard;
 - Turn east on Victory Boulevard;
 - Turn southeast on Lankershim Boulevard, and
 - Turn east into the Rapid Bus parking lot at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station where it would layover.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Oxnard Street** – The total length of this route would be approximately 6 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - The route would start at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station and travel northwest on Lankershim Boulevard;
 - Turn west on Oxnard Street;
 - Turn north on Kester Avenue;
 - Turn west on Victory Boulevard;
 - Turn south on Sepulveda Boulevard; and
 - Turn east on Oxnard Street and stop at the layover stop.
 - From the western layover stop the Rapid Bus would continue east on Oxnard Street;
 - Turn southeast on Lankershim Boulevard, and
 - Turn east into the Rapid Bus parking lot at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station where it would layover.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Burbank Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 10.8 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - The route would start at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station and travel northwest on Lankershim Boulevard;
 - Turn west on Burbank Boulevard;
 - The western layover stop would be at the intersection of Burbank Boulevard and Reseda Boulevard;
 - From the western layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn south on Reseda Boulevard;
 - Turn northwest on Ventura Boulevard;
 - Turn east on Burbank Boulevard;
 - Turn southeast on Lankershim Boulevard; and
 - Turn east into the Rapid Bus parking lot at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station where it would layover.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Chandler Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 4.3 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:



- ❑ The route would start at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station and travel north on Lankershim Boulevard;
- ❑ Turn west on Chandler Boulevard;
- ❑ Turn north on Van Nuys Boulevard;
- ❑ The western layover stop would be at the intersection of Van Nuys Boulevard and Burbank Boulevard.
- ❑ From the western layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn east on Burbank Boulevard;
- ❑ Turn south on Hazeltine Avenue;
- ❑ Turn east on Chandler Boulevard;
- ❑ Turn northwest on Lankershim Boulevard, and
- ❑ Turn east into the Rapid Bus parking lot at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station where it would layover.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

3. **The Rapid Bus Network Alternative (RB-Network)** – This alternative consists of a network of nine rapid bus routes that would function as a grid by having a series of three east-west routes and six north-south routes. The three new east-west Rapid Bus lines would be on Devonshire Street, Roscoe Boulevard, and Victory Boulevard. The six new north-south Rapid Bus lines would be on San Fernando Road, Laurel Canyon Boulevard, Van Nuys Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, Reseda Boulevard, and Topanga Canyon Boulevard. The following are descriptions of the RB-Network routes that comprise this alternative:

Three East-West RB-Network Routes

- **Devonshire Street** – The total length of this route would be approximately 10 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - ❑ The route would start at the intersection of Arleta Avenue and Van Nuys Boulevard and proceed northwest on Arleta Avenue where the street name changes to Devonshire Street;
 - ❑ Proceed west on Devonshire Street;
 - ❑ Turn south on Canoga Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn west on Lassen Avenue, and
 - ❑ Turn north in to the Chatsworth Metrolink Station, which is the western layover stop.
 - ❑ From the western layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn east on Lassen Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn north on Canoga Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn east on Devonshire Street;
 - ❑ Proceed southeast on Arleta Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn northeast on Van Nuys Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn southeast on Laurel Canyon Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn southwest on Terra Bella Street, and



- ❑ Turn northwest on Arleta Avenue to the eastern layover stop at Van Nuys Boulevard.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Roscoe Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 13.1 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - ❑ The route would start at the intersection of Tuxford Street and San Fernando Road and proceed southwest on Tuxford Street where the street name changes to Roscoe Boulevard at Lankershim Boulevard;
 - ❑ Proceed west on Roscoe Boulevard past Topanga Canyon Boulevard, which is the western layover stop, and turn south on Shoup Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn east on Saticoy Street;
 - ❑ Turn north on Topanga Canyon Boulevard and proceed to the layover stop just south of Roscoe Boulevard.
 - ❑ From the western layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn east on Roscoe Boulevard;
 - ❑ Proceed on Roscoe Boulevard and merge onto Tuxford Street;
 - ❑ Turn southeast on San Fernando Road;
 - ❑ Turn southwest on Penrose Street;
 - ❑ Turn south on Tujunga Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn east on Strathern Street;
 - ❑ Turn north on Sunland Boulevard; and
 - ❑ Turn northwest on San Fernando Road to the eastern layover stop just before Tuxford Street.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Victory Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 14.5 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - ❑ The route would start at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station and travel northwest on Lankershim Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn west on Victory Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn south on Owensmouth Avenue; and
 - ❑ Layover at the Warner Center Transit Hub.
 - ❑ From the Warner Center Transit Hub layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn west on Oxnard Street,
 - ❑ Turn north on Topanga Canyon Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn east on Erwin Street;
 - ❑ Turn north on Owensmouth Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn east on Victory Boulevard,



- Turn southeast on Lankershim Boulevard, and
- Turn east into the Rapid Bus parking lot at the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station where it would layover.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

