

APPENDIX 3.1-A Transportation Policy Analysis

This section presents the detailed evaluation of the Proposed Project and Options’ potential to conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, as identified in Section 3.1-4. The analysis in this appendix is presented by plan, rather than by subject matter as in the chapter.

Will the Proposed Project Conflict with a program, plan ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

This Section presents the evaluation of the consistency of the Proposed Project operation with local plans and policies. Under each plan, the Proposed Project, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Options are addressed in order.

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
<p>2020-2045 Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</p> <p>Every four years, SCAG updates its RTP for the 191-city SCAG region. Beginning with the 2012 RTP, Senate Bill (SB) 375 required the inclusion of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in RTPs prepared by Metropolitan Planning Organizations such as SCAG. The key goal of the SCS is to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets through integrated land use and transportation strategies.</p>		
<p>Goal 2: Improve mobility, accessibility, reliability, and travel safety for people and goods.</p>		
<p>The “Green Line Extension to Torrance” is among the selected major capital transit project included in the RTP. Thus, the Project directly supports the RTP/SCS.</p> <p>Implementation of the Project would create new connections and improve existing connections not only to communities along the Project alignment, but also to other area transit lines and stations, including the existing C Line (Green), and several regional and local bus lines serving the Project Study Area. The Project would not conflict with other plans or programs to improve mobility, accessibility, reliability, or travel safety for people or goods.</p>	<p>The Trench Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project and would not introduce any new conflicts to improve mobility, accessibility, reliability, or travel safety. Generally, this option would further these objectives by completely separating the light rail transit (LRT) from surface transportation, further improving reliability and safety without reducing accessibility.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option would not introduce any new conflicts to improve mobility, accessibility, reliability, or travel safety. Generally, this option would further these objectives by completely separating the LRT from surface transportation, further improving reliability and safety without reducing accessibility.</p>

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
Goal 3: Enhance the preservation, security, and resilience of the regional transportation system.		
The Proposed Project furthers this goal by providing an alternative to driving which preserves an existing Metro-owned railroad right-of-way (Metro ROW) and creates resilience by lessening the growth of traffic that would otherwise degrade the existing transportation network.	The Trench Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project and would not introduce new conflicts with this goal.	The Hawthorne Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project and would not introduce new conflicts with this goal.
Goal 4: Increase person and goods movement and travel choices within the transportation system.		
The Proposed Project increases personal travel choices.	The Trench Option increases personal travel choices.	The Hawthorne Option increases personal travel choices.
Goal 7: Adapt to a changing climate and support an integrated regional development pattern and transportation network.		
The Proposed Project improves the transportation network within a fully-developed area and would serve existing transportation needs and focus continued investment in the area served.	The Trench Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project and would not introduce new conflicts with this goal.	The Hawthorne Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project and would not introduce new conflicts with this goal.
Goal 8: Leverage new transportation technologies and data-driven solutions that result in more efficient travel.		
The Proposed Project would not conflict with other plans or projects' ability to leverage new transportation technologies or pursue data-driven solutions.	The Trench Option would not conflict with other plans or projects' ability to leverage new transportation technologies or pursue data-driven solutions.	The Hawthorne Option would not conflict with other plans or projects' ability to leverage new transportation technologies or pursue data-driven solutions.
<p style="text-align: center;">2011 South Bay Bicycle Master Plan</p> <p>The South Bay Bicycle Master Plan (SBBMP) is a multi-city bicycle master plan developed in 2011 by the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition (LACBC) and the South Bay Bicycle Coalition (SBBC) with the common goal of improving the safety and convenience of bicycling in the South Bay Region. Seven member cities of the South Bay Cities Council of Government were involved in the development of the SBBMP, including El Segundo, Gardena, Hermosa Beach, Lawndale, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, and Torrance.</p>		
<p>Objective 1.1 Connectivity through an Expanded Bikeway Network</p> <p>Policy 1.1.4 – Review and encourage implementation of policies and facilities proposed in the SBBMP whenever planning new bicycle facilities or capital improvement projects that may be related to bicycle improvements.</p>		

