




EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE

Final Environmental Impact Report



LOS ANGELES COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

October 1992

HE 4491.E9 E93 1992

26919983

PREFACE

This document constitutes the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route to be located in an area southwest of downtown Los Angeles. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public review period on May 28, 1992 - July 13, 1992. A 2-week extension for public comments was also granted until July 28, 1992. A public hearing was held on June 23, 1992 at 400 West Washington Boulevard in the Grand Theater. Comments and responses to comments are contained in Chapter 9.0 of this report.

During the public review period a number of issues were raised regarding the impacts of Alternative 1b, Washington Boulevard to 29th Street (Separate Bridge). As a result of issues raised during the public review process the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission has developed a modified Alternative 1b which would mitigate the impacts and concerns raised. This mitigated Alternative 1b is presented in Chapter 9.0 of this report and hereby replaces Alternative 1b presented in the Draft portion of this EIR. The Draft EIR portion of this report remains unchanged except for those items identified on the following Errata Sheet and the Summary Section. The Summary Section has been revised to incorporate this mitigated Alternative 1b as well as any new mitigation measures which have been developed in response to comments raised.

HE
4491
.E9
E93
1992
C.3

28343

JUL 24 2002

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE
STATE CLEARING HOUSE NO. 91101009**

Prepared for:

**Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 244-6261**


Contact: Jim de la Loza

in association with:


**Gruen Associates
Terry A. Hayes Associates
Benito Sinclair Associates
Meyer Mohaddes Associates
Gannet Flemming, Inc.
Manuel Padron Associates**

October 1992

WESTERN SEGMENT 29th STREET TO VERMONT




NORTHERN SEGMENT WASHINGTON TO 29th STREET



GRAPHIC LEGEND

- AT GRADE (EXISTING)
- AT GRADE (PROPOSED)
- ELEVATED
- SUBWAY / CUT AND COVER
- STATION LOCATION
- OPTIONAL STATION LOCATION
- PARK AND RIDE OPPORTUNITY
- PROPOSED CALTRANS BUSWAY STATION

NO SCALE



**Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route**

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 1.3-3
PROPOSED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

ERRATA SHEET

The following changes should be made to the text of this EIR which incorporate revisions requested during the public comment period as well as typographic errors:

p. 1-7 - 23rd Street Station; change "21st" to "22nd".

p. 1-7 - Exposition Park/Vermont Station: change "trains" to "cars".

p. 4-1 -

p. 4-6 - Third paragraph, eighth line, change the sentence to read, " Figueroa Street would be two-way with an off-center operation; and Flower Street would be one-way northbound except between Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street, where it would be two-way."

p. 4-13 - add to Table 4.6-1, item 27, first column, "and northward extension of the 110 Transitway from 28th Street".

p. 5-8 - Second paragraph, sixth line, change the sentence to read, "This alternative would include installation of a positive control at the mid-block crossover as required by LADOT at the train crossing which would also control movements into and out of the hospital" (added text is under lined).

p. 5-8 - Third paragraph, delete last sentence.

p. 5-14 - Third paragraph, line 9, change "west" to "east".

p. 5-20 - Last paragraph, second sentence, change to read, "Figueroa Street has three lanes in both directions with left turn channelization throughout the study area,..." (change underlined).

p. 5-23 - Second paragraph, second line, change to read, "Secondary highways have rights-of-way that are approximately 84 feet wide with 66 feet curb to curb" (revisions underlined).

p. 2-23 - Fifth paragraph, first line, add to the end of the sentence after direction, "with left turn channelization throughout the study area".

p. 5-23 - Last paragraph, second sentence, add to the end of the sentence, "and has left turn channelization throughout the study area".

p. 5-24 - First paragraph,, fourth line, change "30 foot" to "26 foot".

p. 5-61 - Third paragraph, change "Washington Boulevard" to "Exposition Boulevard".

p. 5-24 - Third paragraph, second sentence, add to the end of the sentence, "in addition to left turn channelization. North of Exposition Boulevard, Vermont Avenue is striped for the third northbound lane and a southbound right-turn lane."

p. 5-24 - add the following paragraph before the heading **Parking Facilities**, "Dash Route C connects the Exposition Park/USC area to the Seventh Street retail district of downtown. It operates from 6:30 a.m. until 10:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday at 15-minute headways during peak hours and at 30-minute headways midday, in the evening and on Saturday. Route C circles through Exposition Park, travels along Figueroa Street to Adams Boulevard, then along Grand Avenue into downtown, with a diversion along Pico Boulevard to Figueroa Street to serve the Blue Line and Convention Center.

p. 5-27 - Last paragraph, last line, delete "contra-flow".

p. 5-28 - First paragraph, second line, delete "contra-flow".

p. 5-45 - First paragraph, line 12, change "westbound" to "eastbound".

p. 5-49 - Last paragraph, fourth line, add (underlined), "to coincide with the southbound through Flower Street Traffic,..".

p. 5-50 - Second last paragraph, last sentence, Change "500" to 1,000.

p. 5-62 - The text on page 5-62 shall be revised as follows to reflect 1991 air quality monitoring data from the North Main Street Station:

- **Carbon Monoxide** - The maximum recorded one-hour concentration in 1991 was 12 ppm. The State 1-hour standard of 20 ppm was not exceeded in 1991 nor in the preceding five years. The 8-hour standard was not exceeded in 1991 but was exceeded an average of 2 days per year in each of the preceding five years.
- **Ozone** - The 1991 maximum recorded one-hour concentration was 0.19 ppm. The State one-hour standard of 0.09 ppm was exceeded for 59 days in 1991.
- **Nitrogen Oxides** - The maximum one-hour concentration recorded in 1991 was 0.38 ppm and the 1-hour standard of 0.25 ppm was exceeded on 5 days during that year. During the 1986-1991 period, the greatest number of days the standard was exceeded occurred in 1986 (7 days).
- **Total Suspended Particulates** - The maximum 24-hour concentration recorded in 1991 was 183 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).
- **Sulfate** - The maximum 24-hour concentration in 1991 was $23.1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. State standards were not exceeded.
- **Lead** - The maximum 24-hour concentration in 1991 was $0.21 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. Federal and State standards of $1.5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ were not exceeded in 1991 or during the

preceding five-year time period.

- **Particulate (PM₁₀)** - The maximum 24-hour concentration recorded in 1991 was 151 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The State standard of 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was exceeded for 31 days in 1991.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

ERRATA SHEET

CHAPTER 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1.1
1.1 Purpose and Uses of the EIR	1-1
1.2 History of the Project	1-2
1.3 Description of Project Alternatives	1-3
1.4 Environmental Impact Summary	1-8
1.5 Areas of Controversy/Issues to be Resolved	1-9
CHAPTER 2.0 PROJECT PURPOSE AND HISTORY	2.1
2.1 Project Description	2-1
2.2 Project Purpose	2-1
2.3 Planning History	2-2
CHAPTER 3.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	3.1
3.1 Rail Technology	3-1
3.2 Ridership and Operations	3-1
3.3 Route Design Alternatives	3-1
3.4 Station Alternatives	3-8
CHAPTER 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	4.1
4.1 Regional Context	4-1
4.2 Land Use	4-2
4.3 Demographic Characteristics	4-4
4.4 Transportation	4-6
4.5 Air Quality	4-6
4.6 Related Projects	4-7
CHAPTER 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES	5.1
5.1 Land Use	5-1
5.2 Population and Housing	5-16
5.3 Transportation and Circulation	5-20
5.4 Air Quality	5-62
5.5 Noise	5-68
5.6 Geology and Hydrology	5-82
5.7 Construction	5-85
5.8 Public Services	5-93
5.9 Energy Conservation	5-99
5.10 Biological Resources	5-102
5.11 Risk of Upset	5-106
5.12 Aesthetics	5-111
5.13 Cultural and Historic Resources	5-121

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER 6.0 OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS/FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	6.1
6.1 Growth Inducement	6-1
6.2 Long-Term Implications of the Proposed Project	6-3
 CHAPTER 7.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT	 7.1
 CHAPTER 8.0 LIST OF PREPARERS, PERSONS CONTACTED AND REFERENCES	 8.1
8.1 List of Preparers	8-1
8.2 Persons and Agencies Contacted	8-2
8.3 References	8-2
 CHAPTER 9.0 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES	 9.1
 APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A	INITIAL STUDY AND NOTICE OF PREPARATION
APPENDIX B	RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF PREPARATION
APPENDIX C	DISTRIBUTION LIST

UNDER SEPARATE COVER

Alignment Plans and Profiles
Station Design Plans

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

1.3-1	Regional Location	1-4
1.3-2	Project Location	1-5
1.3-3	Proposed Project Alternatives	1-6

CHAPTER 3.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

3.1-1	Typical Blue Line Train	3-2
3.3-1	Alternative 1a-Shared Bridge	3-4
3.3-2	Alternative 1b-Separate Bridge	3-5
3.3-3	Alternative 2a-Part Aerial	3-6
3.3-4	Alternative 2b-Part Subway	3-7
3.3-5	Alternative 2c-All At-Grade	3-9
3.4-1	Typical Station Design (Optional Figueroa Station)	3-10

CHAPTER 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

4.2-1	Communities Adjacent to Proposed Rail Line	4-3
4.5-1	Ozone and Carbon Monoxide Levels in Site Vicinity	4-8
4.5-2	Nitrogen Oxide and Particulate Levels in Site Vicinity	4-9
4.6-1	Related Projects	4-14

CHAPTER 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

5.1-1	Existing Land Uses	5-2
5.1-2	Photos 1 and 2	5-3
5.1-3	Photos 3 and 4	5-4
5.1-4	Photos 5 and 6	5-5
5.1-5	Photo 7	5-7
5.1-6	Photos 8 and 9	5-9
5.1-7	District Planning Designations	5-12
5.1-8	Hoover Redevelopment Area	5-13
5.3-1	Existing Lane Configurations	5-21
5.3-2	Existing Lane Configurations	5-22
5.3-3	No Project - Future Lane Configurations	5-30
5.3-4	No Project - Future Lane Configurations	5-31
5.3-5	No Project - Future AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	5-32
5.3-6	No Project - Future AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	5-33
5.3-7	No Project - Future PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	5-34
5.3-8	No Project - Future PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	5-35
5.3-9	Proposed Lane Configurations With All At-Grade Alternatives (1A and 2B)	5-38
5.3-10	Recommended Lane Configurations	5-57
5.5-1	Proposed UMTA Noise Impact Criteria	5-70
5.5-2	Proximity of Orthopaedic Hospital and Apartment Building to the Proposed Rail Line	5-79

LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

CHAPTER 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

5.7-1 Affected Utilities	5-88
5.10-1 Proposed Jefferson Boulevard Station	5-103
5.10-2 View Looking North on Flower	5-104
5.12-2 Photo Location Map	5-112
5.12-2 Photos 1 and 2	5-113
5.12-3 Photos 3 and 4	5-114
5.12-4 Photos 5 and 6	5-115
5.12-5 Photos 7 and 8	5-116
5.12-6 View of Proposed Rail Line Looking South on Flower	5-118
5.12-7 View of Proposed Rail Line Looking South to Exposition	5-119
5.13-1 Historic Resources	5-122

CHAPTER 6.0 OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS/FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

6.1-1 Zoning Adjacent to the Proposed Rail Line	6-2
---	-----

CHAPTER 9.0 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES

9.0-1 Mitigated Alternative 1B	9-4
--------------------------------------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Table 1.4-1	Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures	1-10
-------------	--	------

CHAPTER 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Table 4.3-1	Population Trends in Communities Adjacent to the Rail Line	4-5
Table 4.3-2	Population Densities in the Areas Adjacent to the Rail Line	4-5
Table 4.6-1	Related Projects	4-10

CHAPTER 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 5.2-1	Demographic Characteristics	5-17
Table 5.2-2	Yearly Income Limits for Affordable Housing	5-18
Table 5.2-3	Distribution of Housing Demand in the City of Los Angeles	5-19
Table 5.3-1:	Parking Supply In and Around the Coliseum	5-25
Table 5.3-2:	ICU Values and Corresponding LOS Designators	5-26
Table 5.3-3:	Existing Intersection Levels of Service	5-27
Table 5.3-4:	No Project AM and PM Levels of Service	5-36
Table 5.3-5:	Alternative 1A and 2C (All At-Grade With Shared Bridge) AM Levels of Service	5-39
Table 5.3-6:	Alternative 1A and 2C (All At-Grade With Shared Bridge) PM Levels of Service	5-40
Table 5.3-7:	Alternative 1B and 2C (All At-Grade With Separate Bridge) AM Levels of Service	5-43
Table 5.3-8:	Alternative 1B and 2C (All At-Grade With Separate Bridge) PM Levels of Service	5-44
Table 5.3-9:	Alternative 1A and 2C (All At-Grade With Shared Bridge) Impacts on Flower Street	5-48
Table 5.3-10:	Alternative 1A and 2C (All At-Grade With Shared Bridge) AM Levels of Service With Mitigation	5-58
Table 5.3-11:	Alternative 1A and 2C (All At-Grade With Shared Bridge) PM Levels of Service With Mitigation	5-59
Table 5.4-1:	Existing 1-hour and 8-hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations	5-63
Table 5.4-2:	Year 2010 1-hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations for Alternative 1a and 2c	5-65
Table 5.4-3:	Year 2010 8-hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations for Alternative 1a and 2c	5-66
Table 5.5-1:	Existing Noise Levels (CNEL Estimate)	5-68
Table 5.5-2:	Alternative 1a - Shared Bridge Noise Impacts	5-71
Table 5.5-3:	Alternative 1b - Separate Bridge Noise Impacts	5-72
Table 5.5-4:	Alternative 2a - Part Aerial Noise Impacts	5-72
Table 5.5-5:	Alternative 2b - Part Subway Noise Impacts	5-73
Table 5.5-6:	Alternative 2c - All At-Grade Noise Impacts	5-74
Table 5.5-7:	Light Rail Ground-Borne Vibration as a Function of Speed and Distance	5-76

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

CHAPTER 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

MEASURES (Continued)

Table 5.5-8: Predicted Light Rail Vibration Ranges for Alternative 1a and 2c . .	5-78
Table 5.5-9: Predicted Light Rail Vibration Ranges for Alternative 1b	5-80
Table 5.5-10: Predicted Light Rail Vibration Ranges for Alternative 2a	5-80
Table 5.7-1: Utility Lines Requiring Relocation	5-87
Table 5.9-1: Energy Consumption Related to Stations and Traction Power	5-100

CHAPTER 1.0

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

1.1 PURPOSE AND USES OF THE EIR

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) identifies, describes, analyzes and evaluates the environmental effects of a proposed light rail transit project to be located in an area southwest of downtown Los Angeles. The EIR is intended to: a) provide the lead agency, which is the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC), responsible agencies, decision-makers and the general public with detailed information on the environmental effects of the proposed project; and b) to be used as a tool by decision-makers to facilitate decision-making on the proposed project. The EIR has been prepared for the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and State CEQA Guidelines, as amended.

The LACTC has determined that the proposed project may have significant environmental impacts upon the environment, and has therefore directed that this EIR be prepared. The LACTC prepared an Initial Environmental Study which indicated those issue areas to be analyzed in this EIR. Following the completion of the Initial Study, a Notice of Preparation was submitted to all identified responsible agencies, and a project summary was distributed to the general public and those on the project mailing list. The Initial Study and the Notice of Preparation are included in Appendix A. Responses to the Notice of Preparation are included in Appendix B. The mailing list is included in Appendix C.

Public Review

Public officials, affected agencies and the general public have the opportunity for reviewing and commenting on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) through a 45-day review period established by the State Office of Planning Research. During this review period, the LACTC will also conduct a public hearing at which time public testimony will be taken concerning the project and the EIR. The preparers of the Draft EIR are required to respond, in writing, to relevant comments on the Draft EIR received from both citizens and public agencies. The comments and the responses to comments are included in the Final EIR prepared after the public circulation period for the Draft EIR has ended.

Project Selection

After state and local governments and the general public have commented on the Draft EIR, LACTC will select a project from the options under study for final environmental clearance. Project decisions include:

- Selection of route design and alignment
- Selection of station locations

These decisions will be based largely on information contained in this report and public comment.

Permits and Approvals

Implementation of the project will require a number of discretionary actions to be taken by the LACTC and other responsible agencies. The following agencies may use the EIR as part of the process of issuing permits, approvals or cooperative agreements required to construct the project:

- City of Los Angeles
- California State Department of Transportation
- Public Utilities Commission
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Southern California Rapid Transit District
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

1.2 HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

Representatives of major institutions along the proposed light rail line approached LACTC staff in July, 1990 to discuss the feasibility of study efforts to extend service to the USC/Exposition Park area. At an initial meeting, area representatives expressed their strong support for the rail project and their willingness to provide private sector funding for the study process. An USC/Exposition Park Blue Line Task Force was formed with representatives from local institutions, elected officials, community organizations, public agencies and property owners to organize and fund the study effort.

Conceptual level planning completed as part of the Central Los Angeles Year 1995 Multi-Modal Transit Study, prepared for the Commission, evaluated six basic rail/busway alternatives for providing service between downtown Los Angeles and the Exposition Park area. The consultant identified the strong viability of a branch light rail line from the Metro Blue Line at Washington Boulevard and Flower Street, two miles to the south to serve Exposition Park, USC and the surrounding community.

In May 1991, the Commission solicited professional assistance to perform route refinement work including conceptual engineering refinement and costing evaluation of the proposed alignment and station locations for at-grade, aerial and subway alternatives. In addition an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) following the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines was deemed necessary for the proposed Light Rail Transit (LRT) project.

1.3 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES


As shown in **Figure 1.3-1**, the proposed Exposition Park Branch Line would operate as a branch of the Metro Blue Line. **Figure 1.3-2** shows the proposed local route which would extend along Flower Street from the point where the existing Blue Line alignment turns at Washington Boulevard. The proposed alignment would extend south along Flower Street and continue on to the Exposition Boulevard median right-of-way to the proposed terminus at Vermont Avenue. The length of the proposed extension would total about 1.8 miles.

The proposed rail route has been divided into two segments for purposes of clearly identifying each alternative option along the segment (see **Figure 1.3-3**). The first segment, hereafter referred to as the northern segment, extends along Flower Street from Washington Boulevard to approximately 29th Street (the approximate location of the future California Department of Transportation's Harbor Freeway Transitway project). In response to comments received during the public review period, Alternative 1b has been modified to place the LRT line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of Orthopedic Hospital as described below. The second segment, hereafter referred to as the western segment, extends from 29th Street south on Flower Street and west on Exposition Boulevard to the proposed route terminus at Vermont Avenue. There are two basic alternatives for the northern segment of the line and three basic alternatives for the western segment of the line. The alternatives have been designed such that either of the options for the northern segment could be combined with any of the options for the western segment of the line. The following summarizes each alternative for the northern and western segments of the line:

Northern Segment

Alternative 1a. Washington Boulevard to 29th Street (Shared Bridge): The segment proposes a light rail transit (LRT) alignment with an at-grade profile between Washington Boulevard and approximately 29th Street. This alternative would be located on the east side of Flower Street within the existing right-of-way utilizing the existing Flower Street bridge between Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street, opposite the Orthopaedic Hospital.


Mitigated Alternative 1b. Washington Boulevard to 29th Street (Separate Bridge): This alternative includes the same route as discussed in 1a. above, however, this alternative would be on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of Orthopaedic Hospital and would require a separate LRT bridge parallel to the existing Flower Street bridge between Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street. The separate LRT bridge would be located on the west side of Flower Street. The alignment would therefore traverse from the east side at about 22nd Street to the west side of Flower Street where the 23rd Street Station would be located. The line would then curve further west behind the apartment building at 23rd and Flower Streets where it would become elevated and would cross the Harbor Freeway on a separate bridge. The



**Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route**
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 1.3-1

REGIONAL LOCATION



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 1.3-2

PROJECT LOCATION

line would remain elevated and would cross Flower Street to the east side where it would be elevated to about the Jefferson Street Station.

Western Segment

Alternative 2a. Flower Street and 29th Street to Vermont Avenue - Part Aerial:

This segment of the alignment would extend from approximately 29th Street, on the east side of Flower Street to Exposition Boulevard where it would then turn west, along the center median right-of-way of Exposition Boulevard to approximately Vermont Avenue. The majority of this profile would be at-grade with an elevated segment between approximately Jefferson Boulevard to approximately 1,000 feet east of Menlo Avenue.

Alternative 2b. Flower Street and 29th Street to Vermont Avenue - Part Subway:

This alternative includes the same alignment as described for 2a, however, a portion of this segment would be below grade (subway) while the majority would be at-grade. The at-grade portion would extend along the east side of Flower Street to about Jefferson Boulevard where a the subway entry would be located. The line would then extend below grade under the Exposition Boulevard right-of-way to approximately 200 feet west of Armory Drive, where another subway entry would be located. This alignment would transition to an at-grade profile to the Vermont Avenue terminus.

Alternative 2c. Flower Street and 29th Street to Vermont Avenue - All At-Grade:

This alternative includes the same alignment as described for 2a and 2b, however, this entire profile would be at-grade.

There are three proposed stations which would be located in the same location for all of the alternatives as follows:

23rd Street Station: This station would be located approximately between 21st and 23rd Streets on Flower Street.

Jefferson Station: This station would be located between 33rd Street and Jefferson Boulevard on Flower Street.