Six North/South RB-Network Routes

- **San Fernando Road** - The total length of this route would be approximately 9.5 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - The route would start at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station and proceed southeast along San Fernando Road;
 - Turn south on Hollywood Way;
 - Turn west on Empire Avenue and enter the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport;
 - Stop at the Burbank Airport Metrolink Station for layover.
 - From southern layover stop proceed east on Empire Avenue;
 - Turn north on Hollywood Way;
 - Turn northwest on San Fernando Road, and
 - Turn north into the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station to the northern layover stop.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Laurel Canyon Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 8.7 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - The route would begin at the intersection of Van Nuys Boulevard and Laurel Canyon Boulevard;
 - Proceed southeast on Laurel Canyon Boulevard to Roscoe Boulevard, and
 - Continue south on Laurel Canyon Boulevard;
 - Turn southeast on Ventura Place; and
 - Turn west on Ventura Boulevard, which is the southern terminus stop.
 - From the southern terminus stop the Rapid Bus would turn north on Laurel Canyon Boulevard;
 - Turn southwest on Terra Bella Street;
 - Turn northwest on Arleta Avenue;
 - Turn northeast on Van Nuys Boulevard, and
 - Turn southeast on Laurel Canyon Boulevard and stop at the northern terminus stop.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Van Nuys Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 10.3 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - ❑ From the northern terminus stop the Rapid Bus would travel southwest on Van Nuys Boulevard;
 - ❑ Continue south on Van Nuys Boulevard after the road changes direction near Woodman Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn west on Ventura Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn north on Sepulveda Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn east on Moorpark Street;
 - ❑ Turn south on Noble Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn east on Ventura Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn north on Van Nuys Boulevard and stop at the southern terminus stop.
 - ❑ From the southern layover stop the Rapid Bus would proceed north on Van Nuys Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn northwest on Glenoaks Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn northeast on Paxton Street;
 - ❑ Turn southeast on Foothill Boulevard, and
 - ❑ Turn southwest on Van Nuys Boulevard and stop at the northern terminus stop.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Sepulveda Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 8 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - ❑ From this northern layover stop at the intersection of Chatsworth Street and Sepulveda Boulevard the Rapid Bus would proceed south on Sepulveda Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn east on Ventura Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn north on Kester Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn west on Moorpark Street;
 - ❑ Turn south on Noble Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn west on Ventura Boulevard, and
 - ❑ Turn north on Sepulveda Boulevard and stop at the southern layover stop.
 - ❑ From the southern layover stop the Rapid Bus would proceed north on Sepulveda Boulevard;
 - ❑ Turn west on Devonshire Street;
 - ❑ Turn north on Haskell Avenue;
 - ❑ Turn east on Chatsworth Street, and
 - ❑ Turn south on Sepulveda Boulevard and stop at the northern layover stop.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.



- **Reseda Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 6.1 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - From this northern layover stop at the intersection of Devonshire Street and Reseda Boulevard the Rapid Bus would proceed south on Reseda Boulevard;
 - Proceed south on Reseda Boulevard to the southern layover stop at Ventura Boulevard.
 - From the southern layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn west on Ventura Boulevard;
 - Turn north on Burbank Boulevard and continue around the curve to the east;
 - Turn north on Roscoe Boulevard;
 - Turn east on Devonshire Street;
 - Turn north on Zelzah Avenue;
 - Turn west on Chatsworth Street, and
 - Turn south on Reseda Boulevard and stop at the northern layover stop.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

- **Topanga Canyon Boulevard** – The total length of this route would be approximately 6.9 miles. Following are the individual segments of the route:
 - From this northern layover stop at the Chatsworth Metrolink Station turn west on Lassen Street;
 - Turn south on Topanga Canyon Boulevard;
 - Turn east on Erwin Street;
 - Turn south on Owensmouth Avenue and stop at the Warner Center Transit Hub, which is the southern layover stop.
 - From the southern layover stop the Rapid Bus would turn west on Oxnard Street;
 - Turn north on Topanga Canyon Boulevard;
 - Turn east on Lassen Street, and
 - Turn north into the Chatsworth Metrolink Station.

The hours of operation are from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Sunday. The headway for this route is 10 minutes during the peak hours, and 12 minutes during the off-peak hours.

C. SCREENING AND SELECTION PROCESS

The three RB Alternatives were identified based on information contained in the Court of Appeal’s “Decision” in *Citizens Organized for Smart Transit v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority* (filed July 19, 2004). The Decision specifically mentioned comment letters that identified a series of three or five east-west routes as an alternative to the Project. Based on this information contained in the Decision and the mentioned

comments, MTA staff developed the three RB Alternatives. The Revised FEIR analyzes and compares the three RB Alternatives with the Orange Line in two fundamental aspects:

1. First, the three RB Alternatives were studied in a way so as to determine if they are capable of being implemented. The primary factor was whether the three RB alternatives meet the Full BRT Alternative's goals and objectives. (See February 2002 Final EIR, Table 1-5, page 1-13.) To determine the feasibility of the alternatives, the following factors were considered:
 - For the objective of minimizing patrons' travel times, an analysis was conducted to determine each alternative's total passenger hours of travel time for patrons and the results were compared with those of the BRT.
 - The three RB Alternatives were also studied to determine if they would satisfy the objective to support land use and development goals in the Valley.
2. Secondly, the Revised FEIR evaluated the environmental impacts of the three RB Alternatives to determine if they caused any potentially significant environmental impacts. Where potential significant environmental impacts were found, feasible mitigation measures are proposed for each RB Alternative to avoid or lessen such impacts, where possible. The remaining unavoidable significant environmental impacts of the RB alternatives were then compared to the Project's unavoidable potentially significant environmental impacts to determine whether any of the Rapid Bus alternatives would clearly avoid or lessen the unavoidable significant environmental impacts of the Project.

D. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

This section provides details on the RB Alternatives. This Revised Final EIR section includes an overall description of Rapid Bus and its features, transit priority/traffic signals, stop locations, bus stop design, and the Rapid Bus Operating Plan. Section 2.2 Detailed Description of Alternatives in the Final EIR is unchanged for the No Build, TSM, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Lankershim/Oxnard On-street Alignment and Weekend Service Option, and Busway Minimum Operable Segment (MOS) alternatives.