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
<p>The SBBMP proposes a bicycle facility along the Metro ROW. The Proposed Project includes this bicycle facility and is thus consistent with Policy 1.1.4. The Project would not conflict with the SBBMP objectives to expand the bike network in other ways because it does not preclude the planning and construction of intersecting or parallel facilities.</p>	<p>The SBBMP proposes a bicycle facility along the Metro ROW. The Trench Option includes this bicycle facility and is thus consistent with Policy 1.1.4. The Trench Option would not conflict with the SBBMP objectives to expand the bike network in other ways because it is similar in nature to the Proposed Project.</p>	<p>The SBBMP proposes a bicycle facility along the Metro ROW. The Hawthorne Option does not preclude the planning and construction of the bicycle facility along the Metro ROW. The Hawthorne Option would not conflict with the SBBMP objectives to expand the bike network because it does not preclude the planning and construction of intersecting or parallel facilities.</p>
<p>Objective 1.2 Consistent Design and Engineering for Bicycles</p>		
<p>The Project does not conflict with policies regarding Objective 1.2 because it does not preclude elements such as reallocation of existing road space, restriping, or other strategies identified by various policy actions to implement bikeways intersecting or parallel to the Project. For the multi-use path component of the Proposed Project, striping and/or signage consistent with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and best practices would be installed at points where the Project alignment intersects facilities proposed in the SBBMP.</p>	<p>The Trench Option does not conflict with policies regarding Objective 1.2 because it is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project in its effect on the road network and its approach to the multi-use path along the Metro ROW.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option does not conflict with policies regarding Objective 1.2 because it does not preclude elements such as reallocation of existing road space, restriping, or other strategies identified by various policy actions to implement bikeways intersecting or parallel to the LRT.</p>
<p>Objective 1.3 Increased Mobility through Bicycle-Transit Integration Policy 1.3.1 – Support the development of bicycle facilities that provide access to regional and local public transit services. Policy 1.3.2 – Coordinate with transit providers to ensure bicycles can be accommodated on all forms of transit vehicles and that adequate space is devoted to their storage on board whenever possible. Policy 1.3.3 – Coordinate with transit agencies to install and maintain convenient and secure short-term and long-term bike parking facilities – racks, on-demand bike lockers, in-station bike storage, and staffed or automated bicycle parking facilities – at transit stops, stations, and terminals.</p>		

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
<p>The Proposed Project would not conflict with policies regarding Objective 1.3 because it increases transit services throughout the region that provide short and long-term bicycle parking at stations (including bike racks and lockers as part of Metro’s typical station design criteria), accommodates bicycles on the LRT vehicles, and does not preclude the planning and construction of facilities that access the LRT stations.</p>	<p>The Trench Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project with regards to integrating bicycle and transit and similarly does not preclude development of bike access to stations, and therefore does not conflict with Objective 1.3.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project with regards to integrating bicycle and transit and similarly does not preclude development of bike access to stations, and therefore does not conflict with Objective 1.3.</p>
<p>Objective 1.4 Provide Convenient and Consistent Bicycle Parking Facilities Policy 1.4.8 – Work with Metro to provide bicycle parking in proximity to bus stops and other transit facilities.</p>		
<p>The Proposed Project would not conflict with policies regarding Objective 1.4 because it provides short and long-term bicycle parking at stations including bike racks and lockers as part of Metro’s typical station design criteria.</p>	<p>The Trench Option would not conflict with policies regarding Objective 1.4 because it provides short and long-term bicycle parking at stations including bike racks and lockers as part of Metro’s typical station design criteria.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option would not conflict with policies regarding Objective 1.4 because it provides short and long-term bicycle parking at stations including bike racks and lockers as part of Metro’s typical station design criteria.</p>
<p>2009 City of Redondo Beach – General Plan Circulation Element The Redondo Beach General Plan Circulation Element was adopted in 2009 and provides goals and policies for the circulation system.</p>		
<p>Goal G1 – Address the root causes of trip generation rather than simply reacting to the consequences. Goal G4 – Allow for safe and convenient walking, biking, or taking transit. Goal G16 – Provide reliable, safe fixed-route transit.</p>		