Exposition Park/Vermont Station: This station would be located approximately 800 feet east of Vermont Avenue on Exposition Boulevard. This station is currently designed as a single station with loading access for three trains. There is an option to expand this station to the west (towards Vermont Avenue) in the future to a double station capable of handling access for six cars.

In addition, there are three optional station locations as follows:

Washington Station: This station would be an optional station which would take the place of the 23rd Street Station. The station would be located between 18th Street and Washington Boulevard on Flower Street and would include a relocation of the Grand station and consolidation with this station.

Figueroa Station: This optional station would be located at approximately Figueroa Street on Exposition Boulevard. This station could be included for the at-grade and subway Alternatives 2b and 2c and would not be an option for the aerial alternative.

Vermont Station: An option for all alternatives (2a, 2b, and 2c) would be to locate this station further west on Exposition Boulevard, closer to Vermont Avenue. This option would include a two-car station with tail tracks extending west of Vermont Avenue to accommodate up to nine, two-car trains each (for storage in support of special events only). It should be noted that this optional station would limit operations on the Branch Line to two-car platforms at all stations. While 3-car platforms are proposed for all other stations, early year operations are anticipated to require only 2-car trains.

There are two potential mitigation measures to provide access from the Jefferson Street Station or from the Figueroa Street Station to the I-110 Transitway Station (proposed at Exposition Boulevard and the I-110 Freeway) as follows:

Alternatives 2a, 2b and 2c: A pedestrian walkway could be provided from the Jefferson Street Station, south to Exposition Boulevard. The elevated crossing would then extend south, halfway between Exposition Boulevard and 37th Street where it would step down to surface level and provide access to the I-110 Transitway Station.

Alternative 2b: The Figueroa Street Station could have a pedestrian extension to the east from the optional subway station providing access east to meet the I-110 Transitway Station.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SUMMARY

Table 1.4-1 summarizes environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the alternatives. Impacts that would remain after mitigation are noted in the summary as "unavoidable adverse impacts" if the project is approved as proposed (CEQA Section 21081). During the public review period a number of issues were raised regarding the impacts of Alternative 1b, Washington Boulevard to 29th Street (Separate Bridge). As a result of issues raised during the public review process the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission has developed a modified Alternative 1b which would mitigate the impacts and concerns raised. This mitigated Alternative 1b is presented in Chapter 9.0 of this report and hereby replaces Alternative 1b presented in the Draft portion of this EIR. The potential environmental effects of mitigated Alternative 1b are shown in Table 1.4-1 and have replaced information presented in the Draft EIR for Alternative 1b.

1.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

During the public workshops that have been held to discuss the project, numerous environmental concerns have been raised by the community as well as public and private agencies. The most frequently raised issues include: pedestrian safety, noise and vibration, particularly in relationship to sensitive land uses adjacent to the alignment alternative; station locations; overall traffic circulation and traffic congestion, traffic/circulation along Exposition Boulevard during special events at Exposition Park; an east versus west side alignment on Flower Street in the vicinity of Orthopaedic Hospital; and the relationship of the proposed light rail line to interface with future transit extensions (i.e., extension of the line east of the Harbor Freeway and west of Vermont Avenue). These issues are addressed in the land use, noise, and transportation/circulation sections of this EIR.

The primary decision to be made is how to select the preferred profile or vertical alignment. Alternatives range from an all at-grade alignment to an at-grade alignment with selected subway or elevated portions.

TABLE 1.4-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Category	Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge)	Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge)	Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)	Alternative 2b (Part Subway)	Alternative 2c (All At-Grade)	Proposed Rail Stations
Land Use	Closure of two LA Trade Tech driveways off Flower Street. Reduction in sidewalk width from 15 feet to 8 feet in front of Orthopedic Hospital. Acquisition of 4 to 8 feet of St. John's parking lot resulting in re-striping and loss of some center tandem parking spaces. Mitigation: LACTC would work with affected property owners regarding compensation for property specific impacts per the Federal Uniform Relocation Act and Real Estate Acquisition and Relocation Policies Act of 1970 and California Government Code Section 7260.	Closure of two LA Trade Tech driveways off Flower Street. The track would traverse to the west side of Flower Street at 22nd Street and result in the taking of an industrial building and surface parking lot and the apartment building at 23rd and Flower Streets. Mitigation: Implementation of a relocation plan for the tenants of the apartment building at 2315 Flower Street in coordination with tenants and the Esperanza Community Housing Corp. Other measures same as Alternative 1a.	Property acquisitions would not impact the Hilton driveway or the commercial property south of the Hilton because the line would be aerial at this location and would not require additional right-of-way from these properties. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Property acquisitions would not impact the Hilton driveway or the commercial property south of the Hilton because the line would be below grade at this location and would not require additional right-of-way from these properties. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Closure of one of Hilton Hotel's driveways due to the widening required on Flower Street to allow two additional turn lanes onto Exposition Blvd. Loss of 8 parking spaces at the commercial center on northwest corner of Flower and Exposition also from the widening of Flower Street. Mitigation: Same as 1a.	Optional Washington Street Station would result in acquisition of 7 buildings and one business. The optional Vermont Avenue station would result in the acquisition of about 8 feet of right-of-way on the south side of Exposition Blvd. between Vermont Ave. and Wisconsin to accommodate the width needed on Exposition Blvd. for the tail tracks. Mitigation: Same as 1a.
Compatibility with Local Area Plans	Generally consistent with local area plans and the project would assist in the revitalization of the area which would help to achieve the goals of the Hoover Redevelopment Plan.	Generally consistent with local area plans and the project would assist in the revitalization of the area which would help to achieve the goals of the Hoover Redevelopment Plan.	Inconsistent with Exposition Park Master Plan which includes a station at Figueroa and an additional pedestrian crossing of Exposition Boulevard opposite the Rose Garden.	Inconsistent with Exposition Park Master Plan which includes a station at Figueroa and an additional pedestrian crossing of Exposition Boulevard opposite the Rose Garden.	Consistent with Exposition Park Master Plan with a proposed Figueroa Street Station; however, would not allow for pedestrian crossing of Exposition Boulevard opposite the Rose Garden.	Generally consistent. Optional Figueroa Station would be consistent with Exposition Park Master Plan. The optional Vermont station would be consistent with the proposed location of this station in the Exposition Park Master Plan.

TABLE 1.4-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (continued)

Environmental Category	Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge)	Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge)	Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)	Alternative 2b (Part Subway)	Alternative 2c (All At-Grade)	Proposed Rail Stations
Population and Housing	Residential units opposite Orthopaedic Hospital and above commercial buildings on Flower Street would experience increased noise levels but they would not be significant. See also pedestrian safety, aesthetics impacts. Mitigation: A railing along the curb on Flower Street in front of the residential building for pedestrian safety. See also aesthetics.	Loss of an industrial building, surface parking spaces and 63 rental units, housing up to 221 persons. Mitigation: Relocation for all tenants of the apartment building and compensation for commercial properties per Government Code Section 7260.	There are no residential units along this segment of the line. Mitigation: None required.	There are no residential units along this segment of the line. Mitigation: None required.	There are no residential units along this segment of the line. Mitigation: None required.	There are no residential units located adjacent the proposed stations. Mitigation: None required.
Transportation and Circulation	Significant impact during p.m. peak hour at Flower/Jefferson, and Flower/Adams. Elimination of 49 parking spaces on the east side of Flower Street. Elimination of 77 parking spaces on the west side of Flower Street during the evening peak hour. Elimination of the existing pedestrian crosswalks on 21st Street and mid-block opposite Orthopaedic Hospital.	Significant impact during p.m. peak hour at Flower/Jefferson. Elimination of 49 parking spaces on the east side of Flower Street and 16 on the west side of Flower. Elimination of pedestrian crossing on 21st Street.	Significant impact during a.m. peak hour at Figueroa/Exposition. Elimination of 9 parking spaces on the east side of Flower Street. Pedestrian under-crossing of the Harbor Freeway remains open. The support columns would reduce sidewalk width adjacent to this aerial segment by 2 feet (from existing 8 feet to 6 feet). Grade separated crossings at Figueroa/Exposition and Flower/Exposition enhances pedestrian safety concerns.	No significant impact. Same as Alternative 2a. Pedestrian under-crossing of the Harbor Freeway remains open. The grade separated line enhances pedestrian safety concerns at Figueroa/Exposition and Flower/Exposition.	Significant impact during a.m. peak hour at Figueroa/Exposition; and during p.m. peak hour at Flower/Exposition. Elimination of 9 parking spaces on the east side of Flower and 76 parking spaces on the north and south side of Exposition between Figueroa and Vermont. Elimination of the existing mid-block crosswalk between Jefferson and Exposition serving pedestrian under-crossing of the Harbor Freeway.	Included in Alternative 1a to 2c. Access would be provided via pedestrian signalized cross walks adjacent to each station.

TABLE 1.4-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (continued)

Environmental Category	Alternative 1a (At-Grade Shared Bridge)	Alternative 1b (At-Grade Separate Bridge)	Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)	Alternative 2b (Part Subway)	Alternative 2c (At-Grade)	Proposed Rail Stations
Transportation and Circulation (continued)	Pedestrian crossings would be prohibited at "T" intersections along Flower at 20th, 21st, 22nd, 27th, 29th, 31st, 33rd and 35th Streets. Mitigation: Implementation of the following: additional southbound lane on Flower St. at Adams; widen Flower at Jefferson to 4 southbound lanes; add left turn signal display on Flower at 23rd, 28th, 30th and Jefferson; signalize 28th St.; and install warning signs along all driveways on Flower Street. A railing would be provided along the curb on Flower Street to prevent pedestrians from stepping off curb onto track and mid-block crossings. Proposed traffic signal at 28th street would include pedestrian signal.	Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Signal at 28th Street; signal at 21st Street and prohibit left turns at 30th Street. Same as Alternative 1a.	Mitigation: Implementation of the following: add southbound lane on Flower St. at Adams; widen Flower at Jefferson to 4 southbound lanes; add left turn signal display on Flower at 23rd, 28th, 30th and Jefferson; signalize 28th St.; install warning signs along all driveways on Flower Street; movements at Armory Drive and driveways to California Museum of Science and Industry should be right-in and right-out only; time signal at Hoover St/Watt Way to accommodate pedestrian traffic to Exposition Park/Vermont station; widen eastbound Exposition by 2 feet to allow 12 feet curb lanes. Provide pedestrian access from the Jefferson Street Station to the I-110 Transitway Station. Provide a railing along both sides of the Exposition Blvd. where the LRT is at grade. Grade separation at aerial portion enhances pedestrian safety.	Mitigation: Implementation of the following: add southbound lane on Flower St. at Adams; widen Flower at Jefferson to 4 southbound lanes; add left turn signal display on Flower at 23rd, 28th, 30th and Jefferson; signalize 28th St.; install warning signs along all driveways on Flower Street; movements at Armory Drive and driveways to California Museum of Science and Industry should be right-in and right-out only; time signal at Hoover St/Watt Way to accommodate pedestrian traffic to Exposition Park/Vermont Station. Extend portal east on Exposition Boulevard to provide pedestrian access to the I-110 Transitway; implement optional subway station at Figueroa. Provide a railing along both sides of Exposition Blvd. where the LRT is at-grade. Grade separation at subway segment enhances pedestrian safety.	Pedestrian crossings would be provided along Exposition at Figueroa, mid-block opposite the Rose Garden at Watt Way and Vermont Avenue. Mitigation: Additional westbound through lane on Exposition Blvd. to Flower; re-stripe southbound Harbor Freeway off-ramp to 2 through and a shared through/left; re-stripe eastbound 37th St. at Flower to five lanes; add southbound right turn lane on Flower at 37th Pl.; add westbound right turn lane on 37th Pl. at Flower; add westbound right turn lane on 37th Pl. at Figueroa and signalize intersection; redirect eastbound left turning vehicles at Figueroa via 37th St.; movements at Armory Drive and driveways to California Museum of Science and Industry should be right-in and right-out only; time signal at Hoover St/Watt Way to accommodate pedestrian traffic to Exposition Park/Vermont station. Provide pedestrian access from the Jefferson Street Station to the I-110 Transitway Station. A rail would be provided along both sides of the Exposition Blvd rail track to enhance pedestrian safety.	Mitigation: At Optional Figueroa and Vermont stations, a railing would be installed at the opposite end of the platform from the access walkway to prevent pedestrian access from mid-block opposite the Rose Garden.

TABLE 1.4-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (continued)

Environmental Category	Alternative 1a (At-Grade Shared Bridge)	Alternative 1b (At-Grade Separate Bridge)	Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)	Alternative 2b (Part Subway)	Alternative 2c (At-Grade)	Proposed Rail Stations
Air Quality	The 1-hr and 8-hr carbon monoxide thresholds would be exceeded at three receptor locations along this segment of the line. Mitigation: Reduce vehicle delays at Adams/Flower resulting from traffic signal pre-emption afforded to light rail.	The 1-hr and 8-hr carbon monoxide thresholds would be exceeded at three receptor locations along this segment of the line. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	The 1-hr and 8-hr carbon monoxide thresholds would not be exceeded at receptor locations along this segment of the line. Mitigation: None required.	The 1-hr and 8-hr carbon monoxide thresholds would not be exceeded at receptor locations along this segment of the line. Mitigation: None required.	The 1-hr and 8-hr carbon monoxide thresholds would be exceeded at one receptor location along this segment of the line. Mitigation: Reduce vehicle delays at Adams/Flower resulting from traffic signal pre-emption afforded to light rail.	At the 23rd Street Station the 1-hr and 8-hr carbon monoxide thresholds would be exceeded. Mitigation: None proposed.
Noise/Vibration	Significant impact at L.A. Trade Tech classrooms on Flower Street. Potential vibration impacts at Orthopaedic Hospital. Mitigation: Reduce train speeds to 30 mph opposite L.A. Trade Tech classrooms or retrofit building to achieve acceptable interior noise level. Determine sensitivity of interior uses to vibration at Orthopaedic Hospital.	Same as Alternative 1a. No vibration impacts on adjacent properties. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. No noise or vibration impacts to Orthopaedic Hospital.	No significant noise impact on adjacent properties. No vibration impacts on adjacent properties. Mitigation: None required.	No significant noise impact on adjacent properties. No vibration impacts on adjacent properties. Mitigation: None required.	No significant noise impact on adjacent properties. No vibration impacts on adjacent properties. Mitigation: None required.	No significant noise impacts on adjacent properties. No vibration impacts on adjacent properties. Mitigation: None required.

TABLE 1.4-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (continued)

Environmental Category	Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge)	Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge)	Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)	Alternative 2b (Part Subway)	Alternative 2c (All At-Grade)	Proposed Rail Stations
Geology/Hydrology	No impacts anticipated. Mitigation: Design all structures to withstand maximum probable earthquake. Complete detailed geotechnical studies prior to permit approvals.	No impacts anticipated. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	No impacts anticipated. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	No impacts anticipated. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	No impacts anticipated. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	No impacts anticipated. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.
Construction	Construction would be the shortest duration; about 6 to 8 months. Relocation of about 2,940 feet of sewer and water lines. Short-term air quality, light and glare and noise impacts from the construction period.	Construction estimated to take about 10 to 12 months. Relocation of about 2,125 feet of water lines. Same as Alternative 1a.	Construction would take from 10 to 12 months. Relocation of 3,215 feet of sewer, water, storm drain, gas and Pacific Bell lines. Same as Alternative 1a but greater noise and vibration impacts for setting of the piles for the aerial guideway.	Construction would take from 14 to 16 months. Relocation of 3,365 feet of sewer, water, storm drain, gas, and Pacific Bell lines. Deep bore trenching would result in significant noise impacts over a longer time period than any other Alternative.	Construction would take about 8 to 10 months. Relocation of 3,215 feet of sewer, water, storm drains and Pacific Bell lines. Same as Alternative 1a or 1b.	Same as whichever Alternative is selected. Relocation of utilities at all stations except the Exposition Park/Vermont Station. Same as Alternative 1a or 1b.

TABLE 1.4-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (continued)

Environmental Category	Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge)	Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge)	Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)	Alternative 2b (Part Subway)	Alternative 2c (All At-Grade)	Proposed Rail Stations
Construction (continued)	Mitigation: Develop a construction management plan. - Coordinate construction timing with adjacent uses and with LADOT and CALTRANS regarding traffic operations. - Provide for pedestrian access to major institutions in the area. - Construction shall be stopped during stage 2 & 3 smog alerts. - Coordinated construction sequencing with local officials to minimize conflicts. - Compliance with SCAQMD rule 403, (site wetting). - Timing of noisy construction activities coordinated with institutions to minimize adverse effects. - The relocation and support of utilities with affected service providers. - Noise barriers used to minimize effects. - Barriers used to keep nighttime lighting on-site. -Improvements to any water system or fire hydrants would be at the applicant's expense.	Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a and consider the use of caissons in lieu of pile driving equipment.	Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.

TABLE 1.4-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (continued)

Environmental Category	Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge)	Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge)	Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)	Alternative 2b (Part Subway)	Alternative 2c (All At-Grade)	Proposed Rail Stations
Public Services	Schools: See Land Use, Transportation/Circulation, Air Quality and Noise. Mitigation: See Land Use, Transportation/Circulation, Air Quality, Noise and construction. Coordination with the Los Angeles District Schools concerning construction phases and pedestrian crossings. Police and Law Enforcement: Potential increase for police protection services. Mitigation: Two-way voice communication on board trains. - Closed circuit cameras at stations. - Alarm system at stations. - Design shelter stops with open, unbroken lines of sight. - Where practical rights-of-way shall be protected from encroachment of people, thrown objects or unauthorized vehicles. - At-grade street crossings to provide access for emergency vehicles. - Interior finish of rail cars to be of vandal resistant materials. - A silent alarm on cars. Fire Protection: Potential for increased fire protection and emergency response services. Mitigation: Final engineering design to be reviewed by the Los Angeles Fire Department. - Access for fire equipment at all times during the construction phase.	Schools: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. Police and Law Enforcement: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. Fire Protection: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a and use of the Rail Corp. Metro Rail Fire/Life Safety Criteria.	Schools: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. Police and Law Enforcement: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. Fire Protection: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1b.	Schools: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. Police and Law Enforcement: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. Fire Protection: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1b.	Schools: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. Police and Law Enforcement: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. Fire Protection: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a and coordinate with the Hilton Hotel and the Fire Department regarding emergency access to the hotel.	Schools: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. Police and Law Enforcement: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a. Fire Protection: Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.

TABLE 1.4-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (continued)

Environmental Category	Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge)	Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge)	Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)	Alternative 2b (Part Subway)	Alternative 2c (All At-Grade)	Proposed Rail Stations
Public Services (Cont.)	Fire Protection, Mitigation (Cont.): - Adequate public and private fire hydrants. - Smoke detectors, fire alarms in stations, on trains and at power stations. -Install automatic sprinkler system and hand held fire extinguishers at stations and on trains. - Clear access to telephones. - An approved turning area for 27th St. at Flower.	Fire Protection, Mitigation (Cont.): Same as Alternative 1a.	Fire Protection, Mitigation (Cont.): Same as Alternative 1a.	Fire Protection, Mitigation (Cont.): Same as Alternative 1a.	Fire Protection, Mitigation (Cont.): Same as Alternative 1a.	Fire Protection, Mitigation (Cont.): Same as Alternative 1a.
Energy Conservation	Consumption of about 2,250 Kwh of electricity per year for traction usage. Mitigation: Use of regenerative braking. - Coordination of traffic and rail signal systems. - Separate electric meters at stations.	Consumption of the same energy as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same energy consumption as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same energy consumption as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same energy consumption as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Consumption of 239,355 Kwh per year for proposed stations and 1,59,570 per year for optional stations. Mitigation: Implement station design features to exceed Title 24.
Biological Resources	Removal of 75 Palms from the east side of Flower Street from Washington Blvd. to Exposition Blvd. Mitigation: Landscaping with drought tolerant plants and re-use of palms along the rail right-of-way. - Retain a licensed landscape architect to determine the maximum number of palms that can be relocated along the line or at other private properties.	Similar to Alternative 1a, however some of the 75 palms removed on Flower Street would be on the west side of Flower where the train crosses from east to west and back again. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Removal of about 26 palms and 17 Italian Cypress along Exposition Blvd. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same as Alternative 2a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same as Alternative 2a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	The Jefferson Street Station would result in the loss of about another 10 palms and several Eucalyptus trees. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.

TABLE 1.4-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (continued)

Environmental Category	Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge)	Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge)	Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)	Alternative 2b (Part Subway)	Alternative 2c (All At-Grade)	Proposed Rail Stations
Risk of Upset	Low to moderate risk potential. Mitigation: Subsurface geotechnical studies prior to permit approval. - Contact the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas if oil wells are found during construction for remedial procedures.	Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a and design underground structures with adequate ventilation. Employ relief wells and gas sensing systems as necessary.	Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.
Aesthetics	Creation of a visual barrier from east to west down Flower Street while trains are passing. Mitigation: Re-landscaping with palms along Flower Street along the rail line right-of-way. An Architect/Urban Designer will be part of the preliminary and final design project team for this extension and shall coordinate the alignment and station design with the community and institutions along the route.	Same as Alternative 1a, however, the rail line along the east side of Flower Street south of Adams would be obscured by the HOV lane along the Harbor Freeway. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Five to 7 foot diameter piers would support the aerial guideway with catenary poles at 120 foot intervals and overhead wires 25 feet above the guideways creating the most dominant visual element of all alternatives. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Rail line not visible along this segment with the subway alternative. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	No significant change to the visual character of Exposition Blvd. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Station lighting would not be adjacent to sensitive land uses. Mitigation: Provide directional shielded lighting at stations to avoid spill over onto adjacent areas.