Rapid Buses would operate in mixed flow traffic on primarily arterial streets. Rapid Bus decreases end-to-end travel time by limiting stops, eliminating time-points through headway-based schedules, and implementing signal priority at major intersections. Rapid Bus stops would be designed similar to those on the Ventura Boulevard Metro Rapid Bus route and would be spaced between one-half and one-mile apart. Key features of Rapid Bus include:

1. Simple Route Layout
2. Frequent Headways
3. Headway-based schedules
4. Less Frequent Stops
5. Level Boarding and Alighting
6. Color Coded Buses and Stops
7. RB Stops

8. Signal Prioritization

Rapid Bus stops preferably would be located on the far side of an intersection to facilitate transit priority. Rapid Bus stop canopies, and any amenities, would be located entirely within the public sidewalk adjacent to the curb of the street.

Local bus stops would be relocated within the immediate area of the intersection if necessary to accommodate the Rapid Bus. Design of Rapid Bus and local bus stops would need to consider site constraints including existing multiple curb cuts, available sidewalk widths, utility poles, and other sidewalk obstructions. Due to these constraints, in some cases, local bus or RB stops would need to be located a distance from the intersection, with considerable walking distance required for those making transfers from buses stopping at cross streets. Some removal of on-street parking spaces would be necessary to accommodate the new RB stops. If adequate public right-of-way would not be available on the sidewalk for a station canopy, only a pole with a Rapid Bus identity sign would be provided. New park-and-ride lots would not be provided for the three Rapid Bus alternatives.

Transit Priority System and Traffic Signals Control and Safety

The City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) has made significant progress in developing software and hardware that will be implemented to allow transit priority treatment at signalized intersections. The use of loop detectors embedded in the pavement in advance of traffic signals will allow the traffic signal controllers to detect a bus as a distinct object separate from a car or truck.

The three RB Alternatives will utilize the transit priority system (TPS) to provide the most efficient operation for both the transit system and vehicular traffic. TPS is the same signal priority technology currently being used by the Metro Rapid Bus operating in mixed traffic on Ventura Boulevard. TPS allows the traffic signal controller to advance the start (early green) or retard the end (extend green) of any vehicle phase. It does not skip any traffic or pedestrian phase.

It may not be feasible to provide the same level of transit priority treatment for buses traveling in both directions if headways become too short. It also may not be feasible to provide transit priority to both east-west streets and north-south streets. In these cases, the peak direction of passenger demand would be given the highest level of priority treatment. LADOT will also have to consider the traffic demand in determining which streets and direction of travel will receive priority.

As the three RB Alternatives will be in-street running in mixed traffic and Rapid Bus stops are at existing signalized intersections, modification of traffic signals other than for transit priority would not be included in the three RB Alternatives. No new pedestrian crossings or special treatment of intersections would be included.

Rapid Bus Stop Locations

At the North Hollywood Metro Rail Station and at the Warner Center Transit Hub termini, one stop would be provided per route. Also, at the end-of-the-line stops, prior to the layover, only a stop sign, and no canopy would be provided per current Metro Rapid policy with the canopy located at the starting point of the next trip.

For the RB-3 Alternative, 78 Rapid Bus stops would be provided. For the RB-5 Alternative, 83 Rapid Bus stops would be provided, and for the RB Network Alternative, 158 Rapid Bus stops would be provided.

Metro RB Stop Design

The current design used on Metro Rapid Ventura Boulevard would be used for the RB Alternatives. The Rapid Bus stops would be spaced between one-half and one-mile apart, and located along the sidewalk within the existing street right-of-way. Most elements installed at the RB stops would be at-grade and would not alter, obstruct, or materially change the visual character of the immediate area. A typical Rapid Bus stop design includes a single canopy supported by two 14-foot 5-inch steel poles joined by a crossbar and surmounted by a curved, translucent canopy. The two poles with the canopy create a gate that marks the location where the door of a Rapid Bus would be spotted to help speed boarding and alighting. On the crossbar an electronic message sign would be mounted, which provides information on the real time arrival of the next Rapid Bus. At the leading edge of each RB stop would be a 19-foot “flag pole” topped with an illuminated Rapid sign that extends over the street. A kiosk is also provided for advertising and system-wide information. In addition, trash receptacles would be provided at all RB stops.

Each bus stop in the RB Alternative would include the above-described components unless unusual site constraints dictate that only a pole could be constructed.

Bus Operating Plan

This section describes the operating characteristics of the RB Alternatives, including maintenance facility requirements, specifications of buses to be used, and a preliminary operating plan.

The RB Alternatives are all based on additions to the TSM alternative. Therefore, the service improvements described in the FEIR Section 2-2.2 for the TSM alternative apply to all RB Alternatives.

Building from the TSM bus system, the RB Alternatives add selected Rapid Bus routes. Service Frequencies for Rapid Bus Routes summarizes the Rapid Bus routes that apply to each of the three RB Alternatives and lists peak and base period service frequencies.

RB Stop Locations for the RB-3 Alternative				
Corridors and RB Stops	Rapid Bus Direction	Near-side	Far-side	Land Uses Adjacent to the RB Stops
<i>a. Lankershim Boulevard</i>				
1. Chandler	Northbound		X	North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station
	Southbound			Depot (drop-off only)
2. Oxnard	Northbound		X	Commercial
	Southbound		X	Parking lot
3. Sherman Way	Northbound			
	Southbound		X	Building materials (industrial)
<i>b. Victory Boulevard</i>				
1. Laurel Canyon	Westbound		X	Department Store
	Eastbound		X	Office
2. Coldwater Canyon	Westbound		X	Florist/Fast Food
	Eastbound		X	Coffee shop
3. Woodman	Westbound		X	Gas station
	Eastbound		X	Electronics Store
4. Van Nuys	Westbound		X	Newsstand
	Eastbound		X	Streetwall retail
5. Sepulveda	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
6. Woodley	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	MTA ROW
7. Balboa	Westbound		X	School
	Eastbound	X		Office building
8. Reseda	Westbound		X	Shops/Apartments
	Eastbound		X	Auto/Single-family
9. Tampa	Westbound		X	Fast food
	Eastbound		X	Gas/Auto
10. Winnetka	Westbound		X	Child Care Center
	Eastbound		X	Office building
11. De Soto	Westbound		X	MTA ROW
	Eastbound		X	College
<i>c. Vanowen Street</i>				
1. Laurel Canyon	Westbound		X	Dental Clinic
	Eastbound		X	Office
2. Coldwater Canyon	Westbound		X	Medical Group
	Eastbound		X	Apartments
3. Woodman	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Gas station
4. Van Nuys	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Bank
5. Sepulveda	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Parking Lot of shopping center
6. Woodley	Westbound	X		Retail
	Eastbound	X		Utility Company
7. Balboa	Westbound		X	Gas station/Retail
	Eastbound		X	Restaurant