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
<p>As a transit improvement, the Proposed Project supports Goals G1 and G16 by providing a reliable fixed-route transit alternative to auto travel, thereby reducing the generation of vehicle trips.</p> <p>The Proposed Project supports G4 by providing an additional high-quality transit option to the area, which will adhere to relevant design standards to support a safe rider experience, as well as safe walking and biking to and from the transit facility. The resource study area (RSA) for the project includes half-mile walk area to each station as well as a 500' radius along the alignment to ensure that pedestrian access across the LRT is maintained and safely provided for. Each crossing is evaluated under the impact criteria regarding the project potential to increase hazards. At-grade crossings include safety features such as warning lights and bells and full gates across all travel lanes and sidewalks, an improvement over existing at-grade freight crossings on the Metro ROW.</p>	<p>The Trench Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project regarding provision of reliable and safe transit and connections to walking and biking. The Trench Option differs from the Proposed Project in fully removing at-grade crossings that further improve safety and convenience for walking and biking across the LRT.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project regarding provision of reliable and safe transit and connections to walking and biking. The Hawthorne Option features no at-grade crossings and is designed to maintain or improve existing pedestrian crossings along Hawthorne Boulevard, including the introduction of three new signalized crossings at 164th Street, a midblock crossing at the South Bay Galleria Station south of Artesia Boulevard, and at 179th Street where no existing crossing is provided.</p>
<p>Policy P31 – Extend Metro’s Green Line. Policy P32 – Create multi-modal transit hubs.</p>		
<p>As an extension of the Metro C Line (Green), the Project inherently and directly supports Policy P31.</p> <p>As a light rail Project that will serve connections to bus transit, private vehicle drop-off zones, and pedestrian infrastructure, the Project supports P32. The Proposed Project locates its LRT station at the Redondo Beach Transit Center, a multi-modal transit hub.</p>	<p>The Trench Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project regarding the extension of Metro’s C Line and the connections to hubs including the Redondo Beach Transit Center.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project regarding the extension of Metro’s C Line. The Hawthorne Option does not directly serve the Redondo Beach Transit Center but does not conflict with its use as a multi-modal hub.</p>

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
Policy P33 – Enhance transit wayfinding and signage at transit stops.		
The Proposed Project alignment and stations would follow Metro’s Systemwide Station Design Criteria, which includes signage to aid in wayfinding, supporting P33.	The Trench Option alignment and stations would follow Metro’s Systemwide Station Design Criteria, which includes signage to aid in wayfinding, supporting P33.	The Hawthorne Option alignment and stations would follow Metro’s Systemwide Station Design Criteria, which includes signage to aid in wayfinding, supporting P33.
<p align="center">1993 City of Redondo Beach General Plan – Safety Element The Redondo Beach General Plan Safety Element was last updated in 1993.</p>		
Policy 12.1.3 – Assess the potential impacts of development to the circulation system as it relates to fire prevention, including emergency response times.		
Refer to the emergency response impact evaluation in Section 3.1-4.4. The Proposed Project would not hinder emergency access or response.	Refer to the emergency response impact evaluation in Section 3.1-4.4. The Trench Option would not increase emergency response times.	Refer to the emergency response impact evaluation in Section 3.1-4.4. The Hawthorne Option would not increase emergency response times.
<p align="center">2010 City of Torrance General Plan Circulation and Infrastructure Element The Torrance General Plan Circulation and Infrastructure Element was adopted in 2010 and provides goals and policies for circulation and utility systems to support land use densities and intensities.</p>		
<p>Objective CI-7 – Expansion and optimization of local and regional bus and other transit systems Policy CI-3.4 – Encourage the use of regional rail, buses, bicycling, carpools, and vanpools for work trips. Policy CI-7.2 – Coordinate transit planning with regional and county transportation agencies. Policy CI-7.3 – Support and encourage the use of public transit. Policy CI-7.4 – Establish a transit center. Policy CI-7.5 – Provide attractive and appropriate transit amenities. Policy CI-7.9 – Support light rail usage by providing connections to transfer opportunities through the Torrance Transit System.</p>		