TABLE 1.4-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (continued)

Environmental Category	Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge)	Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge)	Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)	Alternative 2b (Part Subway)	Alternative 2c (All At-Grade)	Proposed Rail Stations
Cultural Resources	Loss of circa 1932 street lights along the west side of Flower Street. Mitigation: Coordinate removal and remediation plan for street lights with the Los Angeles Bureau of Street Lighting and attempt to reuse these lights along the route and/or at stations. -Coordinate the rail route adjacent to St. John's Church with the church to assure safe and efficient circulation and replacement of on- and off-street parking.	Some loss of 1932 Street lights, but less than Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.	Same as Alternative 1a. Mitigation: Same as Alternative 1a.

CHAPTER 2.0

PROJECT PURPOSE AND HISTORY

2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project examined by this report is a light rail transit (LRT) facility which will operate as a branch of the Metro Blue Line which is part of the larger 150-mile regional rail transit system being developed in Los Angeles, California. The light rail transit facility extensions studied in this document is intended to link and serve the employment, residential, educational, and cultural centers downtown Los Angeles to the Exposition, USC Campus area and Vermont business area. This extension is shown in the context of the existing Blue Line Transit route (see **Figures 1.1-1 and 1.1-2**).

The proposed Exposition Park Branch Line would extend along Flower Street from the junction with the existing Blue Line at Washington Boulevard to the Exposition Boulevard right-of-way, to the proposed terminus at Vermont Avenue. This 1.8-mile route would likely have a total of three stations along this segment. There is also an optional Figueroa Street station and an optional Washington Boulevard station. The optional Washington Boulevard station would be a substitute for the 23rd Street station. In addition, an optional Vermont Avenue station is examined which would place this two-car station right at the corner of Vermont Avenue and Exposition Boulevard with tail tracks for special event trains storage just west of Vermont Avenue.

2.2 PROJECT PURPOSE

The overriding goal of the process is to refine the proposed LRT project to ensure the improvement of both regional and local transit service and to either avoid or successfully mitigate negative impacts within budgeting constraints. In addition the LACTC and Task Force members have developed the following goals for the proposed project:

1. Provide improved regional and local access to the educational, cultural, and recreational facilities of the USC/Exposition Park area;
2. Support and enhance area revitalization and redevelopment efforts such as those planned for the Figueroa Corridor and surrounding neighborhoods;
3. Provide opportunities to integrate station facilities into future station area development such as currently proposed development projects or potential joint development projects;
4. Identify methods to encourage pedestrian circulation and access; new and existing small businesses; and residential development;
5. Design and integrate the light rail project into existing urban neighborhoods primarily as an urban design element given optimum operational engineering parameters;

6. Encourage interface with existing transportation systems and planned improvements currently underway including interface with SCRTD bus system and the Harbor Freeway Transitway project;
7. Facilitate patron transfer between rail and bus service;
8. Provide parking at proposed stations for adjacent neighborhoods not within walking distance of a rail station;
9. Encourage improved access to health care facilities and other public services in the extended rail corridor;
10. Encourage an attempt to keep the alignment within the existing Flower Street right-of-way. The use of excess CALTRANS right-of-way where it runs parallel to Flower Street adjacent to the Harbor Freeway or south of Jefferson Boulevard will be considered. However, at station sites and possibly at some other specific locations along the alignment, track constraints and additional station site amenities such as park and ride facilities and bus transfer areas may require some private property acquisitions.

2.3 PLANNING HISTORY

July 1990: Representatives of major institutions including L.A. Trade Tech along the proposed light rail line approached LACTC staff to discuss the feasibility of study efforts to extend light rail service to the USC/Exposition Park area. At an initial meeting, area representatives expressed their strong support for the light rail extension and their willingness to provide private sector funding for the study process. A USC/Exposition Park Blue Line Task Force was formed with representatives from local institutions, elected officials, community organizations, public agencies and property owners to organize and fund the study effort.

January 1990: The Central Los Angeles Year 1995 Multi-Modal Transit Study, identified the viability of the extension of a branch line from the Metro Blue Line two miles south to serve the USC/Exposition Park area and adjacent neighborhoods.

May 1991: The Commission solicited professional assistance to preform route refinement work including conceptual engineering and cost evaluation of the proposed alignment and station locations for at-grade, aerial and subway profile alternatives.

September 1991: The Notice of Preparation and Initial Study was released. The comment period for the Notice of Preparation ended on November 6, 1991 and comments were received from interested agencies and groups.

CHAPTER 3

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

3.1 LIGHT RAIL TECHNOLOGY

The light rail technology to be used for the proposed project would be identical to the vehicles currently being used on the Long Beach to Los Angeles light rail transit line (the Blue Line). The individual rail cars are made of welded steel, span 90 feet in length, stand 11 feet 6 inches in height, and are about 9 feet wide. Power for the vehicles would be provided by two 195 horsepower DC electric motors. A photo of a typical Blue Line Light Rail train vehicle in operation is illustrated in **Figure 3.1-1**

The two car trains are articulated with an accordion connection. Four double-ended doors are located on each side to provide direct access from the high level platforms directly into the vehicle. Each car provides 76 seats, with two seats located at each end of the car that can be folded to provide space for one wheelchair passenger. The maximum capacity is 237 passengers (76 seated, 161 standing). At full capacity, the vehicle weighs 131,000 pounds; when empty, it weighs 94,000 pounds. With an acceleration rate of 3 miles per hour (mph) per second, the Blue Line trains can achieve a maximum speed of 55 mph reaching top speed in less than 45 seconds. The trains that would run along the proposed Exposition Park Branch line would not exceed a maximum speed of 35 mph and would cross Adams, Jefferson Boulevard and Figueroa Street at about 25 mph and 15 mph at the curve from Flower Street to Exposition Boulevard. The estimated overall time to travel the route from 7th Street and Flower Street to Vermont Avenue and Exposition Boulevard would be about 11 minutes.

3.2 RIDERSHIP AND OPERATIONS

It is anticipated that the proposed rail line would have operation characteristics similar to the existing Blue Line including hours of operation and frequency of service. It is expected that the trains would operate every 6 minutes during the peak hours. The Proposed 30 Year Transportation Plan, prepared by the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, estimates a daily ridership of 15,000 upon project completion.

3.3 ROUTE DESIGN ALTERNATIVES

The proposed rail route has been divided into two segments for purposes of clearly identifying each alternative option along the segment. The first segment, hereafter referred to as the northern segment, extends along Flower Street from Washington Boulevard to approximately 29th Street (the approximate location of the future California Department of Transportation's Harbor Freeway Transitway project).



Source: Gruen Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 3.1-1
EXISTING BLUE LINE TRAIN

The second segment, hereafter referred to as the western segment, extends from 29th Street south on Flower Street and west on Exposition Boulevard to the proposed route terminus at Vermont Avenue. There are two basic alternatives for the northern segment of the line and three basic alternatives for the western segment of the line. The alternatives have been designed such that either of the options for the northern segment could be combined with any of the options for the western segment of the line. The following summarizes each alternative for the northern and western segments of the line:

Northern Segment

Alternative 1a Washington Boulevard to 29th Street (Shared Bridge): An at-grade, light rail transit (LRT) facility between Washington Boulevard and approximately 29th Street (or the future High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) ramp from the Harbor Freeway at approximately 29th Street) (**Figure 3.3-1**): This alternative would be located on the east side of Flower Street with the existing joint CALTRANS/LACTC bridge between Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street, opposite the Orthopaedic Hospital.

Alternative 1b Washington Boulevard to 29th Street (Separate Bridge): This alternative includes the same route as discussed in 1a above, however, this alternative would include a separate LRT bridge parallel to the future CALTRANS bridge between Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street. (**Figure 3.3-2**) The separate bridge would be located on the west side of Flower Street, thus the line would curve just south of Orthopaedic Hospital to the west side of Flower Street, across the Freeway overpass to about 28th Street where it would curve again back to the east side of Flower Street.

Western Segment

Alternative 2a Flower Street and 29th Street to Vermont Avenue - Part Aerial: This segment of the line would extend from approximately 29th Street south, on the east side of Flower Street to Exposition Boulevard where it would then extend east, along the center right-of-way of Exposition Boulevard to approximately Vermont Avenue (**Figure 3.3-3**). The majority of this line would be at-grade with an elevated segment between approximately Jefferson Boulevard to approximately 1,000 feet east of Menlo Avenue.

Alternative 2b Flower Street and 29th Street to Vermont Avenue - Part Subway: This alternative includes the same segment of the line as described for 2a above, however, a portion of this segment would be below grade (subway) while the majority would be at-grade (**Figure 3.3-4**). The at-grade portion would extend along the east side of Flower Street to about Jefferson Boulevard where a portal entry would be located. The line would then extend underground south to Exposition Boulevard and west underneath the Exposition Boulevard right-of-way to approximately 200 feet west of Armory Drive where another portal entry would be

STATION OPTION "A"
RELOCATE GRAND STATION
AND CONSOLIDATE WITH 23RD ST. STATION

23RD STREET STATION

MATCH LINE

LEGEND:

-  At-grade
-  Station Location
-  Optional Station Location




Source: Gruen Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 3.3-1
NORTHERN SEGMENT
ALTERNATIVE 1a
Shared-Bridge



STATION OPTION "A"
RELOCATE GRAND STATION
AND CONSOLIDATE WITH
23RD ST. STATION

NOTE: A MITIGATED HORIZONTAL
AND VERTICAL ALIGNMENT HAS
BEEN PROPOSED FOR THIS
ALTERNATIVE.
REFER TO FIGURE 9.0-1.

23RD STREET STATION

SEPARATE LRT BRIDGE

WEAVE
MATCH LINE

LEGEND:

-  At-grade
-  Station Location
-  Optional Station Location



Source: Gruen Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION





FIGURE 3.3-2
NORTHERN SEGMENT
ALTERNATIVE 1b
Separate-Bridge




Source: Gruen Associates



**Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route**

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**FIGURE 3.3-3
WESTERN SEGMENT
ALTERNATIVE 2a
Elevated-Portion**



Source: Gruen Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 3.3-4
WESTERN SEGMENT
ALTERNATIVE 2b
Subway Portion

located. The line would continue above grade to the Vermont Avenue terminus.

Alternative 2c Flower Street and 29th Street to Vermont Avenue - All At-Grade:

This alternative includes the same segment of line as described for 2a and 2b above, however, this entire segment would be at-grade. (Figure 3.3-5)

3.4 STATION ALTERNATIVES

The proposed rail route would be located primarily on public and LACTC rights-of-way along both Flower Street and Exposition Boulevard. The issue of pedestrian access to platforms is an important consideration in the design of stations and includes the following considerations:

- Levels of existing pedestrian activity
- Ease and safety of pedestrian access
- Concerns related to pedestrian track crossings
- Passenger interchange at multi-modal interchanges.

A typical station platform and track alignment design is illustrated in Figure 3.4-1. The stations would all be platforms with center-loading designs. There are three proposed stations which would be located in the same location for all of the alternatives as follows:

23rd Street Station: This station would be located approximately between 21st and 23rd Streets on Flower Street.


Jefferson Station: This station would be located between 33rd street and Jefferson Boulevard on Flower Street.

Exposition Park/Vermont Station: This station would be located approximately 800 feet east of Vermont Avenue on Exposition Boulevard. This station is currently designed as a single station with loading access for three trains. There is an option to expand this station to the west (towards Vermont Avenue) in the future to a double station capable of handling access for six cars.

In addition there are three optional station locations as follows:

Washington Station: This station would be an optional station which would take the place of the 23rd Street Station. The station would be located between 18th Street and Washington Boulevard on Flower Street and would include a relocation of the Grand station and consolidation with this station.

Figueroa Station: This optional station would be located at approximately Figueroa Street on Exposition Boulevard. This station is only included for the at-grade Alternative 2c and would not be an option for the subway or aerial alternatives.



Source: Gruen Associates



**Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route**
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**FIGURE 3.3-5
WESTERN SEGMENT
ALTERNATIVE 2c
At-Grade**



View from north sidewalk of Exposition Boulevard
looking southeast toward Figueroa Street.

SOURCE: Gruen Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 3.4-1
TYPICAL STATION DESIGN
(Optional Figueroa Station)

Vermont Station: An option for all alternatives (2a, 2b, and 2c) would be to locate this station further west on Exposition Boulevard, closer to Vermont Avenue. This option would include a two-car station with tail tracks extending west of Vermont Avenue to accommodate up to nine, two-car trains each (for storage in support of special events only). It should be noted that this optional station would limit operations on the Branch Line to two-car platforms at all stations. While 3-car platforms are proposed for all other stations, early year operations are anticipated to require only 2-car trains.

CHAPTER 4.0

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

4.1 REGIONAL CONTEXT

The proposed Exposition Branch line will form a part of the Metro Rail system. This system encompasses a 300-mile transit network to be built in the next 30 years that includes light rail, heavy rail and commuter rail. The transit segment studied in this report would be a 1.8-mile light rail extension of the Metro Blue Line route which serves the area from Downtown Los Angeles to Downtown Long Beach. The main Blue Line route connects with the subway portion of the Metro Red Line (currently under construction) at the Seventh Street and Flower Street Station. In addition to this connection, the proposed Blue Line Extension will also intersect with the Harbor Freeway Transitway near 23rd Street--just north of Adams Boulevard. In addition, the proposed Blue Line Extension would be located near the Exposition Boulevard Transitway Station being developed by the California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS).

4.1.1 Geotechnical and Seismic Character

The proposed rail route can be characterized by relatively flat terrain with elevations ranging from approximately 90 feet to 225 feet above sea level. The general topography slopes from northwest to southeast. There are no major hills or landforms in the vicinity of the proposed rail line. Soils in the project vicinity are classified as the Hanford Association. These alluvial deposits are high in sand concentration, have good drainage and permeability and pose no engineering constraints to development. There are no areas with a high potential for liquefaction or subsidence in the project vicinity. There are no Alquist-Priolo Special Fault Studies Zones in the project vicinity nor are there City of Los Angeles designated Detail Study Areas--which require special geotechnical reports prior to development. Although the Los Angeles basin is seismically active, the closest known potentially active faults to the proposed project are the Santa Monica-Hollywood fault which lies approximately 5 miles north of the project and the Newport-Inglewood fault which is located approximately 5 miles west of the project. According to Wildcat Maps available from the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas, the northern part of the rail line, along Flower Street to approximately 20th Street and from 20th Street to about 28th Street is within the Los Angeles Downtown Oil Field and the Las Cienega's Oil Field respectively.¹

4.1.2 Hydrologic Character

There are no major surface water bodies within the vicinity of the proposed rail line. Surface water bodies outside of the project vicinity include the Los Angeles River--located 3 miles to the east, the Dominguez Channel located 10 miles to the southeast and Ballona Creek located 5 miles to the west. Generally, the project vicinity is not in area subject to flooding. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)--when evaluating the 100-year and 500-year flood frequency--has classified the project vicinity as Zone C which has

¹California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Wildcat Maps, W1-5, 1988.

little or no flood hazard potential.² The nearest area susceptible to flood is just west of Vermont Avenue on the north and south side of Exposition Boulevard where FEMA has designated the 500-year flood hazard boundary. Groundwater does not pose an engineering constraint to development within the project vicinity. The depth of the groundwater is approximately 60 to 80 feet below the ground surface.³

4.2 LAND USE


The project area is highly urbanized. The project area is located approximately two miles south of Downtown Los Angeles. It is about one-half mile south of the Los Angeles Convention Center. The project alignment is located just east and south of the University of Southern California (USC) campus. The project alignment along Exposition Boulevard divides Exposition Park (with its complex of museums and sports facilities) from the USC campus.

In general, the project vicinity is characterized as a transitional area between the Los Angeles Central Business District and Exposition Park with its surrounding institutional uses and residential neighborhoods (including historic homes in the North University Park area). With respect to land use character, the project vicinity can be divided into generally into the following three distinct areas (see **Figure 4.2-1**):

- **Hoover-University.** The University of Southern California (USC) and the University Village Shopping Center serve as a major focal point in the subarea. The subarea is bisected by the Harbor Freeway (I-110). The western part features a concentrated stock of historic homes in North University Park area. The eastern part is predominantly an industrial and warehouse area.
- **Central.** Includes a minor concentration of strip commercial at Adams and Central. The subarea is largely a residential island surrounded by industrial and warehouse uses.
- **Exposition Park-Vermont Square.** Includes Exposition Park, State and County Museums, Los Angeles Coliseum/Sports Arena. The northwest, southwest and southeast portions of the subarea are largely single-family in character. The northeast portion adjacent to the Exposition Park area is multi-family in character.

²Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map(s) for the City of Los Angeles, 1987.

³State of California Department of Water Resources, "Planned Utilization of the Groundwater Basins of the Coastal Plain of Los Angeles County", Appendix A, May 1990.



Source: City of Los Angeles Community Development Department



**Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route**
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**FIGURE 4.2-1
COMMUNITIES ADJACENT TO
PROPOSED RAIL LINE**

Community Planning Areas (CPA) as formally designated by the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. Specifically, the project vicinity encompasses the northern portion of the South Central Community Plan Area and the northern portion of the Southeast Community Plan Area. In themselves, these CPA's are cover an extensive 30-square mile area commonly referred to as South Los Angeles.

In addition to the CPA's, the Hoover Redevelopment Project area is located along and west of Flower Street (see Section 5.1). Land uses along the proposed route are primarily a mixture of commercial, industrial and institutional.

The route would begin at Washington Boulevard and Flower Street where the Los Angeles Trade Technical School (Trade Tech) is located. South, along Flower Street to the Harbor Freeway is mostly light industrial uses on the west side of Flower. Orthopaedic Hospital is located on the east side between 23rd Street and the Harbor Freeway over pass. South of the Freeway along the east side of Flower is the freeway right-of-way. There are no developed uses immediately adjacent to Flower all the way to Exposition Boulevard. Along the west side of Flower between the freeway and Jefferson there are a mixture of older warehouse buildings and fast food restaurants. On the southwest corner of Jefferson and Flower is the vacant site of the proposed USC Plaza, a mixed-use office/hotel project.

The former Southern Pacific railroad right-of-way, now owned by LACTC, runs down the center of Exposition Boulevard between Figueroa and westerly past the route terminus at Vermont. Exposition Park is located along the south side of Exposition Boulevard between Figueroa and Vermont. Uses within the park include museums and a rose garden. The University of Southern California (USC) is located along the north side of Exposition Boulevard between Figueroa and Vermont. West of Vermont, on the north side of Exposition, there is an Islamic Temple under construction and west of that are single-family homes. On the south side of Exposition, west of Vermont, there is a gas station, a multi-family housing development and further west, single-family homes.

4.3 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Based on the 1990 preliminary data from the Census of Population and Housing, the three areas adjacent to the proposed rail line have increased in growth between 7 and 36 percent from 1980 to 1990. Over the decade, the County's population increased by 18.5 percent and the City of Los Angeles' population by 17.5 percent. The Hoover-University area witnessed the smallest rate of population growth (7.2 percent) while the Central area had growth rates which exceeded those of the County and the City (see Table 4.3-1). Further demographic characteristics such as ethnicity and income levels is presented in section 5.2, Population and Housing.

**TABLE 4.3-1: POPULATION TRENDS IN COMMUNITIES ADJACENT TO THE RAIL LINE
(1980 to 1990)**

Areas	1980(1) Population	1990(2) Population	# Change	% Change
Hoover-University	31,590	33,856	2,266	7.2
Central	27,733	37,778	10,045	36.2
Exposition Park- Vermont Square	57,444	69,360	11,916	20.7
Sources: (1) U.S. Department of Commerce, <u>1980 Census of Population and Housing</u> , Table P-1 (2) U.S. Department of Commerce, <u>1990 Census of Population and Housing</u> , PL94-171 Data.				

The population density in the areas adjacent to the proposed rail line is more than twice that of the City average of 12 persons per acre and almost 7 times the County average of 3 persons per acre. The areas adjacent to the proposed rail line have an average of 22 to 34 persons per acre (see Table 4.3-2).

TABLE 4.3-2: POPULATION DENSITIES IN THE AREAS ADJACENT TO THE RAIL LINE

Area	Acres	Hectares	Persons per Acre	Persons Per Hectare
Hoover-University	998	404	34	84
Central	1,750	709	22	55
Exposition Park- Vermont Square	2,646	1,071	26	65
Sources: (1) U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census, <u>1983 County and City Data Book</u> , Table B. (2) City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning-Jeff Beckerman. (3) U.S Department of Commerce, <u>1990 Census of Population and Housing</u> , Table P-1.				

4.4 TRANSPORTATION

The proposed rail route area is served by main freeways: the Santa Monica Freeway (I-10) and the Harbor Freeway (I-110). These facilities provide major connections to the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

During peak travel hours and occasionally during non-peak periods, the freeway system serving the downtown area experiences extreme congestion. Both the Harbor and Santa Monica Freeways operate at level of service F during congested peak hours. The situation has become so aggravated that freeway traffic spills over onto local streets during peak periods, causing disruption of residential neighborhoods.

The proposed I-110 Transitway project located in the vicinity of the proposed rail line is intended to improve service to automobile commuters and those using public transportation because the existing freeway cannot adequately move people and goods during peak hour congestion. The plan includes a northbound High-Occupancy-Vehicle (HOV) off-ramp to Adams Boulevard and southbound on-ramp from Flower Street, south of 28th Street (with new HOV frontage road). In addition, Figueroa and Flower Streets would become one-way arterials to accommodate the Traffic System Management (TSM) Plan of the City of Los Angeles. Figueroa Street would be one-way northbound, with two contra-flow lanes; and Flower Street would be one-way southbound, with one northbound contra-flow lane between Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street. The Figueroa/Flower one-way couplet would extend from Washington Boulevard south to where the two streets converge near Exposition Park, south of Exposition Boulevard. This project is discussed further in Section 4.6, Related Projects.