RB Stop Locations for the RB-3 Alternative				
Corridors and RB Stops	Rapid Bus Direction	Near-side	Far-side	Land Uses Adjacent to the RB Stops
8. Reseda	Westbound		X	Gas station/Apartments
	Eastbound		X	Convenience store/Auto
9. Tampa	Westbound		X	Retail
	Eastbound		X	Convenience store/Shops
10. Winnetka	Westbound		X	Gas station/Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
11. De Soto	Westbound		X	Gas station
	Eastbound		X	Fast food/Convenience store
<i>d. Sherman Way</i>				
1. Lankershim	Westbound		X	Auto repair
	Eastbound			
2. Laurel Canyon	Westbound		X	Public facility
	Eastbound		X	Retail
3. Coldwater Canyon	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Gas station/Retail
4. Woodman	Westbound		X	Grocery store
	Eastbound		X	Parking lot
5. Van Nuys	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
6. Sepulveda	Westbound		X	Gas station/Retail
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
7. Woodley	Westbound		X	Gas station
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
8. Balboa	Westbound		X	Retail/Pre-school
	Eastbound		X	Small/Convenience shops
9. Reseda	Westbound		X	Storefront Retail
	Eastbound		X	Storefront Retail
10. Tampa	Westbound		X	Gas station/Camp
	Eastbound		X	Hospital
11. Winnetka	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Fast food/Pre-school
12. De Soto	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Auto
13. Topanga Canyon	Westbound			Retail (farside on Topanga Canyon)
	Eastbound		X	Fast food
<i>e. Topanga Canyon</i>				
1. Sherman Way	Northbound			
	Southbound		X	Bank
<i>f. Owensmouth</i>				
1. Warner Center Transit Hub	Northbound		X	Office building
	Southbound			

RB Stop Locations for the RB-5 Alternative				
Corridors and RB Stops	Rapid Bus Direction	Near-side	Far-side	Land Uses Adjacent to the RB Stops
<i>a. Lankershim Boulevard</i>				
1. Chandler	Northbound		X	North Hollywood Metro Redline Station
	Southbound			Depot (drop-off only)
2. Oxnard	Northbound		X	Commercial
	Southbound		X	Parking lot
<i>b. Chandler Boulevard</i>				
1. Laurel Canyon	Westbound		X	Apartments
	Eastbound		X	Healthcare
3. Coldwater Canyon	Westbound		X	Single-family homes
	Eastbound	X		Single-family homes
3. Woodman	Westbound		X	Single-family homes
	Eastbound		X	Single-family homes
4. Van Nuys	Westbound			
	Eastbound		X	Gas station/grocery store
<i>c. Burbank Boulevard</i>				
1. Laurel Canyon	Westbound		X	Auto
	Eastbound		X	Gas station/Restaurant
2. Coldwater Canyon	Westbound		X	Parking Lot for College
	Eastbound		X	Apartments
3. Woodman	Westbound		X	Clinic
	Eastbound		X	Retail
4. Van Nuys	Westbound		X	Auto Center
	Eastbound		X	Gas station/Grocery store
5. Sepulveda	Westbound	X		Gas station/Offices
	Eastbound		X	Gas station/Offices
6. Balboa	Westbound		X	Sports Center
	Eastbound		X	Single-family homes
7. Reseda and Ventura	Westbound		X	Retail (on Ventura)
	Eastbound			
<i>d. Oxnard Street</i>				
1. Lankershim	Westbound		X	Restaurant/liquor
	Eastbound			
2. Laurel Canyon	Westbound		X	Gas station
	Eastbound		X	Park-and-Ride
3. Coldwater Canyon	Westbound		X	Bridge over Tujunga Wash
	Eastbound		X	Multi-family apartments
4. Woodman	Westbound		X	Gas station
	Eastbound		X	Convenience store/restaurant
5. Van Nuys	Westbound		X	Auto Center
	Eastbound		X	Car dealer
6. Sepulveda	Westbound			Parking lot for Offices
	Eastbound		X	Offices/Plaza
<i>e. Victory Boulevard</i>				
1. Laurel Canyon	Westbound		X	Department Store
	Eastbound		X	Office