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
<p>The Project directly supports Objective CI-7, Policy CI-3.4, 7.3, and 7.4 by providing urban light rail transit service connecting to the Metro Rail and Regional Rail network, The Project further includes accommodations such as bicycle parking and a multiuse trail for a portion of the alignment, and 7.5 through the station design, which would follow Metro’s Systemwide Station Design Criteria. The Project utilizes the planned Torrance Transit Center as its station location.</p> <p>The Project is being planned and implemented through Metro in coordination with Torrance, consistent with Policy CI-7.2.</p> <p>The Project supports policy CI-7.9, as the proposed stations allow connection between Metro’s transit system, Redondo Beach, Hawthorne, County of Los Angeles, and the Torrance Transit systems.</p>	<p>The Trench Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project regarding policies under Objective CI-7 because the core features of the project to provide transit amenities and utilize the Torrance Transit Center as its station remain the same.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project regarding policies under Objective CI-7 because the core features of the project to provide transit amenities and utilize the Torrance Transit Center as its station remain the same.</p>

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
Policy CI-4.1 – Protect residential neighborhoods from cut-through traffic by improving signage, guiding traffic away from residential areas, and employing appropriate traffic-calming methods.		
<p>The Proposed Project does not conflict with the policy to provide traffic calming and wayfinding to reduce neighborhood traffic intrusion. The stations are accessible from major arterial roadways (Hawthorne Boulevard, or Crenshaw Boulevard) and the street grid in the surrounding access shed within 3 miles of the station is generally in a pattern which makes arterials the most efficient means of travel. During the final design of the Project, Metro’s First and Last Mile process would further identify access routes to the station and implement wayfinding signage to guide traffic towards stations along major routes.</p>	<p>The Trench Option of the project is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project related to the residential street network and attracting trips to and from stations, and therefore does not conflict with Policy CI-4.1.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option does not conflict with Policy CI-4.1 because it does not preclude Torrance or other cities from improving signage and employing traffic-calming methods for neighborhoods near the project alignment. On Hawthorne Boulevard, intersection access would be modified at 179th Street to introduce a full traffic signal where there is currently an unsignalized break in the median. The implementation of the signal would improve the safety and ease of crossing Hawthorne Boulevard at this location, between the retail stores on the west side of Hawthorne Boulevard and the neighborhoods to the east. To the extent that new cut-through traffic might take advantage of this improved access, the Project does not preclude the community from implementing measures to discourage cut-through traffic. No substantial amount of neighborhood cut-through traffic is anticipated, because the project preserves existing roadway capacity and should not introduce substantial new traffic delay. Furthermore, the neighborhood street network, which features several turns and stop signs before reaching Prairie Ave (the next major street), would not provide a meaningful travel time benefit to access roads or destinations to the east compared with the nearby arterials (Artesia Boulevard or 182nd Street).</p>

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
Policy CI-7.10 – Implement signal prioritization to support public transit and provide more efficient transit services.		
The Proposed Project would not directly affect any existing intersections as there are no at-grade LRT crossings within the City of Torrance. The Project would not preclude Torrance from implementing transit signal priority.	The Trench Option would not directly affect any existing intersections as there are no at-grade LRT crossings within the City of Torrance. The Project would not preclude Torrance from implementing transit signal priority.	The Hawthorne Option does not include any at-grade LRT crossings on Hawthorne Boulevard. The Project would not preclude Torrance from implementing transit signal priority.
2010 City of Torrance – General Plan Safety Element The Torrance General Plan Safety Element was adopted in 2010 and provides policies to minimize threats from natural and human-caused disasters.		
Objective S-6 – Provision of a high level of fire, police, and emergency medical services. Policy S-6.5 – Provide for a maximum 6-minute Fire Department response time.		
Refer Section 3.1-4.4 of this environmental impact report (EIR) for the emergency response impact evaluation. Based on that analysis, there are no permanent closures that would result in inadequate emergency access. The Proposed Project does not conflict with the City of Torrance’s ability to meet the maximum response time.	Refer Section 3.1-4.4 of this EIR for the emergency response impact evaluation. The Trench Option further reduces the Project effect on the road network by grade-separating the LRT and therefore does not conflict with the City of Torrance’s ability to meet the maximum response time.	Refer Section 3.1-4.4 of this EIR for the emergency response impact evaluation. The Hawthorne Option is grade-separated along Hawthorne Boulevard and generally preserves roadway capacity and turning capability to access properties on either side of the road, and therefore does not conflict with the City of Torrance’s ability to meet the maximum response time. At 180th Street, the existing unsignalized median would be permanently closed to accommodate the elevated span columns and avoid increased traffic safety hazards; however, access for emergency responders is not substantially affected by this closure as the nearest intersection at 179th Street would remain open (with the addition of a signal), and represents a negligible difference in travel time to access nearby homes and businesses.