4.5 AIR QUALITY

The rail corridor is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The SCAB consists of the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties and all of Orange County. Its area is approximately 6,600 square miles. The Los Angeles County portion encompasses approximately 40 percent of the basin area (2,400 square miles).

Under the provisions of the Clean Air Act (CAA), areas are classified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as either attainment or non-attainment areas for pollutants such as carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, ozone, hydrocarbons and total suspended particulates and lead. Attainment is based on whether or not the National Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are being met.

Ambient pollution concentrations recorded in Los Angeles County are among the highest of the four counties comprising the SCAB. Winter air quality problems are due to early and late evening emissions of carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. Summer air quality problems result from the formation of photochemical smog, as hydrocarbons and nitrogen dioxide react under strong sunlight. On the basis of regional monitoring data, Los Angeles County has been designated as a non-attainment area by the U.S. Environmental Protection

Agency, under the provisions of the CAA, for ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides and total suspended particulates. The County is designated as an attainment area for sulfur dioxide.

As shown in **Figure 4.5-1** the proposed rail line route lies primarily within the area where the State standard for Carbon Monoxide was exceeded between 20 to 40 days and ozone standard was exceeded between 25 to 50 days in 1990. Nitrogen dioxide levels did not exceed state standards, however particulate matter levels ranged between 40 to 60 micrograms/cubic meter or exceeding the state standard of 50 micrograms/cubic meter in part of the site vicinity (see **Figure 4.5-2**).

4.6 RELATED PROJECTS

The CEQA Guidelines require a discussion of cumulative impacts defined as the impacts a project development is likely to have when assessed together with the impacts of closely related past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects. Past and present projects are accounted for in the existing conditions discussions. Reasonably foreseeable projects in the proposed site vicinity are included in **Table 4.6-1** and shown on **Figure 4.6-1**. There are a total of 27 projects in the site vicinity which have either been approved, are under construction, or are proposed by the City of Los Angeles, USC or Exposition Park.

The following summarizes the related projects:

City of Los Angeles Projects:

- 573,215 square feet commercial/office/retail/service
- 137 housing units
- 3,735 parking spaces
- 299 fixed-seat conference room

USC Projects:

- 1,260,500 square feet office/retail/research/classroom
- library/arena/laboratory
- 250 hotel rooms
- 126 condominium units
- 2,130 parking spaces


Exposition Park Projects:

- 260,000 square feet of museum/elementary school/community center space
- 6,368 parking spaces (approx. net gain)

Total:


- 1,833,715 square feet commercial/offic/retail service etc.
- 236 housing untis/condominiums
- 260 hotel rooms
- 299 fixed seat conference room
- 12,233 parking spaces
- 260,000 square feet museum/elementary school, etc.

1990 CARBON MONOXIDE LEVELS




LEGEND:

of Days State Standard Was Exceeded




A

1990 OZONE LEVELS



of Days State Standard Was Exceeded



B



1" = 16 miles


SOURCE: South Coast Air Quality Management District,
"Air Quality Management Plan" (1991)



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route


LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 4.5-1
OZONE AND CARBON MONOXIDE
LEVELS IN SITE VICINITY




LEGEND:


of Days State Standard Was Exceeded



C



Annual Average Concentration (micrograms/cubic meter)



D

SOURCE: South Coast Air Quality Management District, "Air Quality Management Plan" (1991)



1" = 16 miles



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 4.5-2
NITROGEN DIOXIDE AND PARTICULATE
MATTER LEVELS IN SITE VICINITY

TABLE 4.6-1: RELATED PROJECTS

No.	Project	Location	Size	Type	Status	Source
City of Los Angeles Projects						
1.	86-0238-ZV (SUB)	1916 Oak Street	17,920 s.f.	Commercial	P	3
2.	88-358-PP	441 Exposition Boulevard	9,745 s.f.	Retail/ Commercial	C/P	3,5
3.	88-519	614-672 Martin Luther King Blvd.	27,000 s.f.	Shopping Center	P	3,5
4.	90-212-ZC	Oak St. NE of Washington Blvd.	44,850 s.f.	Warehouse/ Office/2/	P	1
5.	Villa de Coliseo	600 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.	137 units	Family Housing	UC	2,5
6.	89-701-AV BL Shrine Auditorium	3208 Royal Street	935 parking spaces	Parking Structure	UC	1,2,5
7.	Omar Ibn Al-Khattab Islamic Foundation Mosque	1025 W. Exposition Boulevard	35,000 s.f.	Church and Admin. Offices	UC	13
8.	LA Convention Center Expansion	1201 South Figueroa Street	A: 346,000 s.f. B: 86,000 s.f. C: 2,800 spaces D: 299 fixed seats	A:Exhibit Space B:Meeting Rooms C:Parking Spaces D:Confer. Room	UC	2,9
9.	Coliseum Plaza Phase II	West Side of Vermont Avenue South of Exposition Blvd.	6,700 s.f.	Retail	UC	2,5
SUBTOTAL CITY OF LOS ANGELES PROJECTS: 573,215 s.f. commercial/office/retail/service 137 housing units 3,735 parking spaces 299 fixed seat conference room						
A = Approved; C/P = Constructed/Partially Occupied; P = Proposed; UC = Under Construction						

TABLE 4.6-1: RELATED PROJECTS (Continued)

No.	Project	Location	Size	Type	Status	Source
University of Southern California Projects						
10.	USC Plaza	South of Jefferson Boulevard between Figueroa Street and Flower Street	<u>Phase I:</u> A: 168,000 s.f. B: 10,000 s.f. <u>Phase II:</u> A: 335,000 s.f. B: 10,000 s.f. <u>Phase III:</u> C: 250 rooms <u>Phase IV:</u> A: 252,000 s.f. B: 10,000 s.f.	A:Office B:Retail C:Hotel Rooms	P	2,5
11.	Faculty Housing Phase II	Southeast Corner of Hoover Street and 30th Street	126 units	Condo. Units	P	2
12.	USC Parking Center	3401 Grand Avenue	2,130 parking spaces	Parking Structure	A	6,8
13.	Electrical Engineering Building	Northeast Corner of McClintock Avenue and 37th Place	60,000 s.f.	Office	P	8
14.	Loker Hydrocarbon Addition	Northeast Corner of Watt Way and 37th Street	12,000 s.f.	Chemistry Labs	P	8
15.	Center for Photonic Technology	Watt Way and 37th Street	6,000 s.f.	Research	U/C	8
16.	Heritage Hall Addition	South of Watt Way and 35th Street	13,500 s.f.	Classroom	P	8
17.	Watt/Harris Hall Ground Level Project	North Side of Exposition Blvd. 1/2 Block East of Watt Way	A: 2,333 s.f. B: 2,333 s.f. C: 2,333 s.f.	A:Cafe B:Light Industrial C:Class room	P	8

TABLE 4.6-1: RELATED PROJECTS (Continued)

No.	Project	Location	Size	Type	Status	Source
University of Southern California Projects (Continued)						
18.	University Events Center	Northwest Corner of McClintock Avenue and Childs Way	200,000 s.f. (10,000 fixed seats)	Basketball and Performing Arts Arena	P	8
19.	Teaching Library	Southeast Corner of Hoover Street and 34th Place	85,000 s.f.	Library	P	8
20.	Chemistry Building	Northwest Corner of McClintock Avenue and 36th Place	A: 46,000 s.f. B: 46,000 s.f.	A: Research B: Office/3/	P	8
SUBTOTAL USC PROJECTS: 1,260,500 square feet office/retail/research/classroom library/arena/laboratory 250 hotel rooms 126 condominium units 2,130 parking spaces						
Exposition Park Projects						
21.	90-334-LAMCC	3771-3783 3783,3789,3977, 3987,3991-3995 Menlo Avenue	Approx. 336 surface parking spaces	Parking Development	P	3,7
22.	New LA Swim Stadium/ Menlo Community Center(City of LA Dept. of Recreation and Parks)	Probable Location within or adjacent to Exposition Park	A: 20,200 s.f. B: 1,800 s.f.	A: Indoor Swimming Pool, Handball Courts, Double Gymnasium, Locker and Shower Facilities B: Meeting Rooms	P	10
23.	CMSI/LAMCC Parking Structures	Tentative Locations in Northwestern and Southern Portions of Park	A: Approx. 2,000 parking spaces B: Approx. 4,232 parking spaces (net gain of 3,232 spaces)	A: Museum-Related Parking Structure B: Event-Related Parking Structure	P	1

TABLE 4.6-1: RELATED PROJECTS (Continued)

No.	Project	Location	Size	Type	Status	Source
24.	CMSI/LAUSD Science-Focused Elementary School	Adjacent to Central Building of Museum of Science and Industry	Approx. 53,000 s.f. (968 students, 26 classrooms)	Science-Focused Elementary School	P	12
25.	CMSI Expansion/Renovation	Adjacent to Existing Museum of Science and Industry	Approx. 185,000 s.f. net addition	Additions and Renovations to Museum	P	12
26.	LAMCC/CMSI Street Vacation	Menlo Avenue between Exposition Boulevard and the Leighton Avenue Park extension.	Approx. 800 surface parking spaces	Surface Parking Development	P	11
Subtotal Exposition Projects: 260,000 square feet of museum/elementary school/community center space, 6,368 parking spaces (approx.net gain)						
Other Regional Projects						
27.	CalTrans Harbor Freeway (I-110) Transitway	Along center divider of Harbor Freeway (Interstate 110) between Adams Boulevard and the Redondo Beach Freeway (California 91) (current phase only)	Approx. 10-mile long bus/transitway	Elevated and separated bus and transit lanes, with associated Park and Ride lots and stations.	UC	3


Sources:

1. City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Environmental Review Section
2. Community Redevelopment Agency
3. City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation
4. City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety
5. Terry A. Hayes Associates
6. USC Real Estate Development
7. Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission
8. Mark M. Jones, USC Architectural Services
9. Los Angeles Convention Center, Chris Simons, Administrative Offices
10. Frank Catania, City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks
11. Charles Isgar, Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission
12. Jeff Rudolph, California Museum of Science and Industry
13. Salah Abdul-Wabid, Omar Ibn Al-Khattab Foundation

/1/ Square Feet

/2/ Assumes 80% warehouse, 20% office.

/3/ Assumes 50% research, 50% office.



Source: City of Los Angeles Community Development Department



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



FIGURE 4.6-1
RELATED PROJECTS

CHAPTER 5.0

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES


5.1 LAND USE

The construction of the rail transit facility could create certain land use impacts including: incompatibilities with adopted local area plans and policies and the taking or displacement of existing properties or uses. This section provides a description of existing land uses along the proposed route and then discusses impacts in the two areas noted above. Mitigation measures are then proposed to alleviate anticipated negative impacts.

Existing Uses

Land uses along the proposed route are primarily a mixture of commercial, industrial and institutional. **Figure 5.1-1** shows the existing land uses along the proposed alignment and is described as follows:

- **Flower Street (east side):** At the southeast corner of Washington Boulevard and Flower Street is the Los Angeles Trade Technical School (Trade Tech). Photo 1 of **Figure 5.1-2** shows the classrooms of Trade Tech located at about 22nd Street on Flower Street. South of the Trade Tech along Flower Street is Orthopaedic Hospital located just north of the Harbor Freeway overpass (See Photo 2 of **Figure 5.1-2**). South of the Freeway overpass is the freeway right-of-way with no developed uses along this portion of the east side of Flower to Exposition Boulevard.
- **Flower Street (west side):** Between Washington Boulevard and the Harbor Freeway overpass are seven buildings including five commercial businesses, a government office (social security office) and one apartment building (see Photo 3, **Figure 5.1-3**). Between the freeway overpass and Exposition Boulevard there are about sixteen buildings with various uses including industrial and retail businesses, St. John's Church, (see Photo 4, **Figure 5.1-3**) and a motel at the northwest corner of Flower and 29th Street (see Photo 5, **Figure 5.1-4**). There are residential apartments located above two commercial buildings south of the motel on the west side of Flower Street (See Photo 6, **Figure 5.1-4**). The proposed USC Plaza (a mixed use, office hotel project) is also located along this stretch between Jefferson Boulevard and 35th Street.
- **Exposition Boulevard (north side):** Along most of this portion of the route are various USC Campus buildings. The only exception is between Flower and Figueroa where there is a retail building, mini-mall and a gas station. The Hilton Hotel is also located north of these uses on the east side of Figueroa Street.
- **Exposition Boulevard (south side):** Exposition Park is located along the south side of Exposition Boulevard between Figueroa and Vermont.



Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.1-1
EXISTING LAND USES




Photo 1: Classrooms of Los Angeles Trade Tech on Flower Street looking east.



Photo 2: Orthopaedic Hospital looking northeast on Flower Street.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.1-2
LAND USE
PHOTOS 1 and 2



Photo 3: Apartment building on Flower Street north of the Harbor Freeway overpass.




Photo 4: St. John's Church and parking lot on the west side of Flower Street south of the Harbor Freeway overpass.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.1-3
LAND USE
PHOTOS 3 and 4




Photo 5: Motel and Commercial building (upper floor residential uses) on the southwest corner of Flower Street and 29th Street.




Photo 6: Commercial building (upper floor residential uses) on west side of Flower Street.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.1-4
LAND USE
PHOTOS 5 and 6

The former Southern Pacific railroad right-of-way, now owned by LACTC, runs down the center of Exposition Boulevard westerly past the proposed rail terminus at Vermont Avenue. West of the proposed rail terminus is an Islamic Temple (under construction), a gas station, a multi-family development and west of that are single-family homes.

IMPACTS

The proposed alternatives have been laid out to take advantage of publicly-owned corridors such as the Flower Street right-of-way, the CALTRANS right-of-way along the Harbor Freeway, and the former Southern Pacific railroad right-of-way. The alternatives would, however involve some private property acquisitions in the form of driveway closures along the east side of Flower Street, and some property adjacent to Orthopaedic Hospital and St. John's Church. The following describes the property acquisitions involved with each of the proposed alternatives and the subsequent access to properties effects:

- **Rail Line Effects Northern Segment:**

Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge): Would require the closure of two of the seven driveways along the L.A. Trade Tech frontage on the east side of Flower Street (see Figure 5.1-5). The five driveways to remain open would require signalized warning devices placed adjacent to them to prevent vehicles turning from southbound Flower Street across the tracks into the driveways when a train is approaching. These signalized devices would mitigate potential safety concerns at these locations. The two driveways to be closed are: the second driveway south of Washington Boulevard and the exit driveway from the parking lot north of 23rd Street, adjacent to the 23rd Street Station. The first of these driveways is an old driveway no longer in use. The parking lot exit driveway would need to be closed to accommodate the 23rd Street Station. If the Optional Washington Street Station were constructed then this driveway could remain open. The impact of closing the exit driveway would require Trade Tech to redesign this parking lot to accommodate two-way travel in the single aisle and both entry and exit via the driveway on 23rd Street. This could be accomplished by converting the current diagonal parking to 90-degree parking on one side only, so the loss of the Flower Street driveway should not create a significant impact on access or parking for L.A. Trade Tech.

This alternative would require the acquisition of about 7 feet of the existing sidewalk in front of Orthopaedic Hospital which would bring the rail line to within about 8 feet of the Hospital driveway entrance and about 50 feet from the hospital building. Access to the Hospital driveways would remain via the contra flow lane to be located adjacent to the hospital. (See Section 5.5 regarding noise and vibration impacts.) The two driveways on Flower Street which provide access to the hospital entrance would remain open and would have signalized warning devices as described above.



Photo 7: L.A. Trade Tech driveways on the east side of Flower Street south of Washington Boulevard. Light rail operations on the east side of Flower Street could require either closure of the driveways or the installation of warning devices.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



**Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route**
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**FIGURE 5.1-5
LAND USE
PHOTO 7**

South of Adams Boulevard, this alternative would require the acquisition of additional right-of-way from St. John's Church parking lot. The lot is currently striped for 90-degree parking with a wide center aisle (see Photo 8, **Figure 5.1-6**). The narrowing of the lot by 4 to 8 feet would still leave the lot large enough to accommodate the same number of parking spaces, however, the center aisle would have to be reduced thereby reducing the number of cars which could be tandem parked in the middle of the lot. This would not cause a negative impact on parking during peak church activities. Curb parking along Flower Street would be eliminated during the evening peak hour (4-6pm) weekdays. Therefore, curb parking would not be affected on the weekends.

Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge): This alternative would have similar impacts to Alternative 1a at LA Trade Tech, the Hilton, the commercial development at the corner of Flower and Washington, and along Exposition Blvd. It would be different from Alternative 1a in front of the Orthopedic Hospital; the track would be about 75 feet away from the hospital building. This alternative would include installation of a mid-block signal at the train crossing which would also control movements into and out of the hospital driveway. This would not cause a negative impact on hospital accessibility, but as discussed in the Transportation Impact section this would negatively impact traffic on Flower Street.

The alignment of the tracks along the west side of Flower, between Adams Blvd. and 29th Street, would require that advance warning devices be located adjacent to each driveway along these three blocks to control southbound vehicles turning right across the tracks into driveways. This should not cause a significant impact on any of these properties, nor require the closure of any of the driveways. It might be feasible to close the Flower Street driveway to the McDonalds restaurant south of 28th Street. This driveway is supposed to function as an exit only, but vehicles do frequently turn into it and then have a difficult time maneuvering into the drive through aisle.

- **Rail Line Effects Western Segment:**

Alternatives 2a (Part Aerial) and 2b (Part Subway): These alternatives would not require the widening of Flower Street from 29th Street to Exposition Boulevard. Thus, there would be no negative property acquisition effects. No private land acquisitions would be involved along the Exposition Boulevard segment.



Photo 8: Parking lot at St. John's Church affected by proposed rail line on Flower Street..




Photo 9: Businesses on the northeast corner of Washington Boulevard and Flower Street potentially affected by optional Washington Station.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.1-6
LAND USE
PHOTOS 8 and 9

Alternative 2c (All At-Grade): This alternative would require the widening of Flower Street from the Hilton Hotel property to the corner of Flower Street and Exposition Boulevard. This widening would result in the elimination of the second Hilton driveway, which is gated off at most times and thus would not result in a significant impact on Hilton operations. The parking lot on the corner of Flower and Exposition, south of the Hilton, would lose about eight of its existing 22 spaces due to the widening of Flower Street. This is considered a significant impact on this property. No negative property access effects on Exposition Boulevard.

- **Station Location Effects Northern Segment:**

The optional Washington Street Station would require the acquisition of seven buildings and one business located on the east side of Flower Street between Washington Boulevard and 18th Street (See Photo 9, **Figure 5.1-6**).

- **Station Location Effects Western Segment:**

None of the stations proposed for the western segment would require the acquisition of private property.

- **Optional Station Location Effects Western Segment:**

The optional Vermont Station would require the acquisition of about 8 feet of right of way on the south side of Exposition Boulevard between Vermont Avenue and Wisconsin to accommodate the needed street width of Exposition Boulevard for the tail tracks.

See also the Transportation/Circulation Section of this EIR for a discussion of parking impacts along Flower Street and adjacent to the station locations.

Since some of the parcels along the west side of Flower Street, adjacent to the rail line, are currently developed under capacity, (less dense than allowed by the existing Community Plans and Zoning Code) it is likely that the rail line could induce redevelopment on some of these under utilized parcels (see Section 6.0, Growth Inducement for a further detailed discussion of the potential growth inducing effects of the proposed rail line).

MITIGATION MEASURES

In the acquisition of real property by a public agency, California state law and LACTC policy requires those agencies to: 1) ensure consistent and fair treatment for owners of real property; 2) encourage and expedite acquisition by agreement in order to avoid litigation and relieve congestion in the courts, and; 3) promote confidence in public land acquisition.

LACTC would work with affected property owners, once the design alternative has been selected, to develop plans for compensating property acquisitions and the lost driveway access along the east side of Flower Street and the loss of parking at St. John's Church.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The loss of 8 parking spaces at the commercial property at the northwest corner of Flower and Exposition Boulevard is considered an unavoidable adverse impact of Alternative 2c.

Compatibility with Local Area Plans


As noted earlier the proposed rail route traverses two community planning areas including the Southeast Los Angeles Community (that portion of the line along Flower Street between Washington Boulevard and Exposition Boulevard) and the South Central Los Angeles Community (that portion of the line along Exposition Boulevard from Figueroa to Vermont).

The community plans each have established land uses and accompanying policies and implementation programs. Both Plans are currently under revision by the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. The project area also traverses part of the Hoover Redevelopment Area under the development jurisdiction of the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles. In addition to the community plans for the area, USC has on-going plans for their campus, Exposition Park is in the process of developing a master plan and the California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS) has plans for the Harbor Freeway. The following describes each of these plans and the relationship of the proposed route alignment with each plan.

Los Angeles Community Plans and Zoning. Figure 5.1-7 shows the land use designations of both community planning areas in the vicinity of the proposed rail route. As shown, most of the land in the vicinity of the proposed route is designated as highway-oriented commerce or public, quasi-public. The closest residential land use designations are one-half block west of Figueroa Street and one-half block west of Vermont Avenue.