RB Stop Locations for the RB-5 Alternative				
Corridors and RB Stops	Rapid Bus Direction	Near-side	Far-side	Land Uses Adjacent to the RB Stops
2. Coldwater Canyon	Westbound		X	Florist/Fast Food
	Eastbound		X	Coffee shop
3. Woodman	Westbound		X	Gas station
	Eastbound		X	Electronics Store
4. Van Nuys	Westbound		X	Newsstand
	Eastbound		X	Streetwall retail
5. Sepulveda	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
6. Woodley	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	MTA ROW
7. Balboa	Westbound		X	School
	Eastbound	X		Office building
8. Reseda	Westbound		X	Shops/Apartments
	Eastbound		X	Auto/Single-family
9. Tampa	Westbound		X	Fast food
	Eastbound		X	Gas/Auto
10. Winnetka	Westbound		X	Child Care Center
	Eastbound		X	Office building
11. De Soto	Westbound		X	MTA ROW
	Eastbound		X	College
<i>f. Sherman Way</i>				
1. Vineland	Westbound		X	Auto repair/sales
	Eastbound			No stop; drop-off only
2. Laurel Canyon	Westbound		X	Public Facility
	Eastbound		X	Retail
3. Coldwater Canyon	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Gas station/Retail
4. Woodman	Westbound		X	Grocery store
	Eastbound		X	Parking lot
5. Van Nuys	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
6. Sepulveda	Westbound		X	Gas station/Retail
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
7. Woodley	Westbound		X	Gas station
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
8. Balboa	Westbound		X	Retail/Pre-school
	Eastbound		X	Small/Convenience shops
9. Reseda	Westbound		X	Storefront Retail
	Eastbound		X	Storefront Retail
10. Tampa	Westbound		X	Gas station/Camp
	Eastbound		X	Hospital
11. Winnetka	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Fast food/Pre-school
12. De Soto	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Auto
13. Topanga Canyon	Westbound			Retail (drop-off only)
	Eastbound		X	Fast food

RB Stop Locations for the RB-5 Alternative

Corridors and RB Stops	Rapid Bus Direction	Near-side	Far-side	Land Uses Adjacent to the RB Stops
<i>g. Owensmouth</i>				
1. Warner Center Transit Hub	Northbound		X	Office building
	Southbound			

RB Stop Locations for the RB-Network Alternative				
Corridors and RB Stops	Rapid Bus Direction	Near-side	Far-side	Land Uses Adjacent to the RB Stops
<i>a. Lankershim Boulevard</i>				
1. Chandler	Northbound		X	North Hollywood Metro Redline Station
	Southbound			Depot (drop-off only)
2. Oxnard	Northbound		X	Commercial
	Southbound		X	Parking lot
<i>b. Victory Boulevard</i>				
1. Laurel Canyon	Westbound		X	Department Store
	Eastbound		X	Office
2. Coldwater Canyon	Westbound		X	Florist/Fast Food
	Eastbound		X	Coffee shop
3. Woodman	Westbound		X	Gas station
	Eastbound		X	Electronics Store
4. Van Nuys	Westbound		X	Newsstand
	Eastbound		X	Streetwall retail
5. Sepulveda	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
6. Woodley	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	MTA ROW
7. Balboa	Westbound		X	School
	Eastbound	X		Office building
8. Reseda	Westbound		X	Shops/Apartments
	Eastbound		X	Auto/Single-family
9. Tampa	Westbound		X	Fast food
	Eastbound		X	Gas/Auto
10. Winnetka	Westbound		X	Child Care Center
	Eastbound		X	Office building
11. De Soto	Westbound		X	MTA ROW
	Eastbound		X	College
<i>c. Roscoe Boulevard</i>				
1. Tuxford/San Fernando	Westbound		X	SF Rd FS of Tuxford
2. Laurel Canyon	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Fast food
3. Coldwater Canyon	Westbound		X	Vacant lot
	Eastbound		X	Gas station/Nursery
4. Woodman	Westbound		X	Auto/Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Hospital
5. Van Nuys	Westbound		X	Restaurants/Department Store
	Eastbound		X	Department Store
6. Sepulveda	Westbound		X	Car dealer
	Eastbound	X		Shopping Center
7. Woodley	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Industrial
8. Balboa	Westbound	X		Liquor store/Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Gas station

RB Stop Locations for the RB-Network Alternative				
Corridors and RB Stops	Rapid Bus Direction	Near-side	Far-side	Land Uses Adjacent to the RB Stops
9. Reseda	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Medical offices
10. Tampa	Westbound		X	Auto
	Eastbound		X	Auto/Retail
11. Winnetka	Westbound		X	Gas station
	Eastbound		X	School
12. De Soto	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Auto/Fast food
13. Topanga Canyon	Westbound			Shopping Center (drop-off only)
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
<i>d. Devonshire Street</i>				
1. Van Nuys	Northbound		X	Auto/Single-family
	Southbound			Auto (drop-off only)
2. Woodman	Westbound		X	Car dealer
	Eastbound		X	Park
3. Sepulveda	Westbound		X	Grocery store
	Eastbound		X	Gas station/Apartments
4. Woodley	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Gas station/Single-family
5. Balboa	Westbound		X	Gas station/Dental Center
	Eastbound		X	Shopping Center
6. Reseda	Westbound		X	Shopping Center
	Eastbound		X	Auto
7. Tampa	Westbound		X	Single-family
	Eastbound		X	Single-family
8. Winnetka	Westbound		X	Church/Pre-school
	Eastbound		X	Single-family
9. Chatsworth Metrolink Station	Westbound			
	Eastbound		X	Metrolink Station
<i>e. San Fernando Road</i>				
1. Sylmar/SF Metrolink Station	Northbound			
	Southbound		X	Metrolink Station
2. Truman/Maclay	Northbound		X	Retail
	Southbound		X	Auto
3. Van Nuys	Northbound		X	Rail tracks/Auto
	Southbound	X		Retail/Auto
4. Osborne	Northbound		X	Rail tracks/Airport
	Southbound		X	Auto
5. Sheldon	Northbound		X	Rail tracks/Industrial
	Southbound		X	Auto
6. Tuxford	Northbound		X	Industrial
	Southbound		X	Open space
7. Sunland	Northbound		X	Rail tracks
	Southbound		X	Warehouse
8. Burbank Airport Metrolink Station	Northbound		X	On Empire Avenue at Station
	Southbound			