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
<p align="center">1996 City of Torrance – Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan</p> <p>The City of Torrance adopted the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan in 1996 in order to guide future decision-making regarding land use, development, transportation, streetscape, and other public improvements within the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan Area. The plan area runs along Hawthorne Boulevard and extends from Redondo Beach Boulevard in the north to Rolling Hills Road in the south, encompassing the Del Amo Fashion Center, the Civic Center, Madrona Marsh, and Torrance Municipal Airport.</p>		
<p>Goal 1E – Maximize opportunities for alternative modes of transportation and maintain mobility.</p> <p>Objective 7A – Transit service which enhances mobility in the corridor and serves as a convenient alternative to automobile travel.</p> <p>Policy 7-1 – Coordinate local and regional transit service operating in the corridor in order to maximize the service provided and to optimize convenience to the user.</p> <p>Policy 7-5 – Establish shuttle services that enhance corridor carrying capacity and accessibility to adjacent land uses.</p> <p>Objective 8A – Reduce the dependence on single-occupant vehicles for circulation in the corridor.</p>		
<p>As an alternative mode of transit to the automobile, the Proposed Project has the potential to increase the capacity along or near the corridor, without adding additional vehicle congestion. While the Project does not propose shuttle service, it would not preclude future implementation of shuttles and is therefore consistent with Policy 7-5. As an extension of Los Angeles County’s urban network, the Project will enhance non-automobile mobility near the Hawthorne Corridor, serving Objective 7A, Policy 7-1, and Objective 8A.</p>	<p>The Trench Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project regarding its nature as a transit service near to the Hawthorne Boulevard corridor.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project and furthermore maximizes alignment with the Specific Plan objectives by locating the new transit option directly on the corridor with a station at the South Bay Galleria and connecting to points south in Torrance.</p>

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
Policy 6-2 – Minimize potential conflicts between through traffic on Hawthorne Boulevard and turning traffic, between vehicles and pedestrians, and between traffic and stopped transit vehicles.		
<p>The Proposed Project includes no design features that would alter existing operating conditions between through and turning vehicles or roadway users on Hawthorne Boulevard.</p>	<p>The Trench Option includes no design features that would alter existing operating conditions between through and turning vehicles or roadway users on Hawthorne Boulevard.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option avoids introduction of new intersection conflicts by elevating the LRT above the roadway and locating support columns so as to maintain visibility between vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists. At the south end of the South Bay Galleria Station between Artesia Boulevard and 177th Street, and at 179th Street, new traffic signals will provide new pedestrian crossings. At 179th Street, the addition of the signal would provide turning access for businesses and residents on either side of Hawthorne Boulevard and eliminate two unsignalized intersections (179th and 180th) where left turns into and from these intersecting streets must currently cross many lanes of uncontrolled traffic.</p>
Policy 6-4 – Avoid the intrusion of through traffic in residential areas.		
<p>As described above under the 2010 Torrance Circulation and Infrastructure Element, the Proposed Project does not conflict with Policy 6-4 as it would not affect through lane capacity on Hawthorne and thus would not encourage drivers to use nearby residential streets as a cut-through alternative.</p>	<p>As described above under the 2010 Torrance Circulation and Infrastructure Element, the Trench Option does not conflict with Policy 6-4 as it would not affect through lane capacity on Hawthorne and thus would not encourage drivers to use nearby residential streets as a cut-through alternative.</p>	<p>As described above under the 2010 Torrance Circulation and Infrastructure Element, the Hawthorne Option does not conflict with Policy 6-4 as it would preserve lane capacity on Hawthorne and thus would not encourage drivers to use nearby residential streets as a cut-through alternative.</p>