Most of the zoning along the proposed rail route is commercial or manufacturing (C2-1, CM-2 and M1-2) with the exception of Exposition Park which is zoned residential (RD2-1 and RD1.5-1). All of the project alternatives would be consistent with both the highway-oriented commerce, public and quasi-public land use designations and the commercial and manufacturing zoning of the adjacent properties as designated in the community plans and zoning ordinance.

Hoover Redevelopment Project. As shown on Figure 5.1-8, the western side of Flower Street from Washington Boulevard to Jefferson Boulevard are within the amended Hoover Redevelopment Project area (March 1989) and are designated for commercial use including, but not limited to, office, retail, service businesses, churches, schools, ancillary




SOURCE: South Central Los Angeles District Plan
and Southeast Los Angeles District Plan



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.1-7
DISTRICT PLANNING
DESIGNATIONS



SOURCE: Terry A. Hayes Associates

MARCH 16, 1989



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.1-8

HOOVER REDEVELOPMENT AREA

parking and parking structures and limited manufacturing. The area south of Jefferson Boulevard is within the original Hoover Redevelopment Plan (adopted in 1966) and is also designated for commercial uses with a primary orientation toward transient housing accommodations in hotel-motel establishments with related uses such as eating. All of Exposition Park is designated as public use in the Plan. All of the proposed rail line alternatives are generally consistent with the goals of the redevelopment plan as the plan encourages reinvestment and redevelopment along the rail corridor.

Exposition Park Master Plan. The Exposition Park Master Plan includes expansions and renovations to park buildings and open space, new construction, and roadway and parking improvements. The plan also identifies pedestrian connections into and out of the park along its perimeter. The plan identifies five pedestrian connections from the north side to the south side of Exposition Boulevard into the park. The plan identifies two light rail station locations; one at the corner of Exposition Boulevard and Vermont Avenue and one at the corner of Figueroa and Exposition Boulevard. The northern rail segments (alternatives 1a and 1b) are not located adjacent to the Master Plan and are therefore not applicable in relationship to the Master Plan. The western rail segments are adjacent to the Master Plan. The following describes the consistency of each of the western segment alternatives with the Park Master Plan stations and the pedestrian connections:

Alternative 2a (Part Aerial) and 2b (Part Subway) These alternatives would not include a station at Figueroa Street and would therefore not be consistent with the Park Master Plan for this station location. These alternatives would include four signalized pedestrian cross walks along the Exposition Boulevard segment; at Figueroa Street, at the mid-block signal opposite the Rose Garden, at Watt Way and at Vermont Avenue, west of the proposed rail line. This is one less pedestrian crossing than is shown in the park's master plan; the plan also includes a pedestrian crossing mid-block between Figueroa and the rose garden. The proposed Exposition Park/Vermont station would be located about 1,000 feet west of Vermont Avenue, which is not consistent with the Park Master Plan station location on Exposition Boulevard at Vermont Avenue. The Optional Vermont station would be closer to Vermont Avenue and would be consistent with the Park Master Plan.

Alternative 2c (All At-Grade) The all at-grade alternative includes an optional station along Exposition Boulevard just west of Figueroa Street which is consistent with the Park Master Plan for a station at Figueroa Street. This alternative would include four signalized pedestrian cross walks along the Exposition Boulevard segment similar to Alternatives 2a and 2b above. This alternative would include the optional Vermont station as described for alternatives 2a and 2b above.

University of Southern California. Currently, USC has a number of proposed projects in the site vicinity as noted in the related projects Section 4.6. One proposed project would be directly adjacent to the proposed rail route on Flower Street. The USC Plaza project is a proposed mixed use project between Flower and Figueroa Streets, just south of Jefferson. The project would consist of office, retail and hotel uses. Parking for the project would be 7 levels of subsurface spaces underneath the proposed site. All of the proposed project alternatives would be consistent with the type of mixed use proposed for the USC Plaza project.

California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS). CALTRANS has a variety of proposed roadway improvement plans for Flower and Figueroa Streets in the vicinity of the proposed rail route. Specific plans are discussed in the Transportation Section of this EIR (Section 5.3). The Harbor Freeway Transitway Plan proposes an Exposition Boulevard Station at the tunnel located under the Harbor Freeway (at Exposition Boulevard). The plan calls for excavating the tunnel south of the existing right-of-way to allow for bus layovers with a transit station above. Pedestrians leaving the station would be required to cross over the proposed rail line and walk north to Jefferson Street, cross over Flower Street again to access the rail line at the Jefferson Street Station. This would not provide convenient access to the proposed rail line for riders leaving the Transitway Station at Washington Boulevard. LACTC will work with CALTRANS to identify the potential for a bus/rail interface with the Harbor Freeway Transitway at the 23rd Street Station.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Commission staff and consultants have been working to provide a convenient and workable interface with the Harbor Freeway Transitway. Due to a number of technical problems, it is difficult to place a station closer to the Transitway than has been proposed in this report. LACTC would continue to work with CALTRANS to improve pedestrian access between these two transportation modes and identify the potential for a bus rail interface with the Transitway at the 23rd Street Station.

In addition, all the western segments (alternatives 2a, 2b, and 2c) would include four signalized pedestrian crossings along Exposition Boulevard between Flower Street and Vermont Avenue.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The proposed rail route together with other planned projects in the site vicinity will increase the land use density of the site area and will help to achieve the goals of the redevelopment plan of the area.

5.2 POPULATION AND HOUSING

SETTING

Population

The proposed light rail line traverses two Community planning areas: the Southeast Los Angeles and the South Central Los Angeles Communities. The South Central Planning area had an estimated population of 257,469 in 1990, an increase of 36,500 over the 1980 estimate which represents an annual growth rate of about 1.5 percent. The Southeast Los Angeles Planning area had an estimated population of 234,621 in 1990 which is an increase of 47,637 over the 1980 estimate for an annual growth rate of 2.3 percent. This compares to the Citywide growth rate of 1.6 percent for the same period.

Further detailed information regarding the population of the immediate rail route area is provided by the eight census tracts immediately adjacent to the proposed rail line. As shown in **Table 5.2-1** there were an estimated 39,142 persons residing in the eight census tracts adjacent to the proposed rail line which was an increase of 4,411 from 1980 and an annual growth rate of 1.2 percent per year. Thus, the growth rate in this area was slightly lower than the Citywide average of 1.6 percent for the same period.

Like many other areas throughout the City of Los Angeles, both of the Planning areas have undergone significant changes in demographic composition. As black in-migration has greatly slowed and black out-migration to other areas has begun to accelerate, the area has experienced a rapid in-migration of Hispanic and other residents. The largest ethnic group in the area are Hispanics who represent about 61 percent of the areas population. The black population in the area accounts for another 19 percent of the total population.

Income Levels

The median household income level of the census tracts adjacent to the rail route ranged from \$5,529 to \$14,312 in 1988 (average of \$9,920) which is considerably lower than the median income of the City which was \$28,687.

TABLE 5.2-1: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Census Tracts	Population 1980	Housing 1980	Population 1990	Housing 1990
222600	4133	1485	5462	1752
222700	2904	225	2750	218
224000	5104	1417	5189	1417
224400	6762	1990	7216	2134
224600	3470	885	4182	1020
224700	4036	669	4014	1359
231100	2120	569	2080	256
231200	6202	2376	8249	2764
Total	34,731	9,616	39,142	11,233

Source: U.S. 1990 Census, STF 1A Tape.

Housing

There were an estimated 145,951 housing units in 1990 in the two community planning areas in the vicinity of the rail route. This was an increase of 4.4 percent from 1980 when there were an estimated 139,770 units. On the whole the areas gained 91,008 people between 1980 and 1990 or 22.2 percent from 410,376 to 501,384 individuals during the decade. The average household size was 2.9 in 1980 and 3.4 in 1990.

Within the census tracts adjacent to the rail line the housing stock grew from 9,616 units in 1980 to 10,920 in 1990 or an increase of 13.5 percent. The population in these census tracts grew from 34,731 to 39,142 or a 13 percent increase during the last decade. The average household size was 3.0 in 1980 and 3.5 in 1990 which is about the same as for the community planning areas adjacent to the rail line but considerably higher than the averages for the City as a whole which were 2.5 and 2.7 in 1980 and 1990 respectively.

As a result of housing production not keeping up with the population growth in the City or Community planning areas there has been a decrease in the number of available or unoccupied dwelling units throughout the City. In 1990, of the estimated 10,920 housing units in the adjacent census tracts about 1,389 were vacant for a 13 percent vacancy rate. This is considerably higher than the vacancy rate for the City as a whole which had a 4.7 percent vacancy rate in 1990, thus indicating that there is a greater vacancy rate and less demand for units in these census tracts than in the City as a whole.

Within the census tracts adjacent to the rail line the majority of the units are rental with only 8.5 percent of the total units being owner occupied. The average rent paid in the area

was about \$450.00 per month (\$5,400 per year). This is considerably lower than the Citywide average rent of \$690.00 per month (\$8,280 per year). The average home value in the area is \$157,700 which is considerably less than the Citywide average of \$291,160.

The housing cost to income ratio in the surrounding census tracts ranges from 11.1 to 30.1, meaning the cost of buying a home in the area is 11 to 30 times the median income of persons in these census tracts and therefore home purchase for these individuals is not an option. The average rental rate to income ratio ranges from .98 to .38 for the same census tracts.

Housing Affordability

A commonly-used local model can be used to distribute the demand for housing units by cost or value into very low, low, moderate and high price ranges.¹ These ranges are based on median income categories provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Community Development. The City of Los Angeles uses these figures to determine the income for affordable housing at different family sizes that would classify a household as very low, low, or moderate income. Table 5.2-2 provides the current income limits for selected family sizes.

TABLE 5.2-2: YEARLY INCOME LIMITS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
Family Size	Very Low	Low	Moderate
1	\$ 14,700	\$ 23,520	\$ 35,280
2	\$ 16,800	\$ 26,880	\$ 40,320
4	\$ 21,000	\$ 33,600	\$ 50,400
6	\$ 24,360	\$ 40,350	\$ 58,464
Source: City of Los Angeles Housing Preservation and Production Department, Housing Division, based on U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as of April 1991.			

As evidenced from Table 5.2-2, the median income of families within the census tracts adjacent to the rail line fall within the very low income category. Distribution of demand for housing in each of these affordable categories, and in the high cost category, can be predicted as provided in Table 5.2-3.

As indicated in Table 5.2-3, the majority of housing demand in the three affordable categories is for rental units, ranging from 60 percent for moderate income households to 83 percent for very low income.

¹Kenneth C. Topping, "Proposed Guidelines to Address Jobs/Housing Balance" Memorandum, May 15, 1990.

TABLE 5.2-3: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING DEMAND IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High
Percent of total demand	19%	18%	19%	44%
Percent owner-occupied	17%	33%	40%	67%
Percent renter-occupied	83%	67%	60%	33%

Source: City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning. Based on "Proposed Guidelines to Address Jobs/Housing Balance," May 15, 1990.

IMPACTS

Population and Housing

Alternatives 1a and 1b would require that the rail alignment pass in front of the apartment building located at 2315 S. Flower Street, directly across from Orthopaedic Hospital. The building has a total of 63 rental units and one retail tenant. Assuming the average household size of 3.5 persons for the census tracts in this area, it is estimated that up to 221 persons could reside in the building.

As currently designed, the track alignment for Alternative 1a or 1b would not require that the building be displaced. In the case of Alternative 1a the centerline of the rail tracks would be located 65 feet from the edge of the apartment building. For Alternative 1b the centerline of the rail racks would be located 45 feet from the edge of the apartment building. The existing sidewalk in front of the building would be narrowed from 15 feet to 8 feet for either alternative. See also Section 5.5 regarding the noise impacts at these locations.

In addition there are apartment units located above two other commercial buildings along Flower Street. While the proposed light rail line would not result in the displacement of these units they would be affected in terms of noise, pedestrian safety and aesthetics. Please see each respective section of this EIR for a discussion of these effects.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None are proposed.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Other related projects in the site vicinity would not displace any housing units. Thus, there would be no cumulative displacement impacts.

5.3 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

SETTING

A traffic report was prepared by Meyer, Mohaddes Associates which is available for review at the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission.








Existing Roadway Network

The existing lane configurations in the site vicinity are shown in **Figures 5.3-1 and 5.3-2**. The following is a description of the freeway, and major road facilities in and near the proposed rail line.


Harbor Freeway. The Harbor Freeway (I-110 and SR 110) is located to the east of the study area. The Harbor Freeway extends from the San Pedro Harbor and continues to the Hollywood Freeway (US 101). North of the Hollywood Freeway, the freeway changes name to the Pasadena Freeway. The Harbor Freeway is an Interstate Highway from its terminus in San Pedro to the Santa Monica Freeway (I-10). North of the Santa Monica Freeway, the freeway becomes a State Highway (SR 110). In the study area, the Harbor Freeway has four lanes in either direction. There are two auxiliary drop lanes on the northbound Harbor Freeway in advance of the Santa Monica Freeway. Traveling northbound towards the Santa Monica Freeway, there is an off-ramp to 37th Street, an on-ramp from Exposition, and an off-ramp to Adams Boulevard. In the southbound direction there is an off-ramp to 23rd Street, an off-ramp to Exposition Boulevard, and an on-ramp from 37th Street. The ADT (Average Daily Traffic) on the Harbor Freeway near Exposition Boulevard is 260,000 vehicles per day. Currently, there is an HOV transitway being constructed in the median of the Harbor Freeway. (This transitway is discussed further in the, Programmed Transportation Improvements discussion and in the Impacts Section.)

Santa Monica Freeway. The Santa Monica Freeway (I-10) is located to the north of the study area. The Santa Monica Freeway extends from the Pacific Coast Highway and continues to the Pomona (SR 60)/Santa Ana (I-5) Freeway split. The Santa Monica Freeway (I-10) is contiguous with the Santa Ana Freeway (I-5) to the north for a little over a mile, where it then splits and becomes the San Bernadino Freeway. There is a full interchange at Vermont Avenue and a partial interchange at Hoover Street. The missing movement at the Hoover Street interchange is the on-ramp to the eastbound freeway. The ADT on the Santa Monica Freeway just west of the Harbor Freeway is 324,000 vehicles per day.

Figueroa Street. Figueroa Street is classified as a major highway. Major highways have rights-of-way that are approximately 100 feet wide with 80 feet curb-to-curb. Figueroa Street has three lanes in both directions throughout the study area, however, parking is allowed in the two curb lanes during non-peak periods, resulting



SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates




Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.3-1

EXISTING LANE CONFIGURATIONS



SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.3-2
EXISTING LANE CONFIGURATIONS

in two lanes in each direction. Figueroa Street continues north to the Central Business District, where it becomes one-way northbound north of Olympic Boulevard, and south to the San Diego Freeway (I-405). There are two phase traffic signals on Figueroa Street at 23rd Street, Adams Boulevard, 30th Street, Jefferson Boulevard, and 35th Street. There are multi-phases signals at Washington and Exposition Boulevards. The ADT on Figueroa Street between Adams Boulevard and Jefferson Boulevard is 27,100 vehicles per day and 30,300 vehicles per day south of Flower Street.

Flower Street. Flower Street is classified as a secondary highway. Secondary highways have rights-of-way that are approximately 80 feet wide with 60 feet curb-to-curb. Flower Street extends to the study area from the Central Business District as a one-way, southbound street until it reaches Washington Boulevard where it has two lanes in both directions until its terminus at Figueroa Street, south of Exposition. North of Washington Boulevard, the existing Blue Line trains run along Flower Street at-grade along the east curb with three southbound lanes provided on Flower Street. There are two phase traffic signals on Flower Street at 23rd Street, Adams Boulevard, 30th Street, and Jefferson Boulevard. There are multi-phases signals at Washington Boulevard, Exposition Boulevard, and 37th Street. The ADT on Flower Street between Washington Boulevard and 23rd Street is 7,800 vehicles per day and 12,500 vehicles per day south of Adams Boulevard.

Washington Boulevard. Washington Boulevard is classified as a major highway. Washington Boulevard has three lanes in both directions west of Flower Street and two lanes in each direction east of Flower Street. Washington Boulevard extends from Venice to the west to Whittier to the east. The ADT on Washington Boulevard west of Figueroa Street is 27,300 vehicles per day.

23rd Street. 23rd Street is classified as a collector street. 23rd Street has one to two lanes in both directions in the study area. The ADT on 23rd Street west of Figueroa Street is 9,900 vehicles per day and 7,800 vehicles per day east of Flower.

Adams Boulevard. Adams Boulevard is classified as a major highway even though right-of-way constraints limit Adams Boulevard to two lanes in each direction. Adams Boulevard extends from La Cienega Boulevard in the west to the Southern Pacific tracks just west of the City of Vernon. The ADT on Adams Boulevard west of Figueroa Street is 25,700 vehicles per day.

Jefferson Boulevard. Jefferson Boulevard is classified as a secondary highway east of Figueroa Street, and a major highway west of Figueroa Street. Jefferson Boulevard has three lanes in both directions west of Flower Street and two lanes in both directions east of Flower Street. Jefferson Boulevard extends from Playa Vista in the west, east to Central Avenue. The ADT on Jefferson Boulevard west of Figueroa Street is 25,800 vehicles per day and 20,500 vehicles per day east of Flower Street.

Exposition Boulevard. Exposition is classified as a secondary highway between Flower Street and Hoover Street and a modified secondary highway west of Hoover Street. Exposition has three lanes in both directions in the study area. There is a 30 foot wide abandoned railroad right-of-way in the median of Exposition. Exposition extends from La Brea Avenue in the west to Central Avenue. The ADT on Exposition west of Figueroa Street is 26,000 vehicles per day.

Hoover Street. Hoover Street, north of Exposition, is a private street that serves internal access to the USC campus. North of Jefferson Boulevard, Hoover Street becomes a public roadway again.

Vermont Avenue. Vermont Avenue is classified as a major highway. Vermont Avenue has two lanes in both directions at Exposition and extends from Wilmington in the south to Griffith Park in the north. The ADT on Vermont Avenue north of Exposition is 34,300 vehicles per day and 28,000 vehicles per day south of Exposition.

Transit Service

The proposed Exposition Park LRT is to be an extension of the Metro Blue Line. The Blue Line connects Long Beach with downtown Los Angeles. The Blue Line comes from downtown into the study area along the east side of Flower Street, where it turns to the east on Washington Boulevard. There is a station just to the east of Flower Street on Washington Boulevard.

There are also several bus lines which serve the area. On Figueroa Street, there are several express commuter buses which use Figueroa Street to access the downtown area. Local service includes the Expo Park Dash line (Route C), RTD 81, the Figueroa Street line and RTD 102, the East Jefferson-Coliseum Street line. RTD 102 turns onto Exposition at Figueroa Street and continues to the west. On Washington Boulevard, there is the RTD 65, the Washington Boulevard line and RTD 68, the West Washington Boulevard-Brooklyn Avenue line. The RTD 37, West Adams Boulevard line, the RTD 38, and West Jefferson Boulevard line, also serve the area.

Parking Facilities

There are both public and private parking facilities in the study area. During the daytime, there is ample on-street parking available, especially on Flower Street. However, this is probably due to the time restrictions placed on this parking. Many of the long-term off-street lots appear to be quite full. Longer-term metered parking adjacent to the USC campus is also heavily used and occupied. In the areas directly adjacent to the Coliseum and the Sports Arena, where parking is free, parking is heavily utilized. In the public pay lots at Exposition Park, there is parking available for visitors. Parking demand for sporting events held at the Sports Arena and more especially for Coliseum events, is extremely heavy. In many cases, patrons park on or around the USC campus, and walk considerable

distances. There are also several property owners who provide parking at a cost for these events. **Table 5.3-1** shows the parking available in the area for sporting events. Most of the streets in the study area allow on-street parking.

TABLE 5.3-1: PARKING SUPPLY IN AND AROUND THE COLISEUM

Location	Number of Spaces	Percent of Total Spaces
Expo Park/Coliseum Parking	7,890	41%
USC Campus Parking	7,700	40%
Parking in Small Lots or private yards.	3,500	19%
Total Spaces	19,090	100%
Source: Meyer Mohaddes Associates.		

Pedestrian Activity

The major weekday pedestrian activities center around the USC campus. Heavy pedestrian traffic crosses Jefferson Boulevard between Figueroa Street and Vermont Avenue to and from the north side of the campus. There is also considerable USC pedestrian traffic across Figueroa Street between Jefferson and Exposition Boulevards. During sporting events, there is a heavy pedestrian demand to and from Exposition Park. Many of these pedestrians crossing Exposition come from parking spaces on the USC campus. There is a mid-block signalized pedestrian crossing of Exposition at the Rose Garden, between Figueroa and Hoover Streets. At this location and at Hoover Street, are the only areas where pedestrians may enter the campus from the Exposition frontage. The remainder of the Exposition frontage is fenced to prohibit pedestrian access. Pedestrian undercrossings crossing Figueroa Street and Exposition in the area of the Figueroa/Exposition intersection also facilitate pedestrian movements.

Existing Traffic Volumes

To analyze the existing traffic conditions within the study area, intersection capacity utilization (ICU) analyses were performed at the study intersections. The intersection capacity utilization method results in a number value (the ICU), representing the theoretical percentage of signal green time required to accommodate intersection traffic with a given number of lanes at each approach. More simply, the ICU can be thought of as the percent utilization of available capacity. A value exceeding 1.000 indicates that the volume is at theoretical capacity. For the ICU method, capacity of an intersection is defined in terms of vehicles per lane per hour of green time. Capacity of a lane is assumed to be an empirically derived value of 1,500 vehicles per hour (vph) of green time.