RB Stop Locations for the RB-Network Alternative				
Corridors and RB Stops	Rapid Bus Direction	Near-side	Far-side	Land Uses Adjacent to the RB Stops
<i>f. Laurel Canyon Boulevard</i>				
1. Van Nuys	Northbound			
	Southbound		X	Fast food
2. Osborne	Northbound		X	Parking lot
	Southbound		X	Auto-serving
3. Sheldon	Northbound		X	Restaurant
	Southbound		X	Freeway overpass
4. Roscoe	Northbound		X	Auto
	Southbound		X	Gas station
5. Sherman	Northbound		X	RR tracks (may need NS)
	Southbound		X	Local shop
6. Victory	Northbound		X	Office
	Southbound		X	Shopping Center (Valley Plaza)
7. Magnolia	Northbound		X	Local shop
	Southbound		X	Parking lot
8. Ventura	Northbound		X	Bank
	Southbound			Drop-off only
<i>g. Van Nuys Boulevard</i>				
1. Foothill	Northbound			Auto
	Southbound		X	Commercial building
2. Glenoaks	Northbound		X	Fast food
	Southbound		X	Retail
3. San Fernando	Northbound	X		Auto
	Southbound		X	Auto
4. Laurel Canyon	Northbound		X	Fast food/Commercial
	Southbound		X	Auto
5. Arleta	Northbound		X	Shopping Center/Single-family
	Southbound		X	Coffee shop/Church
6. Woodman	Northbound		X	Apartments
	Southbound		X	Shopping Center
7. Nordhoff	Northbound		X	Gas station/Shopping Center
	Southbound		X	Shopping Center
8. Roscoe	Northbound		X	Retail
	Southbound		X	Office
9. Keswick at Van Nuys Metrolink Station	Northbound		X	Metrolink Station
	Southbound		X	Parking lot
10. Sherman	Northbound		X	Commercial
	Southbound		X	Commercial
11. Vanowen	Northbound		X	Commercial
	Southbound		X	Retail
12. Victory	Northbound		X	Retail
	Southbound		X	Retail
13. Burbank	Northbound		X	Retail
	Southbound		X	Retail/Auto
14. Ventura	Northbound		X	Commercial/Offices
	Southbound			Apartments (turns at Moorpark)

RB Stop Locations for the RB-Network Alternative				
Corridors and RB Stops	Rapid Bus Direction	Near-side	Far-side	Land Uses Adjacent to the RB Stops
<i>h. Sepulveda Boulevard</i>				
1. Chatsworth	Northbound			
	Southbound		X	Gas station
2. Devonshire	Northbound		X	Parking lot/Shopping Center
	Southbound	X		Parking lot/Shopping Center
3. Nordhoff	Northbound		X	Shopping Center
	Southbound		X	Auto
4. Roscoe	Northbound		X	Gas station
	Southbound		X	Shopping Center
5. Sherman	Northbound		X	Gas station
	Southbound		X	Commercial
6. Vanowen	Northbound		X	Gas station
	Southbound		X	Auto
7. Victory	Northbound		X	Shopping Center
	Southbound	X		Shopping Center
8. Burbank	Northbound		X	Gas station/Auto
	Southbound		X	Shopping Center
9. Ventura	Northbound		X	Bank/Offices
	Southbound			Retail
<i>i. Reseda Boulevard</i>				
1. Devonshire	Northbound			
	Southbound		X	Parking lot of pharmacy
2. Nordhoff	Northbound		X	Parking lots/Large retail
	Southbound		X	Banks/Office
3. Roscoe	Northbound		X	Convenience store
	Southbound		X	Gas station
4. Sherman	Northbound		X	Gas station
	Southbound	X		Commercial
5. Vanowen	Northbound		X	Restaurant
	Southbound		X	Auto
6. Victory	Northbound		X	Park and Recreation Center
	Southbound		X	Gas station/Apartments
7. Ventura	Westbound		X	Commercial
	Eastbound			
<i>j. Topanga Canyon Boulevard</i>				
1. Chatsworth Metrolink Station	Southbound		X	In Metrolink Station
2. Nordhoff	Northbound		X	Gas station
	Southbound		X	Restaurant/retail
3. Roscoe	Northbound		X	Gas station
	Southbound		X	Retail
4. Sherman	Northbound		X	Auto
	Southbound		X	Bank
5. Vanowen	Northbound		X	High School
	Southbound		X	Office building
<i>k. Owensmouth</i>				
1. Warner Center Transit Hub	Northbound		X	Office building



Metro

San Fernando Valley
East-West Transit Corridor
REVISED FEIR

Service Frequencies for Rapid Bus Routes					
Rapid Bus Route	RB-3	RB-5	RB-Network	Peak Period Frequency (in minutes)	Base Period Frequency (in minutes)
Chandler		•		10	12
Burbank		•		10	12
Oxnard		•		10	12
Victory Boulevard	•	•	•	10	12
Vanowen	•			10	12
Sherman Way	•	•		10	12
Roscoe			•	10	12
Devonshire			•	10	12
San Fernando			•	10	12
Laurel Canyon			•	10	12
Van Nuys			•	10	12
Sepulveda			•	10	12
Reseda			•	10	12
Topanga Canyon			•	10	12
Note: Applicable rapid bus routes are indicated for each alternative.					

Each added Rapid Bus route is assumed to have 10-minute service frequencies in the peak period, and 12-minute service frequencies in the base period. Service frequencies are representative of typical Rapid Bus service, and what is used on Ventura Boulevard. For purposes of this analysis, Rapid Bus service is assumed to overlay local bus service. Over time, service frequencies will be tailored to optimize demand between the two service types (local and Rapid Bus).