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
<p align="center">1991 City of Lawndale General Plan Circulation Element</p> <p>The Lawndale General Plan Circulation Element was developed in 1991. Goals of the Circulation Element include provision of an integrated transportation system, consideration of all modes of transportation, development of alternative transportation strategies to reduce traffic volumes, and coordination and integration of the City's transportation system with the regional transportation system.</p>		
<p>Policy 1B – Provide necessary facilities to balance all travel modes, users, and for a variety of trip purposes. Transportation modes are prioritized in the following order: vehicles, public transit, pedestrians, bicycles where sufficient right-of-way exists, and freight.</p> <p>Policy 4A – Reduce daily and peak hour vehicle trips.</p> <p>Policy 5A – Work with regional transportation agencies to establish criteria to implement transit improvements and develop short- and long-term transit service plans, corridor improvements, transit centers, park and ride lots, and the preservation of rights-of-way for commuter rail stations.</p> <p>Policy 5D – Work with regional transportation agencies to plan and implement a commuter rail system, including routes, location of stops, service schedules, feeder bus routes, parking needs, a transit terminal/park and ride lot, and funding.</p>		
<p>The Proposed Project does not conflict with Circulation Element policies regarding the provision of facilities to balance travel modes, reduce vehicle trips, implement transit improvements including a “commuter rail” system (as it was described in 1991, although the contemporary terminology would more accurately describe the LRT as a regional or urban rail transit project). The Project achieves these objectives by providing an alternative to driving, and incorporates specific elements including a terminal and park and ride lot nearby at the Redondo Beach Transit Center.</p>	<p>The Trench Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project regarding its nature as a transit service supporting the policy objectives in the Circulation Element.</p>	<p>The Hawthorne Option is fundamentally the same as the Proposed Project regarding its nature as a transit service supporting the policy objectives in the Circulation Element, although it would not directly connect with the Redondo Beach Transit Center; however, the South Bay Galleria Station would be a short, less than half-mile walk away and it is reasonable to expect that some bus services would provide a direct connection between the two.</p>
<p>Policy 3A – Require or provide adequate traffic safety measures on all roadways.</p>		
<p>Any altered or re-designed roadway will be designed in accordance with relevant safety standards, such as MUTCD, Highway Design Manual (HDM), and local design guidelines supporting Policy 3A.</p>	<p>Any altered or re-designed roadway will be designed in accordance with relevant safety standards, such as MUTCD, HDM, and local design guidelines supporting Policy 3A.</p>	<p>Any altered or re-designed roadway will be designed in accordance with relevant safety standards, such as MUTCD, HDM, and local design guidelines supporting Policy 3A.</p>

Proposed Project	Trench Option	Hawthorne Option
<p align="center">2015 City of Lawndale – General Plan Safety Element</p> <p align="center">The Lawndale General Plan Safety Element was adopted in 2015. Relevant goals of the Safety Element include protection of the community from loss of life or injury and damage to property due to fire hazards.</p>		
<p>Policy SAF-4.4 – Provision of adequate access for emergency vehicles and evacuation in all new developments.</p>		
<p>See section 3.1-4 of this EIR for consistency with Policy SAF-4.4. The Proposed Project is not, technically speaking, a new development. However, access for emergency vehicles across the Metro ROW would be affected by the increase in train frequency compared to existing conditions. Based on the analysis in section 3.1-4, no significant impact was identified in the City of Lawndale related to emergency response times.</p>	<p>Refer Section 3.1-4 of this EIR for the emergency response impact evaluation. The Trench Option further reduces the Project effect on the road network by grade-separating the LRT and therefore does not conflict with the provision of adequate access for emergency vehicles.</p>	<p>Refer Section 3.1-4 of this EIR for the emergency response impact evaluation. The Hawthorne Option is grade-separated along Hawthorne Boulevard and generally preserves roadway capacity and turning capability to access properties on either side of the road, and therefore does not conflict with the provision of adequate access for emergency vehicles.</p>

Source: Goals & policies per noted document / Fehr & Peers analysis, 2021