The percent utilization (the ICU value) is often associated with level of service (LOS). LOS ranges from "A" through "F" representing the traffic quality; from good operating conditions with no delay to motorists (LOS A), to (LOS F), in which the arrival of vehicles exceeds the capacity of the intersection, and motorists are faced with excessive delay in

travel. Table 5.3-2 below shows the relationship between ICU values and LOS designations.

TABLE 5.3-2: ICU VALUES AND CORRESPONDING LOS DESIGNATORS	
Level of Service	ICU Value
A	0.600 or less
B	0.601 to 0.700
C	0.701 to 0.800
D	0.801 to 0.900
E	0.901 to 1.000
F	Over 1.000
Source: Meyer Mohaddes Associates.	

The results of these calculations for existing conditions are depicted on Table 5.3-3. Some conclusions which can be drawn from include the following:

At the Flower Street and Washington Boulevard intersection where the Blue Line turns from Flower Street to Washington Boulevard, there exists a reasonable level of service (LOS "A" in the a.m. and "B" in the p.m. peak).

Exposition Boulevard is very congested in the morning. All four of the study intersections on Exposition operate at a LOS of "E" or worse during the morning peak. The LOS during the afternoon peak is acceptable.

Adams Boulevard is congested in the afternoon with the Figueroa and Flower Streets intersections operating at a LOS of "E".

The Flower Street and Jefferson Boulevard intersection operates at a LOS of "F" in the afternoon and at a LOS of "A" in the morning. This is due to much heavier afternoon traffic out of the downtown area and from the USC campus to the west during the afternoon peak.

TABLE 5.3-3: EXISTING INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE

Intersection	A.M. Peak		P.M. Peak	
	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS
Figueroa Street at Washington Boulevard	0.812	D	0.849	D
Flower Street at Washington Boulevard	0.642	B	0.781	C
Figueroa Street at 23rd Street	0.570	A	0.624	B
Flower Street at 23rd Street	0.573	A	0.870	D
Figueroa Street at Adams Boulevard	0.812	D	0.944	E
Flower Street at Adams Boulevard	0.632	B	0.957	E
Figueroa Street at Jefferson Boulevard	0.679	B	0.839	D
Flower Street at Jefferson Boulevard	0.579	A	1.215	F
Flower Street at Exposition Boulevard	0.980	E	0.693	B
Flower Street at 37th Street	0.960	E	0.740	C
Figueroa Street at Exposition Boulevard	1.229	F	0.829	D
Hoover Street at Exposition Boulevard	0.966	E	0.558	A
Vermont Avenue at Exposition Boulevard	0.957	E	0.761	C
Source: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates.				

Programmed Transportation Improvements

The Harbor Freeway Transitway Project is presently being constructed in the median of the Harbor Freeway, and will serve High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV). High Occupancy Vehicles can be either buses or carpools. Both of the freeway's fast lanes are to be blocked during the construction of the support columns. Improvements are needed to the surface streets to handle the diverted traffic and are planned to be constructed by Summer, 1992 to accommodate construction of this portion of the transitway.

LADOT has proposed roadway improvement plans for Flower and Figueroa Streets in the area of the Harbor Freeway Transitway which would essentially expand the Figueroa/Flower couplet which exists in the Central Business District, south to Exposition Boulevard. The current plan for Flower Street is to have Flower Street one-way southbound from Washington Boulevard south to Exposition Boulevard. Flower Street is to be five lanes during peak hours and four lanes with a parking lane during the day. Flower Street will not need to be widened for this to take place. There will be one contra-flow north bound

lane in front of Orthopaedic Hospital on Flower Street. Figueroa Street is to be four lanes northbound and two lanes southbound during the peak hour. The southbound contra-flow lanes are being retained to maintain access to fronting properties. The west side of Figueroa Street is to drop to one lane southbound during the day to allow for parking. The widening of Figueroa Street is to take place within the sidewalk area. There are to be sidewalks on both sides of Figueroa Street, between eight and ten feet wide.

A short, one-way couplet is also proposed for the Exposition and 37th Street undercrossings of the Harbor Freeway with 37th Street one-way eastbound and Exposition one-way westbound. This will be accomplished through the realignment of the northbound I-110 off-ramp.

A large bus terminal is proposed on a block under the Harbor Freeway, between Flower Street, 37th Street and Exposition. This facility is to have direct access to and from the Harbor Freeway Transitway station located above. This will facilitate transfers between the transitway and surface street buses.

IMPACT

Methodology

The first step in the traffic impact analysis is to forecast traffic conditions for the future before the addition of train traffic through the study intersections. Based on discussions with the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC) staff and input from the City of Los Angeles staff, the Year 2010 was assumed to be the horizon year for future traffic analysis. The future no-project conditions includes assumptions relative to traffic pattern changes and geometric modifications planned by LADOT and CALTRANS between now and 2010.

The ambient growth rate used in this study is 1.5 percent per year compounded for 19 years to 2010 (a total growth rate of 33 percent). This is a slightly higher rate than is typically used for background growth to account for the other related projects as described in Section 4.6. The traffic generated by the USC Plaza project, described earlier, was explicitly included in the background traffic.

Traffic accessing the Harbor Freeway transitway will also add traffic to the study area roadways. The anticipated transitway traffic volumes were provided by Caltrans and added to the local street volumes for this study. Prior to assigning the traffic from the USC Plaza and transitway project the resulting changes in background traffic patterns due to transportation improvements programmed by LADOT were analyzed and identified.

The primary programmed improvements which affect the background traffic patterns in the study area are modifications to the traffic patterns on Figueroa Street, Flower Street, Exposition Boulevard and 37th Street as previously described in the Planned Transportation Improvements section. These improvements will be implemented within the next year,

prior to the start of construction on the northernmost segments of the transitway project.

The lane configurations assumed for the Figueroa Street/Flower Street one-way couplet were provided by LADOT. The future lane configurations assumed in the No Project analysis are displayed in **Figures 5.3-3 and 5.3-4**.







Fifty percent of southbound Figueroa Street traffic was assumed to shift to southbound Flower Street and 100 percent of northbound Flower Street traffic was assumed to shift to Figueroa Street as a result of the one-way couplet.

In conjunction with the Harbor Freeway Transitway and the Figueroa Street/Flower Street one-way couplet LADOT and Caltrans have developed a proposal to create a short one-way couplet on 37th Street and Exposition Boulevard, between Figueroa Street and Hope Street, essentially creating a triangular loop to serve the four Harbor Freeway on/off-ramps. This proposed roadway alignment has also been included in the 2010 No Project analysis.


Future No Project Traffic Conditions

The base 1991 traffic volumes were reassigned and the ambient growth along with traffic volumes from the related projects and the transitway project were added to obtain the future cumulative traffic volumes. **Figures 5.3-5 to 5.3-8** display the total future traffic volumes (2010) without the project during the AM and PM peak hours at the study intersections.

The operations analysis methodology described in the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, SR 209, Washington, D.C., 1985) for signalized intersections was used in analyzing the level of service at the study intersections for all future conditions. The 2010 peak hour intersection levels of service for the No Project scenario are reflected in **Table 5.3-4**. During the AM peak hour, the intersections projected to operate with an estimated LOS E or worse are Figueroa Street/Exposition Boulevard and Vermont Avenue/Exposition Boulevard. During the PM peak hour the intersections of Flower Street/Washington Boulevard, Figueroa Street/Jefferson Boulevard, and Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard are estimated to operate at LOS E or worse. Five of the 13 intersections analyzed would be expected to operate at capacity in either the AM or PM in 2010 under the No Project scenario.



SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates






Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.3-3

NO PROJECT - FUTURE INTERSECTION
LANE CONFIGURATIONS









SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.3-4
NO PROJECT - FUTURE INTERSECTION
LANE CONFIGURATIONS



SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates



Exclusive turn lane
 Through lane
 Shared through and turn lane







Exposition Park Branch Line
 Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.3-5
 NO PROJECT - FUTURE A.M. PEAK
 HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES



BLUELINE










SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates

Exclusive turn lane
Through lane
Shared through and turn lane



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.3-7
NO PROJECT - FUTURE P.M. PEAK
HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES



SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates

Exclusive turn lane 
 Through lane 
 Shared through and turn lane 



Exposition Park Branch Line
 Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.3-8

NO PROJECT - FUTURE P.M. PEAK
 HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES

TABLE 5.3-4: NO PROJECT AM AND PM LEVELS OF SERVICE

Intersection	AM Peak		PM Peak	
	Delay/a/	LOS	Delay/a/	LOS
Figueroa at Washington	14.5	B	18.3	C
Flower at Washington	26.8	D	100+ V/C=1.22/b/	F
Figueroa at 23rd	9.7	B	9.8	B
Flower at 23rd	10.1	B	9.2	B
Figueroa at Adams	17.9	C	27.2	D
Flower at Adams	10.4	B	15.7	C
Figueroa at Jefferson	27.9	D	80.6	F
Flower at Jefferson	8.5	B	22.7	C
Flower at Exposition	18.0	C	44.7	E
Flower at 37th	12.8	B	8.3	B
Figueroa at Exposition	100+ V/C=1.42/b/	F	16.6	C
Hoover at Exposition	19.9	C	37.4	D
Vermont at Exposition	58.9	E	15.7	C
/a/ Seconds/Vehicle /b/ When intersections are forecast to operate at LOS F and delay reaches beyond approximately 100 seconds, the Highway Capacity Manual approach to levels of service calculation no longer reports delay (it exceeds reasonable maximum values). The volume-to-capacity ratio is provided as an alternative measure for comparison of impacts of alternative scenarios where intersections are forecast to operate well into the LOS F range. Source: Meyer Mohaddes Associates.				

Traffic Impacts

Alternative 1a and 2c (All At-Grade Line with a Shared Bridge Crossing the Harbor Freeway)

The all at-grade alternative assumes that the proposed rail line would run at-grade along the east side of Flower Street and along the median of Exposition Boulevard. This alternative includes the assumption that one of the southbound lanes on Flower Street would be displaced by the rail lines. This would result in three southbound lanes on Flower Street and two southbound plus five northbound lanes on Figueroa Street; still providing a balance in north-south capacity. The eastbound double left-turn lane on Exposition Boulevard at Figueroa Street would also be eliminated by the at-grade alignment in the

median of Exposition Boulevard. Left turns at the Figueroa Street/Exposition Boulevard intersection would have to be made from a shared through/left-turn lane and the signal operated on a split phase (eastbound movements separate from westbound) to accommodate at-grade rail operations.


Left turns from southbound Flower Street were assumed to be made from a shared through/left-turn lane in several cases where a left-turn lane is not proposed. During signal cycles when a train is passing through the intersection, southbound traffic would continue to receive a green indication, but the shared lane could potentially be blocked by a left-turning vehicle waiting for a train to pass (see mitigation measures regarding left-turn arrow traffic signal heads to be placed for southbound movements in the shared lane on Flower Street). Trains were assumed to operate at six-minute headways in each direction. Therefore, a train was assumed to cross each intersection along the alignment on average once every three minutes during the peak hour. The traffic volume on the shared lane that could be potentially blocked by a stopped left-turn vehicle was adjusted to reflect the delay due to the passage of trains through the intersection. It was assumed that the lane would be blocked for approximately 30 seconds every three minutes based on the distance to be traveled, train speed, and other factors. Assuming a cycle length of 60 seconds at that intersection, the blockage time is about 10 seconds per cycle length or approximately 17 percent of the cycle time. Therefore, the southbound Flower Street traffic volumes estimated for the shared lane is increased by 17 percent to conservatively reflect the blockage due to train passage.

Levels of services based on the 2010 volumes were reevaluated with these revised lane configurations and operating parameters¹. The future lane configurations for this alternative are shown in **Figure 5.3-9** for those intersections where the lane configurations would be different from the future without project shown in **Figures 5.3-3 and 5.3-4**. The 2010 levels of service for the All At-Grade Alternative (Alternatives 1a and 2c) in the AM and PM peak hours are shown in **Tables 5.3-5 and 5.3-6**, respectively. Discussion of lane configuration assumptions of the major intersections along the rail line and resulting LOS analysis are described below:

Flower/Washington - The proposed project lane configuration is the same lane configurations as future without project conditions shown in **Figure 5.3-3**. No change in delay was identified for AM peak and the V/C ratio (used for LOS when it is F) remained the same.

At the Flower Street/Washington Boulevard intersection, the trains would travel north-south across Washington Boulevard during the signal phase when the southbound Flower Street traffic is moving. The trains would, therefore, not impact east-west traffic movements and would move simultaneously with the southbound

¹The 2010 traffic volumes were not adjusted to reflect any shift in mode split toward the train for worst-case analysis purposes. That is, no reduction was made to north-south auto traffic on Figueroa or Flower Streets to reflect the potential shift from auto to light rail.



SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.3-9
PROPOSED LANE CONFIGURATIONS WITH
ALL AT-GRADE ALTERNATIVES (1A & 2C)

**TABLE 5.3-5: ALTERNATIVE 1A AND 2C (ALL AT-GRADE WITH SHARED BRIDGE)
AM LEVELS OF SERVICE**

Intersection	Without Project		With Project		Impact
	Delay/a/	LOS	Delay/a/	LOS	
Figueroa at Washington	14.5	B	14.5	B	N.C.
Flower at Washington	26.8	D	26.8	D	N.C.
Figueroa at 23rd	9.7	B	9.7	B	N.C.
Flower at 23rd	10.1	B	10.1	B	N.C.
Figueroa at Adams	17.9	C	17.9	C	N.C.
Flower at Adams	10.4	B	15.1	C	+
Flower at 28th	N/A	N/A	14.2	B	N/A
Figueroa at Jefferson	27.9	D	27.9	D	N.C.
Flower at Jefferson	8.5	B	9.5	B	+
Flower at Exposition	18.0	C	39.6	D	+
Flower at 37th	12.8	B	12.8	B	N.C.
Figueroa at Exposition	100+ V/C=1.42	F	100+ V/C=1.64	F	*
Hoover at Exposition	19.9	C	19.9	C	N.C.
Vermont at Exposition	58.9	E	58.9	E	N.C.
Key to Symbols: + Delay increases, but not a significant impact * Significant impact N.C. No change /a/Seconds/Vehicle Source: Meyer Mohaddes Associates.					

traffic. The southbound left-turning traffic would, on average once every three minutes, be delayed slightly because the left-turn phase would be delayed or shortened as the trains cross Washington Boulevard. This would not affect the level of service at the intersection, however, because the southbound through volume is so much higher than the left-turn volume (701 vs. 126 in the AM and 1882 vs. 180 in the PM) that the southbound signal phase required to accommodate the through volume would be long enough to accommodate simultaneously both the left-turn phase and the train phase. The proposed project therefore does not have a significant impact at the Flower Street/Washington Boulevard intersection.

TABLE 5.3-6: ALTERNATIVE 1A AND 2C (ALL AT-GRADE WITH SHARED BRIDGE) PM LEVELS OF SERVICE					
Intersection	Without Project		With Project		Impact
	Delay/a/	LOS	Delay/a/	LOS	
Figueroa at Washington	18.3	C	18.3	C	N.C.
Flower at Washington	100+ V/C=1.22	F	100+ V/C=1.22	F	N.C.
Figueroa at 23rd	9.8	B	9.8	B	N.C.
Flower at 23rd	9.8	B	10.0	B	+
Figueroa at Adams	27.2	D	27.2	D	N.C.
Flower at Adams	15.7	C	100+ V/C=1.21	F	*
Flower at 28th	N/A	N/A	29.3	D	N/A
Figueroa at Jefferson	80.6	F	79.9	F	N.C.
Flower at Jefferson	22.7	C	100+ V/C=1.23	F	*
Flower at Exposition	44.7	E	81.5	F	*
Flower at 37th	8.3	B	8.3	B	N.C.
Figueroa at Exposition	16.6	C	37.8	D	+
Hoover at Exposition	37.4	D	37.4	D	N.C.
Vermont at Exposition	15.7	C	15.7	C	N.C.
Key to Symbols: + Delay increases, but not a significant impact * Significant impact N.C. No Change /a/Seconds/Vehicle Source: Meyer Mohaddes Associates.					

Flower/23rd - The project is proposed to have the same as the future without the project (see Figure 5.3-3). At this intersection there would be a northbound contra flow lane turning right. No change of delay was found for AM peak and during the PM peak period delay slightly increased from 9.8 to 10.0 seconds, which is not a significant impact.

Flower/Adams - Due to geometric configuration constraints, the project is proposed to have three southbound lanes (two through, one shared though/right turn) and a northbound contra flow lane (see Figure 5.3-9), which is two lanes less than future

without project. Southbound left turns are prohibited to reduce the significant increase in delay. Under future without the project, southbound left turns would be permitted. During the AM peak, the intersection level of service with project increases from B to LOS C and from C to F during the PM peak period. This constitutes a significant impact.

Flower/28th - Because of HOV on-ramps proposed just south of this intersection and the need to control conflicting rail and vehicular traffic volumes, this intersection has been analyzed as a signalized intersection. The geometric configuration includes a dedicated lane for left turns as well as HOV on-ramp, two through lanes and one shared through/right lane. Level of service for the 2010 AM and PM peak is projected to be B and D respectively, which is not a significant impact.

Flower/Jefferson - The proposed project includes three southbound lanes (shared right/through, through and shared through/left, see **Figure 5.3-9**) which is two less lanes than would occur under the future without project scenario. The LOS stayed the same for the AM peak and significantly increased during the PM peak period (from C to F). This constitutes a significant impact.

Exposition/Flower - The proposed geometric configuration for southbound Flower includes an exclusive right-turn lane, a shared right/through lane and four through lanes (total of 6 lanes, see **Figure 5.3-9**) which is one more lane than under the future without project scenario. The level of service during AM peak increases from C to D and from E to F during the PM peak period. This constitutes a significant impact.

Exposition/Figueroa - The proposed lane geometry for Figueroa includes a southbound exclusive right, two through and an exclusive left-turn lane (total of four lanes), and northbound exclusive left lane, three through, and one shared through/right lane (total of 5 lanes); the same as future without project. For Exposition Boulevard the proposed lane configurations include eastbound shared left/through, two through and one shared through/right lane (total of four lanes, two less than future without project), and westbound three through lanes and one shared through/right lane (total of 4 lanes, the same as future without project). LOS stayed the same during the AM peak (F) although V/C ratio increased significantly. The level of service increased from C to D during the PM peak period. The project therefore results in a significant impact during the AM peak hour.

Hoover/Watt Way - The proposed geometry at this intersection would be identical to the existing conditions; three lanes in each direction on Exposition Boulevard. The LOS is therefore not changed at the intersection due to the project.

The locations where at-grade operations of the proposed rail line would cause traffic impacts requiring mitigation include the following:

AM Peak Hour

- Figueroa Street/Exposition Boulevard

PM Peak Hour

- Flower Street/Jefferson Boulevard
- Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard
- Flower Street/Adams Boulevard

At these locations, the project results in increased delay at intersections where the resulting level of service is either E or F. At four other intersections, the project causes some increases in delay but the intersections would still operate at LOS D or better and therefore mitigation is not required. The threshold for identification of a significant impact was an increase in delay that caused an intersection to move from better than LOS E to either LOS E or F, or where delay increased by more than 4 seconds at an intersection already at LOS E or F (equivalent of change in V/C ratio of 0.02 or more, LADOT's threshold of significant impact).

Alternative 1b and 2c (All At-Grade with Separate Bridge over the Harbor Freeway)

Alternative 1b and 2c is an all at-grade alternative with the trains assumed to run along the east side of Flower Street between Washington Boulevard and the proposed station at 23rd Street. Just south of 23rd Street, the alignment would cross Flower Street and run along the west side curving back across Flower Street to the east side between 28th and 30th Streets to accommodate a separate rail bridge crossing over the Harbor Freeway. Then it would run along the east side of Flower Street and along the median of Exposition Boulevard to its terminus. This alternative would have the same lane configurations as Alternative 1a and 2c (All At-Grade with Shared Bridge).

Tables 5.3-7 and 5.3-8 illustrate the level of service analysis for this alternative. An all red phase has been assumed for the intersection of 23rd at Flower Street during the train crossing.

The primary impacts along this alignment are similar to those resulting from Alternative 1a and 2c, except at the mid-block crossings of the rail line when it traverses from east side to west side and vice versa on Flower Street and at selected intersections along Flower Street. The impact of train crossings at these two mid-block locations were analyzed to supplement Alternative 1a and 2c. Signalization is suggested as a safety and control measure to prevent the conflicts between vehicular traffic and trains. A new mid-block signal would be required in front of Orthopaedic Hospital where the trains would cross not only southbound Flower Street, but also the contra flow lane along the hospital frontage. This signal would have to be coordinated with signals at adjacent intersections to prevent traffic backups into adjacent intersections. At the second cross over point, south of 28th

**TABLE 5.3-7: ALTERNATIVE 1B AND 2C (ALL AT-GRADE WITH SEPARATE BRIDGE)
AM LEVELS OF SERVICE**

Intersection	Without Project		With Project		Impact
	Delay/a/	LOS	Delay/a/	LOS	
Figueroa at Washington	14.5	B	14.5	B	N.C.
Flower at Washington	26.8	D	26.8	D	N.C.
Figueroa at 23rd	9.7	B	9.7	B	N.C.
Flower at 23rd	10.1	B	14.4	B	N.C.
Figueroa at Adams	17.9	C	17.9	C	N.C.
Flower at Adams	10.4	B	15.3	C	+
Flower at 28th	N/A	N/A	27.7	D	N/A
Figueroa at Jefferson	27.9	D	27.9	D	N.C.
Flower at Jefferson	8.5	B	9.5	B	+
Flower at Exposition	18.0	C	39.6	D	+
Flower at 37th	12.8	B	12.8	B	N.C.
Figueroa at Exposition	100+ V/C=1.42	F	100+ V/C=1.64	F	*
Hoover at Exposition	19.9	C	19.9	C	N.C.
Vermont at Exposition	58.9	E	58.9	E	N.C.
Key to Symbols: + Delay increases, but not a significant impact * Significant impact N.C. No change /a/ Seconds/Vehicle Source: Meyer Mohaddes Associates.					