Standard Metro Rapid vehicles (40-foot or 45-foot) would be used on the Rapid Bus routes depending upon actual demand. The R B Alternatives require anywhere from 64 to 143 buses. Vehicle Requirements for RB Alternatives summarizes the number of buses calculated to operate Rapid Bus service under each of the three RB Alternatives. These numbers are expressed as a range to account for potential variances in the way the Rapid Bus routes operate. The lower end of the range assumes Rapid Bus routes have minimal turnaround and no barriers to operating at a speed reflective of transit priority. The upper end of the range allows for bus turnaround routings that are typical for the San Fernando Valley, and the potential for somewhat slower operating speeds since the City of Los Angeles has indicated that there cannot be widespread transit priority on east-west arterials across the San Fernando Valley.

Vehicle Requirements for Rapid Bus Alternatives	
RB-3	64 to 89 buses
RB-5	69 to 96 buses
RB-Network	106 to 143 buses
Note: Range based on potential variations in end-of-line routing and speed.	

Source: Manuel Padron & Associates, 2004.

Maintenance and storage of the Metro Rapid vehicles would be accommodated within the two existing bus divisions in the San Fernando Valley. The anticipated vehicles for RB-3 and RB-5 are less than or similar to the buses anticipated for the BRT alternative, so the maintenance yard analysis provided in Section 2-2.6.1 applies. For RB-Network, the lower end of the estimated vehicle range (number of Rapid Buses required to operate this alternative) is similar to the vehicle needs identified for the BRT alternative. If the number of vehicles needed approaches the upper end of the range, then there may be a need to expand need to expand the existing divisions.

NO SIGNIFICANT NEW INFORMATION

The MTA Board has reviewed the final Revised FEIR and Final EIR for the San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor project in the context of Public Resources Code section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 and has concluded that it presents no significant new information that would require the recirculation of the draft Revised FEIR. The reasons supporting this decision are as follows:

1. No new significant unmitigated environmental impacts resulting from the Project or from a proposed new mitigation measure have been presented in the final Revised FEIR. Between the Draft Revised FEIR and the Final Revised FEIR, MTA staff identified several minor miscalculations of end-to-end run times of several routes in the RB Alternatives. Those miscalculations were corrected. The corrected results do not change the results on the ridership performance of the RB Alternatives because the miscalculations were manually done from various modeling outputs. However, the inputs to the model are correct. Further, model validation exercises demonstrate the model performed correctly and accurately.
2. None of the new information from the comment or responses demonstrates a substantial increase in the severity of environmental impacts previously disclosed in the Draft Revised FEIR.
3. No feasible project alternative has been identified between the Draft and Final Revised FEIR that is considerably different from those previously considered that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the Project. A number of commenters have

suggested numerous slight variations to the three RB Alternatives as discussed below. However, no commenter presented evidence that such variations clearly lessen the environment impacts of the project. Instead, commenter focused on claiming these variants would perform better than the three RB Alternatives. This call for MTA to find the optimum assemblage of multiple Rapid Bus routes is infeasible. No transit modeling program exists that can optimize a multiple route transit system. In fact, modeling the ridership of one specifically defined transit line takes a week to complete. Several commenters claim that MTA is required to find the optimum alternative of multiple Rapid Bus routes by conducting numerous manual iterations. Responses to these comments explained that no transit agency conducts numerous manual iterations to determine the optimum multiple route transit system and it is infeasible to do. There are thousands of possible Rapid Bus routes through the Valley. To identify the optimum grouping of routes would take years of analysis to complete. Instead, the RB Alternatives provide a reasonable and good approximation of what multiple Rapid Bus routes can accomplish in the Valley. The specific variation suggested by reviewers are as follows:

Comment 6-3 suggests adding a Sherman Way route and Vineland route to the RB Network. As discussed in the response to this comment, the RB Network already contains three east-west routes geographically distributed across the Valley. Adding an additional east-west route is not considerably different from the alternative of multiple Rapid Bus routes embodied in RB Network. The RB Network has six north-south Rapid Bus routes. The commenter's suggestion of adding a seventh is again a slight variation to the RB Network Alternative and is therefore not considerably different from the RB Network Alternative already considered in the Revised FEIR. Moreover, the additional suggestion of diverting the Roscoe route down Lankershim Blvd. to the North Hollywood Metro Red Line station is yet another slight variation of the RB Network that is not considerably different from the RB Network Alternative and has already been studied in the Revised FEIR.

Comment 16-3 suggests connecting Sherman Way to the North Hollywood Metro Red Line station in the RB-5 Alternative. As discussed in the response to this comment, the RB-5 Alternative has a Sherman Way route that traverses the Valley in an east-west direction. The suggestion to connect this route to the North Hollywood Metro Red Line station is a slight variation to the pre-existing Sherman Way Route. The suggestion is therefore not considerably different from the RB-5 Alternative already considered in the Revised FEIR.

Comment 20-46 suggests eliminating the Vanowen route in the RB-3 Alternative. As discussed in the response to this comment, the deletion of one of three east-west routes is merely a slight variation to the RB-3 Alternative, and therefore, is not considerably different from the RB-3 Alternative already studied in the Revised FEIR;

Comment 20-50 suggests several routings to extend the Sherman Way route in the RB-3 Alternative to the east. These extended routings are slight variations to the Sherman Way route already present in the RB-3 Alternative. The suggested routings are not



considerably different from the RB-3 Alternative already studied in the Revised FEIR. The suggestions are focused only on one Rapid Bus routing on its eastern end.

Comment 20-56 suggests extending the RB-3 Alternatives along Lankershim to Moorpark Avenue (a purported distance of approximately 2 1/3 miles). The suggestion is a slight extension of the three Rapid Bus routes down Lankershim, which is already served by the Metro Red Line.

Comment 20-65 suggests additional east-west lines, such as along Roscoe and Devonshire, in the northern portion of the Valley. As the response to comment explains, these more northern east-west Rapid Bus routes were analyzed in the RB Network and found to have very low ridership. Thus, their addition would not substantially increase ridership while at the same time lower the suggested variation's cost effectiveness. Since these routes were already studied as part of the RB Network and are but two additional east-west routes to the RB-5 Alternative that currently has five east-west routes, the suggestion is a slight variation to the RB-5 Alternative that is not considerably different from the RB-5 Alternative or the RB Network already studied in the Revised FEIR. The commenter further suggests adding a Sherman Way Route to the RB Network. As discussed above concerning Comment 6-3, this suggestion is not considerably different from the RB Network already studied in the Revised FEIR.

Comment 20-109 suggests extending Sherman Way of the RB-5 Alternative. The suggestion is merely a variation of the end of the Sherman Way route in the RB-5 Alternative, and thus, is not considerably different from the RB-5 Alternative studied in the Revised FEIR.

Comment 20-111 suggests replacing the Sherman Way route in the RB-5 Alternative with the Sherman Way routing of the RB-3 Alternative. This suggestion merely swaps a line studied in one RB Alternative with a line studied in another RB Alternative. As such, is merely a slight variation of the RB-5 Alternative, and thus, is not considerably different from the RB-5 Alternative studied in the Revised FEIR.

Comment 26-1 suggests the alternative of running a Rapid Bus on the 101 Freeway. As the response to this comment explains, this suggested alternative does not conform to the Court of Appeal's Decision that directed MTA to consider the alternative of multiple Rapid Bus routes as an alternative to the Project.

Comment 26-3 suggests the alternative of allow vehicles to use the busway along with the BRT. The same reasoning for the finding on Comment 26-1 applies here.

Comment 26-4 suggests the alternative of adding a new lane (not HOV) to each side of the 101 freeway between the 170 and Topanga Canyon. The same reasoning for the finding on Comment 26-1 applies here.

4. The Draft Revised FEIR presented information and data sufficient to provide the public with an opportunity to conduct meaningful review and comment on the environmental impacts of RB Alternatives and how they compare to the Project. The Draft Revised FEIR was circulated for 30 days for public and state agency comments. Thirty One comment submittals were received during the comment period and responses are included in the Final Revised FEIR.



IX. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

This section provides the rationale to support a determination by the MTA, as lead agency under CEQA, that the benefits of the proposed Project outweigh those unavoidable adverse environmental effects that have been predicted to occur. This discussion, which is required by Section 15093 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, is organized into two sections. In the first section, the unavoidable adverse effects are identified, and in the second section, the reasons in support of the determination are presented.

A. Unavoidable Adverse Effects

The proposed Orange Line will result in two potentially temporary and localized adverse impacts, which may not be avoided or mitigated. This unavoidable impact is identified below.

Construction Noise - It is possible that noise levels occurring as a result of construction activities may exceed annoyance levels at sensitive locations nearby to construction areas, at varying times during the construction period. It is also possible that not all such noise can be effectively reduced to a level not resulting in some annoyance to nearby persons, despite the application of aggressive mitigation measures and adherence to established standards and practices. Should such residual construction noise exceed levels resulting in annoyance to nearby residents and persons, this occurrence would constitute an unavoidable adverse impact.

Construction Air Quality - It is possible that dust generated by construction of the Project may exceed regulatory levels at certain locations along the Orange Line despite the implementation of feasible mitigation measures that can lessen, but not completely reduce the impact to less than significant.

B. Determination

The MTA has determined that the overall benefits of the Orange Line outweigh and override the unavoidable adverse environmental impact discussed above. The reasons supporting this determination are as follows:

The BRT Alternative would have several beneficial environmental effects that neither the No Build Alternative nor the TSM Alternative would provide. Among these are:

Decreased traffic congestion and increased regional mobility – The Orange Line Alternative will result in between 13,000-to-15,300 new daily transit trips over the No-Build alternative and between 4,000-to-6,300 new daily transit trips over the TSM alternative made in Los Angeles County in the year 2020, resulting in enhanced mobility and decreased congestion. On the other hand, the RB Alternatives do not generate the same level of new daily transit trips as the Project.

Reliability – The Orange Line will be constructed primarily in an exclusive right-of-way. Consequently, bus operations under this alternative tend to be more reliable than in the No Build or TSM scenarios.

Consistency with regional and local plans – The Orange Line is included in SCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan and MTA’s Long-Range Transportation Plan, and will provide a higher level of support to local land use and redevelopment plans such as the *Warner Center Specific Plan*.

Transit opportunities for transit dependent persons – The BRT Alternative will provide decreased travel times and better connections to the remainder of the MTA system, and better service to a greater number of destinations than would the No Build Alternative or the TSM Alternative. On the other hand, all the RB Alternatives and the suggested variations to them would be inconsistent with a number of these plans, which is a significant land use impact that the Orange Line would not create.

Increased employment – The BRT Alternative will generate between 21,440 and 22,350 total jobs during construction and 1,078 full-time employment equivalent jobs during operation; whereas the employment forecasts for the RB Alternatives are minimal.

Enhanced air quality – The Orange Line will reduce more regional air pollution than the RB Alternatives by generating more new riders, which otherwise would be in automobiles, than the RB Alternatives.

The potentially significant construction impacts of noise and air quality that may be caused by the construction of the Orange Line are temporary and localized impacts. However, the RB Alternatives would have a long-term significant impact on land use from their inconsistency with Regional and community plans. Accordingly, the significant impact that would be caused by the RB Alternatives would be more severe than temporary construction impacts of the Orange Line. Thus, the RB Alternatives do not clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the Project. Accordingly, the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed Project outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and are thus acceptable.