**TABLE 5.3-8: ALTERNATIVE 1B AND 2C (ALL AT-GRADE WITH SEPARATE BRIDGE)
PM LEVELS OF SERVICE**

Intersection	Without Project		With Project		Impact
	Delay/a/	LOS	Delay/a/	LOS	
Figueroa at Washington	18.3	C	18.3	C	N.C.
Flower at Washington	100+ V/C=1.22	F	100+ V/C=1.22	F	N.C.
Figueroa at 23rd	9.8	B	9.8	B	N.C.
Flower at 23rd	9.8	B	31.0	D	+
Figueroa at Adams	27.2	D	27.2	D	N.C.
Flower at Adams	15.7	C	100+ V/C=1.22	F	*
Flower at 28th	N/A	N/A	54.0	E	N/A
Figueroa at Jefferson	80.6	F	79.9	F	N.C.
Flower at Jefferson	22.7	C	100+ V/C=1.23	F	*
Flower at Exposition	44.7	E	81.5	F	*
Flower at 37th	8.3	B	8.3	B	N.C.
Figueroa at Exposition	16.6	C	37.8	D	+
Hoover at Exposition	37.4	D	37.4	D	N.C.
Vermont at Exposition	15.7	C	15.7	C	N.C.
Key to Symbols: + Delay increases, but not a significant impact * Significant impact N.C. No Change /a/ Seconds/Vehicle Source: Meyer Mohaddes Associates.					

Street, where the trains would transition back to the east side of Flower, the 28th Street signal would control the traffic during train movements. The impact of the all-red phase that would have to be added to the 28th Street signal would be to change the levels of service to E in the PM peak hour. This Alternative would have significant impacts at the following locations:

AM Peak Hour

- Figueroa Street/Exposition Boulevard

PM Peak Hour

- Flower Street/Adams Boulevard
- Flower Street/28th Street
- Flower Street/Jefferson Boulevard
- Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard

Alternative 2a Partial Aerial Segment

The aerial alternative is anticipated to have reduced impacts on street traffic compared to both the All At-Grade Alternatives. It would follow the proposed at-grade alignments with at-grade operations until south of Jefferson Street. It would eliminate the at-grade crossings of the Flower/Exposition and Figueroa/Exposition intersections. Therefore, the levels of service at intersections for this alternative would be the same as the proposed project everywhere except at these two intersections. At the Flower/ Exposition intersection, the LOS would be the same as the No-Project Alternative (or future without project conditions) and therefore would have no impact at Flower/Exposition. At Figueroa/Exposition, however, the placement of the column supporting the aerial structure on the Exposition Boulevard median would require additional right-of-way (3 to 5 feet), reduction of sidewalks (from existing 7 and 9 feet to 5 and 8 feet) and also narrowing the vehicular lanes to 10 feet. This would then allow double left turns from westbound Exposition to Figueroa as in the no project scenario. The narrow lanes would result in operations at LOS F in the AM ($V/C = 1.53$) and LOS C in the PM (delay = 20.7). This would create a significant impact during the AM peak hour because without the project, the AM peak V/C is 1.42. The No Project PM peak delay is 16.6 seconds/vehicle. This alternative would therefore impact the following intersections:

AM Peak Hour

- Figueroa Street/Exposition Boulevard

PM Peak Hour

- Flower Street/Adams Boulevard
- Flower Street/Jefferson Boulevard

For the aerial alternative, column placement required to support the grade separation of the alignment may affect the roadway capacity and sight distance. Those impacts would have to be evaluated in detail during the design phase of the project if the aerial alternative is selected as the preferred alternative.

Alternative 2b Partial Subway Segment

The subway alternative would be similar to Alternative 2a (aerial), in that it would follow the At-Grade Alternative alignment to south of Jefferson and would then enter a subway,

resurfacing in the median of Exposition Boulevard, west of Figueroa Street. The subway alignment would eliminate the potential impacts at the Flower/Exposition and Figueroa/Exposition intersections. Each would operate at the same levels of service as in the No Project scenario.

This alternative would impact the following intersections:

PM Peak Hour

- Flower Street/Adams Boulevard
- Flower Street/Jefferson Boulevard

Weekend Traffic

The proposed project would serve Exposition Park, the Coliseum, the Sports Arena, USC and other facilities which attract major sporting events and recreational activities on weekends. The facilities along the extension host a variety of major entertainment events throughout the year and most of the events are scheduled during weekends. These events are generally scheduled to avoid overlapping of event times to reduce the impact on traffic, congestion, and parking.

Congestion on streets and highways surrounding these facilities prior to and following events is due to large number of patrons desiring access to the area in a concentrated time period and does not generally affect peak hour commuting travel patterns. Most events are on weekends or after the evening commute. Intersections operate at capacity and require the presence of traffic control officers to manage the traffic. The nature of event traffic is such that it tends to result in similar levels of congestion for all events; the congestion just lasts longer for higher-attendance events than lower-attendance events. There is currently no regularly scheduled special RTD bus service provided for event days.

The Harbor Freeway Transitway in conjunction with the proposed rail line could facilitate dedicated special event service from outlying park and ride lots upon its completion. Implementation of this rail extension would also aid in effective utilization of downtown parking spaces that are generally not in use at the time of these events and should be considered to disperse the impacts of event traffic and parking in the Exposition Park area.

In summary, implementation of the branch line would help alleviate some of the weekend traffic and parking impacts in the Exposition Park area associated with events at facilities in the area.

PARKING IMPACTS

Parking is not proposed to be provided at any of the stations as part of the project. The primary modes of access at these stations would be walk-ins, bus transfer, kiss-and-ride (drop offs), or parking in available parking provided by others.

23rd Street Station - At the 23rd Street Station, minimal demand for parking is anticipated. The demand would be lower at this station compared to the other two because of its proximity to downtown (it's too close to serve as a park-and-ride station). The majority of trips made to/from this station would be walking trips (i.e., to LA Trade Tech College, Orthopaedic Hospital, or adjacent commercial and residential areas) or bus transfer trips from east-west bus routes.

Jefferson Station - At the Jefferson Station, sufficient nearby public parking spaces are expected to be available for use at the new 2130-space USC parking structure. The USC parking structure is located east of Harbor Freeway in close proximity to this station. The parking structure has recently begun its operations and the number of public parking spaces available are anticipated to be adequate to serve parking demand at this station.

Exposition Park/Vermont Station - Currently, there are approximately 19,000 spaces in the vicinity of this station available through various sources such as Coliseum/Exposition Park parking lots, USC Campus parking lots, private parking lots located primarily along Vermont Avenue, Hoover Street, Figueroa Street, Martin Luther King Boulevard, and on-street curb parking in nearby residential areas.

Within about two to three blocks from the intersection of Exposition Boulevard and Vermont Avenue, there are approximately 1,800 spaces available on these parking lots. These parking lots primarily serve events at the Los Angeles Coliseum, Sports Arena, and the Exposition Park. The nature of events and schedule are such that they do not conflict with peak workday parking demand (or hours). Thus, these parking spaces can be assumed to be available for rail commuters on weekdays. Among the three stations, this station near Exposition Park is the most logical one to be promoted as a park-and-ride station based on its proximity to adequate parking supply as well as being far enough away from downtown to serve as intercept parking.

Conversely, downtown parking spaces that are generally not in use at the time of Coliseum/Sports Arena events can be utilized to accommodate some of the parking demand at these events.

Alternative 1a and 2c (All At-Grade with Shared Bridge)

Table 5.3-9 illustrates the impact of Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge) along Flower Street. A total of 49 on-street parking spaces on the east side of Flower Street would be eliminated (between Washington Boulevard to 29th Street). Most of these spaces are currently designated for long-term (more than two hour) parking, indicating that there is not a great deal of demand for short-term on-street parking to serve business patrons needs. Only in front of Orthopaedic Hospital is there currently short-term (two hour) parking. On the west side of Flower Street, there are currently 77 parking spaces. These spaces would be retained, but parking would have to be prohibited during peak hours so that the curb lane could be utilized as a travel lane.

TABLE 5.3-9: ALTERNATIVE 1A AND 2C (ALL AT-GRADE WITH SHARED BRIDGE) PARKING IMPACTS ON FLOWER STREET

Block	Eastside		Westside	
	Currently	With Project	Currently	With Project
Washington-20th	3:6 Hr. Pkg.	NPAT	6:6 Hr. Pkg.	6:NP 4-6 PM
20th-21st	7:6 Hr. Pkg.	NPAT	6:6 Hr. Pkg.	6:NP 4-6 PM
21st-22nd	6:6 Hr. Pkg.	NPAT	6:6 Hr. Pkg.	6:NP 4-6 PM
22nd-23rd	5:6 Hr. Pkg.	NPAT	6:6 Hr. Pkg.	6:NP 4-6 PM
23rd-Adams	14:2 Hr. Pkg.	NPAT	2:2 Hr. Pkg.	2:NP 4-6 PM
Adams-27th	NPAT	NPAT	4:2 Hr. Pkg.	4:NP 4-6 PM
27th-29th	14:unrestricted	NPAT	6:2 Hr. Pkg.	6:NP 4-6 PM
29th-30th	NPAT	NPAT	4:unrestricted	4:NP 4-6 PM
30th-Jefferson	NPAT	NPAT	37:2 Hr. Pkg.	37:NP 4-6 PM
Jefferson-Exposition	9:4 Hr. Pkg.	NPAT	NPAT	NPAT
TOTAL	58	0	77	77:NP 4-6 PM
NPAT = No parking at any time; Source: Meyer Mohaddes Associates.				

Due to the availability of nearby off-street parking, the proposed project is not expected to have a significant impact on parking along its alignment. No parking mitigation measures are required.

Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge)

Along the blocks of Flower Street between 23rd Street and 30th Street, where the tracks would be transitioning to/from the east side of Flower and running along the west side, under this alternative, on-street parking would be prohibited. This would result in the loss of an additional 16 parking spaces along Flower Street, in addition to the 49 lost due to the All At-Grade Alternative 1a. This alternative would not cause a significant impact on parking.

Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)

This alternative would result in the elimination of 9 parking spaces on the east side of Flower Street. This alternative would not require any parking mitigation measures.

Alternative 2b (Part Subway)

This alternative would result in the same parking impacts as Alternative 2b and would therefore not require any parking mitigation measures.

Alternative 2c (All At-Grade)

Along Exposition Boulevard there are currently 96 on-street parking spaces, 48 on the north side along the USC Campus and 48 on the south side along Exposition Park, in the center of the block between Figueroa and Menlo Avenue. These spaces are all designated for four hour parking. Approximately 76 spaces would be displaced along the north side and south side of Exposition Boulevard for the optional Figueroa station and the Vermont station. About 20 spaces would potentially be retained near the center of the block.

PEDESTRIAN IMPACTS**Alternative 1a and 2c (All At-Grade with Shared Bridge)**

There are three issues with regard to pedestrian circulation that need to be evaluated with respect to impacts due to the proposed rail line: (1) locations where pedestrians cross the light rail tracks, (2) locations where the project causes changes in pedestrian travel patterns and (3) pedestrian access routes to the transit stations.

Crossings - A railing would be provided along the curb on Flower Street to prevent pedestrians from stepping off the sidewalk onto the tracks and to prevent mid-block crossings of the tracks by pedestrians. Along Exposition Boulevard fencing would be provided on either side of the tracks to prohibit mid-block pedestrian crossings of the tracks.

Crossings of the tracks would be accommodated at marked crosswalks at signalized intersections where the pedestrian signals would regulate pedestrian movements. This would result in the elimination of three existing crosswalks, one at the unsignalized 21st Street intersection, the mid-block crosswalk opposite Orthopaedic Hospital and the mid-block crosswalk between Jefferson and Exposition, serving the pedestrian undercrossing of the Harbor Freeway.

At the Washington Boulevard/Flower Street intersection the existing pedestrian crosswalk would be redesigned to accommodate the proposed line to the south. The pedestrian crossing phase on the eastern leg of the intersection, across Washington Boulevard, would be timed to coincide with the southbound Flower Street traffic, but would be preempted when the trains to/from Long Beach are turning the corner simultaneously with the Flower Street traffic signal phase, approximately once every three minutes. This would cause minor delays to some pedestrians waiting to cross Washington Boulevard, but would not be a significant impact.

At the Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard intersection, pedestrians would be restricted to crossing the intersection only on the west and south legs. This is due to the redesign of the intersection planned by CALTRANS and LADOT, however, not as a result of the proposed project.

Pedestrian crossings would be prohibited at "T" intersections along Flower Street, at 20th, 21st, 22nd, 27th, 29th, 31st, 33rd, and 35th Streets. At these locations, railings would be installed with signs directing pedestrians to use the crosswalk at the closest nearby signalized intersection. This would cause some pedestrians to have to walk up to about 350 feet out of their way to reach a crossing. Given the relatively light volumes of pedestrian activity along Flower Street, this would not be considered a significant impact.

At the currently unsignalized intersection at 28th Street, a traffic signal is proposed to be installed to control vehicular movements across the tracks. This signal would also include pedestrian signals, thereby improving conditions for pedestrians crossing Flower Street at 28th Street.

On Exposition Boulevard, pedestrian crossings would be provided at signalized intersections at Figueroa Street, at the mid-block signal opposite the Rose Garden, at Watt Way, and at Vermont Avenue, west of the proposed rail line terminus.

Changes in Pedestrian Travel Patterns -In addition to Trade Tech students, Orthopaedic Hospital visitors/employees who park on the west side of Flower Street in Lot G would have to walk to 23rd Street to cross Flower Street, rather than crossing mid block. This would add approximately 250' to the distance walked between the hospital entrance and Lot G and should not cause a significant negative impact.

The sidewalk on the east side of Flower Street would be eliminated along the tracks from a point just south of Orthopaedic Hospital, where a new pedestrian walkway connecting Flower Street to Adams Boulevard would be provided to replace the existing sidewalk on the freeway overcrossing, to Exposition Boulevard. There are no land uses along the east side of Flower Street in this area which require access other than the Jefferson Street transit station, which is discussed below, so this should not cause a significant impact on pedestrians.

The elimination of the mid-block crosswalk between Jefferson and Exposition which currently serves the Harbor Freeway undercrossing would require pedestrians to utilize either the Jefferson or Exposition Boulevard pedestrian crossings instead. This would increase the walking distance from the east side of the freeway to the west side by 500'.

Station Access - Pedestrian access to each station would be provided by a handicapped-accessible walkway located at one end of the station platform. At the 23rd Street Station, the walkway would be accessed via the crosswalk at 23rd Street. The Jefferson Station would be accessed from the south via the crosswalk on Jefferson Street. The Figueroa Station would be accessed from the east end via a walkway to the Figueroa Street

crosswalk. The Exposition Park/Vermont Station would be accessed from the west via a walkway to the Watt Way signalized crosswalk. If in the future this station is extended to the west, the access point would be relocated to a new signal at Menlo Avenue.

At the Figueroa and Exposition Park/Vermont Stations, a railing would be installed at the opposite end of the platform from the access walkway to prevent patrons from attempting to access the station via the mid-block pedestrian signal opposite the Rose Garden.

Special Event Pedestrian Traffic - When special events are held in Exposition Park, either at the Coliseum or the Sports Arena, the volume of pedestrians crossing the tracks and accessing the stations would be significantly higher than on typical days. The peak event, in terms of pedestrian volumes crossing Exposition Boulevard, would be USC football games. For USC games 60-70 percent of the spectators may cross Exposition Boulevard, either to/from parking or residences or pre/post game meeting locations on or near the USC campus. For professional sporting events or other activities at Exposition Park, a larger percentage of the attendees park at Exposition Park or in surrounding parking locations to the south, thereby reducing the pedestrian volume crossing Exposition Boulevard.

The number of spectators crossing the tracks prior to and after a sold out USC football game could be expected to range from 55,000 to 65,000 persons, spread over a several hour period. Average attendance at USC games approximates 65,000, which would result in 40,000 to 45,000 crossings of Exposition Boulevard. The proposed rail line design should be planned to accommodate peak pedestrian flows associated with sold out events. It has been estimated that 20 percent of the attendees at sporting events at the Coliseum arrive by transit (public bus or charters). It would be reasonable to assume that as many as 10 percent of the Coliseum event attendees might ride the proposed rail line to the games. This would mean that as many as 9,000 riders might utilize the two stations and associated crosswalks along Exposition Boulevard.

During special events, City of Los Angeles traffic control officers and police are assigned to the Exposition Park area to assist in the management of traffic and pedestrian flows. The pedestrian signals at the four signalized intersections along the park would be adjusted to respond to special event conditions, either through the Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) computerized signal system or by manual control in the field.

The capacity of the crosswalks to accommodate the peak pedestrian flows is a function of the crosswalk widths and the amount of walk time provided for the pedestrian phase. Based on an estimate of the likely distribution of pedestrians to the crosswalks, it was determined that approximately 16,000 pedestrians would cross at the mid-block crosswalk opposite the Rose Garden in the peak hour before or after a sold out game. At the two crosswalks adjacent to the stations (Figueroa and Watt Way) it was estimated that 8,700 pedestrians would cross in the peak hour. The green time at each traffic signal which can be allocated to the pedestrian walk phase is approximately 19 minutes per hour, based on the capacity analysis conducted at the Figueroa/Exposition intersection. Based on that

amount of available crossing time, these crosswalks would need to be 35 feet wide at the mid-block location and 20 feet wide at the two stations in order to accommodate the peak pedestrian flows.

Alternative 1b and 2c (All At-Grade with Separate Bridge)

In the section of Flower Street between 23rd and 30th, where the trains would transition to/from the west side of the street, pedestrian traffic would be effected in the following ways.

The new mid-block signal that would be required in front of Orthopaedic Hospital to control both southbound traffic and traffic in the northbound contra flow lane where the trains cross the street, could potentially also be utilized as a mid-block pedestrian signal to preserve the existing crosswalk in that location. This would however further impact traffic flows on Flower Street at this location by delaying Flower Street traffic not only when trains cross the street, but also when pedestrians do so. It would therefore be preferable to require pedestrians to walk to 23rd Street to cross at the signalized intersection, resulting in the same impact on pedestrians as in Alternative 1a and 2c.

This alternative would retain the pedestrian sidewalks on the existing bridge across the Harbor Freeway. This would eliminate the need for some pedestrians to walk out of there way several hundred feet to reach the new walkway proposed on the east side of the Harbor Freeway under the proposed project. Pedestrians walking on the west side of Flower Street between 23rd Street and Adams Boulevard would however, be required to cross the tracks twice under this alternative, which would cause pedestrian safety concerns. Pedestrian signals would be provided at each of these crossings in conjunction with the traffic signals.

Between Adams Boulevard and 29th Street, a railing would be provided along the sidewalk on the west side of Flower Street to prevent pedestrians from stepping of the curb onto the tracks. This would not negatively impact pedestrian traffic.

At all other locations along the alignment, this alternative would have the same impact on pedestrian travel patterns as Alternative 1a and 2c.

Alternative 2a (Part Aerial)

This alternative would have the same impacts on pedestrians as Alternative 1a and 2c except that the placement of columns to support the aerial structure could impede pedestrian flows to a minor degree along the block of Exposition Boulevard between Flower Street and Figueroa Street. Six columns would be located in the sidewalk and could reduce the sidewalk width adjacent to the columns to six feet from its current eight feet unless additional right of way were purchased to allow placement of the columns behind the existing sidewalks.

This alternative would not result in the elimination of the existing pedestrian undercrossing of the Harbor Freeway between Jefferson and Exposition Boulevards. The mid-block pedestrian crosswalk across Flower Street in this location would also be retained in this alternative.

This alternative would eliminate the need for pedestrians to cross the tracks at both the Flower/Exposition and Figueroa/Exposition intersections because the trains would be grade separated above the crosswalks. This would enhance pedestrian safety concerns at these two locations.

This alternative does not include the provision of an optional station at Figueroa Street. Without such a station, the volumes of pedestrians accessing the Exposition Park/Vermont Station would be increased. This would not cause a significant impact on a typical day, but would cause some delays on days when a special event were taking place at Exposition Park. The concentration of pedestrians at this one station would require enhanced pedestrian facilities at the Exposition Park/Vermont Station. These would include wider sidewalks crossing Exposition Boulevard to access the station and an expanded staging area on the sidewalk along Exposition Park to accommodate the queues of event attendees waiting to access the station after an event.

Alternative 2b (Part Subway)

Alternative 2b would have similar impacts to Alternative 2a in all areas except along the sidewalks on Exposition Boulevard where this alternative would not result in the placement of columns in the sidewalk. The pedestrian undercrossing of the Harbor Freeway and the mid-block crosswalk on Flower Street between Jefferson and Exposition Boulevards would be retained. The need for pedestrians to cross the tracks at the Flower/Exposition and Figueroa/Exposition intersections would be eliminated. The elimination of the optional Figueroa Station would require enhanced pedestrian handling facilities at the Exposition Park/Vermont Station.

Optional Vermont Station

The optional Vermont Station would provide a two-car station and this would have two parallel tail tracks on the west side of Vermont, on Exposition Boulevard to accommodate 2 three car trains each for storage in support of special events only.

Operation Overview

At present, the Blue Line service operates between downtown Los Angeles and the City of Long Beach at a six-minute peak headway. In addition to the proposed Exposition Park branch line, future plans call for the Blue Line to be extended through downtown Los Angeles to Pasadena. With the Pasadena Line in operation, headways on the Blue Line through downtown are projected to be just under four minutes during peak hours. Addition of the proposed branch line to the Exposition Park would require an additional

train service. Also, there is an existing rail road corridor in the median of Exposition Boulevard, which extends west as far as Santa Monica and is being considered as a potential transit corridor. The proposed branch line would provide the necessary regional connection to the Santa Monica corridor transit service.

Bus Service

The widening of the Harbor Freeway to accommodate a Transitway is currently under construction. The plan is to provide a HOV/bus facility in the median of the Harbor Freeway from Artesia Boulevard to Adams Boulevard. The proposed operating plan for the Harbor Freeway Transitway by Southern California Rapid Transit District (SCRTD) is a line-haul plan. Most existing bus routes in the southern portion of the Harbor Freeway corridor would be converted to feeder routes for the two new line-haul routes that would be operated on the Transitway.

HOV/Bus Transfer to Rail Service and Intercept Opportunities

There are several options available for HOV/buses at the northern terminus of the Transitway to reach downtown. These vehicles could continue on the Harbor Freeway and access downtown. Under the other option, these vehicles would exit at northbound HOV off-ramp at Adams Boulevard. The existing northbound off-ramp at Adams Boulevard is planned to be modified to accommodate an HOV lane. These vehicles would then turn left onto Adams Boulevard and will utilize a new HOV frontage road for buses and carpools that would begin at the northwest corner of Adams Boulevard and Flower Street and goes in a diagonal fashion to join Figueroa Street. Figueroa Street would provide convenient access to Los Angeles Central Business District. A bus lay-over area may be possible on the HOV frontage road between Adams Boulevard and Figueroa Street or at another located in close proximity. This bus lay-over area provides excellent opportunities for bus passengers to transfer to the Blue Line at the nearby 23rd Street Station, which is within a short walking distance. Also, there are plans to terminate some of the Transitway buses at this juncture and they would turn back onto the Transitway. The passengers of these buses would utilize Blue Line service to reach downtown and other destinations. There are opportunities for HOV auto (car pools) intercept through park-n-ride facilities (see Parking Impacts section for more discussion) near the Exposition Park/Vermont Station which can be reached from the Transitway via 37th Street exit.

Traffic Impacts due to These Transfer/Intercept Opportunities

The two primary advantages through interface of the proposed rail line with the transitway vehicles are reduction in downtown bus trips and reduction in auto trips. Some of the benefit of reduced bus operations could be achieved by turning back the Transitway buses at the northern terminus. The proposed rail line should also allow a slight reduction in the frequency of bus routes operating along Vermont Avenue, Figueroa Street, and Jefferson Boulevard, as some existing patrons would switch to the rail lines. Also, any increase in transit use should be accompanied by a reduction in auto trips. The Exposition

Park/Vermont Station could attract considerable park-n-ride patronage. These cars would therefore be removed from freeways and arterials between Exposition Park area and downtown, including Figueroa Street, Flower Street, Vermont Avenue, and the Harbor Freeway. Another possible impact would be the diversion of much of the special-event traffic from auto to transit.

MITIGATION MEASURES

ALTERNATIVE 1a and 2c (All At-Grade with Shared Bridge)

In order to fully mitigate the impacts of the proposed rail line on the intersections of Flower Street/ Exposition Boulevard and Figueroa Street/Exposition Boulevard, without right-of-way purchase, the rail line would have to be grade separated.

In summary, assuming that the base line roadway alignments discussed earlier (Figueroa/Flower one-way couplet and Exposition/37th one-way couplet) are implemented, the impacts of the at-grade alternative on the east side of Flower Street can be mitigated by the following measures:

1. An additional southbound lane at Flower Street and Adams Boulevard is required. This could be accomplished either by widening the overcrossing to provide additional lanes when the Harbor Freeway Transitway is extended, or eliminate the contra flow lane, perhaps if the Orthopaedic Hospital ever expands or remodels and can relocate its entrance from Flower Street.
2. Widen Flower Street at Jefferson Boulevard to provide four southbound through lanes.
3. Add an additional westbound through lane on Exposition Boulevard under the Harbor Freeway at Flower Street.
4. Restripe the southbound Harbor Freeway off-ramp to two through lanes and a shared through/left lane.
5. Restripe eastbound 37th Street at Flower Street to provide one right turn lane, one shared through/right lane, and three through lanes.
6. Add a southbound right turn lane on Flower Street at 37th Place.
7. Add a westbound right turn lane on 37th Place at Figueroa Street and signalize this intersection.
8. The eastbound left turning vehicles on Exposition Boulevard at Figueroa Street would be redirected to travel via 37th Street and right turn around the

block surrounded by 37th Street, Flower Street, 37th Place and Figueroa Street.


Figure 5.3-10 illustrates the lane configurations required to mitigate the impacts of at-grade train operations at the intersections of Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard, Flower Street/Figueroa Street, and Flower Street/37th Street. **Tables 5.3-10** and **5.3-11** summarize the mitigated LOS for AM and PM peak hours.

In order to mitigate the potential impacts of the proposed rail line on traffic operations, a number of modifications are recommended at intersections and roadways along the proposed alignments. The modifications include the following elements:

- Locations of turn restrictions, parking, and/or lane restrictions.
- Placement of permanent signs to direct traffic.
- Traffic signal timing or phasing modifications.
- Location and type of traffic control.

The traffic operations modifications to mitigate Alternative 1a and 2c are listed below:

- Along Flower Street:
 9. At 23rd Street, 28th Street, 30th Street, and Jefferson Boulevard, add left-turn signal display (for the shared through/left lane) to prohibit left turns from southbound Flower for the duration of a train crossing.
 10. The intersection at 28th Street should be signalized. The southbound Flower left turns onto 28th Street would be permitted from the east side curb lane on Flower which would also accommodate traffic accessing the HOV on-ramp south of 28th Street. This intersection should be signalized to control the HOV traffic and 28th Street traffic while a train passes by.
 11. Illuminate warning signs, similar to existing Blue Line warning signs on Flower Street north of Washington Boulevard, should be installed on all driveways to restrict traffic from the driveways while trains are crossing that section.
- Along Exposition Boulevard:
 12. At Armory Drive and driveways to California Museum of Science and Industry, the movements should be limited to right-in and right-out only.
 13. At Hoover Street/Watt Way, which is the main entrance to the USC Campus, traffic signal timing should be modified to accommodate increased pedestrian access to the proposed Exposition Park/Vermont Station. Southbound left turns from Watt Way should be precluded by the signal when LRT trains are



SOURCE: Meyer, Mohaddes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.3-10

RECOMMENDED
LANE CONFIGURATIONS

TABLE 5.3-10: ALTERNATIVE 1A AND 2C (ALL AT-GRADE WITH SHARED BRIDGE) AM LEVELS OF SERVICE WITH MITIGATION

Intersection	Without Project		With Project		Impact	W/Mitigation	
	Delay/a/	LOS	Delay/a/	LOS		Delay	LOS
Figueroa at Washington	14.5	B	14.5	B	N.C.		
Flower at Washington	26.8	D	26.8	D	N.C.		
Figueroa at 23rd	9.7	B	9.7	B	N.C.		
Flower at 23rd	10.1	B	10.1	B	N.C.		
Figueroa at Adams	17.9	C	17.9	C	N.C.		
Flower at Adams	10.4	B	15.1	C	+	12.2/b/	B/b/
Flower at 28th	N/A	N/A	27.7	D	N/A		
Figueroa at Jefferson	27.9	D	27.9	D	N.C.		
Flower at Jefferson	8.5	B	9.5	B	+	8.82/b/	B/b/
Flower at Exposition	18.0	C	39.6	D	*	23.8/c/	C/c/
Flower at 37th	12.8	B	12.8	B	N.C.	12.5/d/	B/d/
Figueroa at Exposition	100+ V/C=1.42	F	100+ V/C=1.64	F	*	100+ V/C=1.28 /e/	F/e/
Hoover at Exposition	19.9	C	19.9	C	N.C.		
Vermont at Exposition	58.9	E	58.9	E	N.C.		

Key: + = Delay increases, but not a significant impact

* = Significant impact

N.C. = No change

/a/ Seconds/Vehicle

/b/ With mitigation measure required to mitigate PM peak hour impact: additional southbound lane through the intersection.

/c/ With mitigation measure: additional westbound (Exposition) lane through lane; restripe the southbound 110 off-ramp to accommodate two through lanes and a shared through/left-turn lane

/d/ With mitigation measure: restripe the eastbound 37th St. to accommodate three through lanes, one shared through/right-turn lane, and one right-turn lane

/e/ With mitigation measure: remove the eastbound Exposition left-turn lanes; the left-turn vehicular traffic is accommodated via 37th St./Flower St./37th Pl./Figueroa St. circulation.

Source: Meyer Mohaddes Associates.

**TABLE 5.3-11: ALTERNATIVE 1A AND 2C (ALL AT-GRADE WITH SHARED BRIDGE)
PM LEVELS OF SERVICE WITH MITIGATION**

Intersection	Without Project		With Project		Impact	W/Mitigation	
	Delay/a/	LOS	Delay/a/	LOS		Delay	LOS
Figueroa at Washington	18.3	C	18.3	C	N.C.		
Flower at Washington	100+ V/C=1.22	F	100+ V/C=1.22	F	N.C.		
Figueroa at 23rd	9.8	B	9.8	B	N.C.		
Flower at 23rd	9.2	B	10.0	B	+		
Figueroa at Adams	27.2	D	27.2	D	N.C.		
Flower at Adams	15.7	C	100+ V/C=1.21	F	*	39.0/b/	D/b/
Flower at 28th	N/A	N/A	54.0	E	N/A		
Figueroa at Jefferson	80.6	F	79.9	F	N.C.		
Flower at Jefferson	22.7	C	100+ V/C=1.23	F	*	37.7/b/	D/b/
Flower at Exposition	44.7	E	81.5	F	*	35.2/c/	D/c/
Flower at 37th	8.3	B	8.3	B	N.C.	9.3/d/	B/d/
Figueroa at Exposition	16.6	C	37.8	D	+	12.7/e/	B/e/
Hoover at Exposition	37.4	D	37.4	D	N.C.		
Vermont at Exposition	15.7	C	15.7	C	N.C.		

Key to Symbols:

+ Delay increases, but not a significant impact

* Significant impact

N.C. No Change

/a/ Seconds/Vehicle

/b/ With mitigation measure required to mitigate PM peak hour impact: additional southbound lane through the intersection.

/c/ With mitigation measure: additional westbound (Exposition) lane through lane; restripe the southbound 110 off-ramp to accommodate two through lanes and a shared through/left-turn lane

/d/ With mitigation measure: restripe the eastbound 37th St. to accommodate three through lanes, one shared through/right-turn lane, and one right-turn lane

/e/ With mitigation measure: remove the eastbound Exposition left-turn lanes; the left-turn vehicular traffic is accommodated via 37th St./Flower St./37th Pl./Figueroa St. circulation.

Source: Meyer Mohaddes Associates.

traveling west of the Exposition Park/Vermont Station to the storage area.

14. In conjunction with the potential Phase 2 expansion of the Exposition Park/Vermont Station area, pedestrian access to the Station will be relocated from Watt Way. Also according to the USC master plan, the main entrance to the USC Campus may be relocated from Watt Way, potentially to align with Menlo Avenue. At that time, a traffic signal should be installed at Menlo Avenue to control pedestrian access and to prohibit vehicular movements that are in conflict with train movements.

ALTERNATIVE 1b and 2c (All At-Grade with Separate Bridge)

The mitigations required for this alignment are similar to the mitigations required for Alternative 1a and 2c except at Adams Boulevard, 27th Street, 28th Street, the HOV on-ramp, and 30th Street along Flower Street.

- At Adams Boulevard, add right-turn signalization and prohibit right-turns while trains are crossing that section. An additional (fourth) southbound lane is also needed.
- South of 23rd Street, mid-block signalization should be added both north and south of the LRT tracks crossover from east side to west side of Flower Street. The north side signal would control the southbound Flower traffic and the south side signal would control the northbound contra flow lane traffic.
- 27th Street should be closed at Flower Street and converted to a cul-de-sac.
- For the HOV on-ramp, a traffic signal is recommended at Flower Street and 28th Street. The traffic signal would aid in blocking traffic on 28th Street and southbound Flower through traffic when trains cross that section. An all red phase should be added to adequately control the southbound traffic relative to the trains cross over south of this intersection. Also the cycle length should be increased to 120 seconds as found to be optimum for this intersection.
- Southbound Flower Street left turns should be prohibited at 30th Street to prevent left turn queues from extending onto the rail tracks.

ALTERNATIVE 2a (Part Aerial)

- Mitigation measures 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of alternative 1a and 2c (All At-Grade With Shared Bridge).
- Widen the eastbound Exposition cross section to allow 12 feet lanes for the curb lanes (2 feet on each side in addition to proposed 10 feet curb lanes).

ALTERNATIVE 2b (Part Subway)

- Mitigation measures 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of alternative 1a and 2c (All At-Grade With Shared Bridge).

Pedestrian Mitigation Measures (All Alternatives)

In order to accommodate peak pedestrian flows from events at the Coliseum that the crosswalks would need to be 35 feet wide at the mid-block location and 20 feet wide at the two stations in on Exposition Boulevard in order to accommodate the peak pedestrian flows.

Between Adams Boulevard and 29th Street, a railing would be provided along the sidewalk on the west side of Flower Street to prevent pedestrians from stepping of the curb onto the tracks.

Along Washington Boulevard a railing would be provided along the entire length of the line, except at designated pedestrian crossings, to discourage mid-block crossings and enhance pedestrian safety.

LACTC will work with other public agencies and the institutions within the park to improve the pedestrian connections between the Harbor Freeway Transitway Station and the LRT station along Exposition Boulevard and to develop a potential bus/rail interface with the Harbor Freeway Transitway at the 23rd Street Station.

Parking Mitigation Measures (All Alternatives)

LACTC will identify potential parking for rail users at the Exposition Park/Vermont and Jefferson Stations. Once these spaces are defined they should be identified through maps and directional signs at the stations. LACTC will work with St. John's Church and the owner of the commercial lot on the northwest corner of Flower/Exposition Boulevard to develop adequate mitigation for the loss of parking spaces.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The loss of about eight parking spaces from the commercial property just south of the Hilton on the east side of Flower Street.

The additional right-of-way required along the west side of Flower Street adjacent to St. John's Church, for all alternatives, would require redesign of the lot and would reduce the number of cars which could be tandem parked in the middle of the lot.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative effects of the proposed project together with other planned and/or approved projects in the site area has been included in the previous analysis.

5.4 AIR QUALITY

SETTING

The proposed project is located within Source Receptor Area No.1 as designated by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The air quality in this Source Receptor Area is represented by measurements taken at the North Main Street monitoring station located approximately 3.6 miles to the northeast. Air quality measurements taken at this location in 1990 (the last full year with a complete data set) indicate:

- Carbon Monoxide - The maximum 1-hour concentration was 13 ppm. The maximum 8-hour concentration was 9.9 ppm. The State 1-hour standard was not exceeded. The State 8-hour standard was exceeded on one day.
- Ozone - The maximum 1-hour concentration was 0.20 ppm. The State standard of 0.09 ppm was exceeded for 70 days during 1990.
- Nitrogen Dioxide - The maximum 1-hour concentration was 0.28 ppm. The State standard of 0.25 ppm was exceeded for 3 days during 1990.
- Sulfur Dioxide - The maximum 24-hour concentration was 0.013 ppm. The State standard was not exceeded in 1990.
- Suspended Particulates PM10 - The maximum 24-hour concentration was 152 micrograms per cubic meter. 51.7 percent of the samples taken at this location exceeded the State standard of 50 micrograms per cubic meter.
- Particulates - The maximum 24-hour concentration was 211 micrograms per cubic meter.
- Lead - The maximum monthly concentration was 0.09 micrograms per cubic meter. The State standard of 1.5 micrograms per cubic meter was not exceeded in 1990.
- Sulfate - The maximum 24-hour concentration was 25.3 micrograms per cubic meter. 1.7 percent of the samples taken at this location exceeded the State standard of 25 micrograms per cubic meter.

Table 5.4-1 illustrates existing carbon monoxide levels for sensitive land uses adjacent to the proposed light rail route. The existing carbon monoxide levels were estimated using the CALINE4 carbon monoxide dispersion model developed by the California Department of Transportation in conjunction with existing traffic volumes and existing intersection operation characteristics. It can be seen that of the 10 locations studied, four locations exceed the 1-hour State standard of 20 ppm. All 10 locations exceed the 8-hour State standard of 9 ppm.

TABLE 5.4-1: EXISTING ONE-HOUR AND EIGHT-HOUR CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS	
Receptor Location and Description	1-Hour (8-Hour) Parts Per Million
LA Trade Tech Campus North East Corner: Flower at 23rd	15.8 (10.8*)
Flower St. Entrance to Orthopaedic Hospital South of Flower and 23rd Sts.	17.1 (11.6*)
Apartment Building South West Corner of Flower St and 23rd St.	16.9 (11.5*)
St. John's Church Flower St. at Adams	26.9* (18.3*)
Apartment Building: Flower at 30th St.	22.4* (15.2*)
USC Hilton Exterior Walkway on East Side.	20.1* (13.7*)
USC Campus - Mudd Hall	16.9 (11.5*)
Exposition Park Rose Garden	18.7 (12.7*)
USC Parkside Apartments North East Corner of Vermont at Exposition Blvd.	22.4* (15.2*)
Islamic Center on North West Corner of Vermont at Exposition	19.4 (13.2*)
Note: * = Exceeds State Ambient Air Quality Standard a. 1-hour CO concentrations include an assumed ambient of 13.8 ppm based on the average of 2nd highest 8-hour measurements from the SCAQMD North Main Street Monitoring Station between 1986 and 1990. 8-hour concentrations include an assumed ambient of 9.4 ppm.	
Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates	

IMPACTS

It is anticipated that the proposed rail transit project would have regional air quality benefits because automobile trips to the Exposition Park area --particularly from downtown Los Angeles would be reduced. The preliminary 30-Year Plan estimate of 15,000 daily riders using the Blue Line extension, suggests that 7,500 to 8,500 daily vehicle trips may be eliminated in the region. Based on regional trip length averages, this level of reduction for the proposed Blue Line extension would convert into a reduction of 61,500-69,700 vehicle miles traveled. Year 2010 mobile emissions would be reduced by approximately 0.06 tons per day of Total Organic Gas (TOG); 0.05 tons per day of Reactive Organic Gas (ROG); 0.6 tons per day of Carbon Monoxide (CO); 0.1 tons per day of Nitrogen Oxides (NOX); and 0.02 tons per day of particulate matter (PM).

The proposed rail transit project would be consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan prepared by the South Coast Air Quality Management District, as well as with the Regional Mobility Plan prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Specifically, the proposed project would implement Control Measure 2g (Tier I Transit Improvements)¹. The SCAG Air Quality Management Plan Conformity Procedures explicitly exempt rail transit projects. The procedures indicate that it is the intent of the Regional Mobility Plan (RMP) to give priority to all transit and ridesharing projects over highway capacity expansion projects. SCAG further indicates that transit and ridesharing facilities are exempt from conformity review.²

Northern Segment

Alternative 1a and 2c

While the proposed project would have regional benefits, it is anticipated that there may be localized air quality impacts at intersections where light rail operations may cause additional delays at intersections --where there are at grade crossings-- as well as adjacent to station areas where vehicles may be attracted to drop off or pickup passengers. Table 5.4-2 and Table 5.4-3 illustrate the affect of at grade light rail operations on sensitive land uses adjacent to intersections in the Exposition Park area in the Year 2010. As can be seen, the changes attributable to light rail operations are generally not discernible, with the exception of increased carbon monoxide concentrations in the vicinity of St. John's Church where the existing 1-hour concentration is 26.9 ppm and the 8-hour is 18.3 ppm. Future levels with the project are estimated to be 28.4 ppm and 19.3 ppm for the 1-hour and 8-hour concentrations, respectively. For both the 1-hour and the 8-hour period, the changes in carbon monoxide concentration from daily weekday traffic would exceed the incremental change thresholds of 1.0 ppm for 1-hour and 0.45 ppm for 8-hour periods established by the SCAQMD in the New Source Review Rule (No. 1303). As a result, a significant adverse impact is anticipated.

Alternative 1b - Separate Bridge

The new light rail bridge alternative would continue to require that the light rail vehicle cross the Flower and Adams intersection at grade. As a result, the predicted impact at St. John's Church would remain.

¹South Coast Air Quality Management District and Southern California Association of Governments, Air Quality Management Plan, South Coast Air Basin, March 1989, page 6-14.

²Southern California Association of Governments, Guidance for Implementation of 1989 AQMP Conformity Procedures, March 1990.

TABLE 5.4-2: YEAR 2010 ONE-HOUR CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE 1a AND 2c (Parts Per Million)			
Receptor Location and Description	Future Without Project	Future With Project	Change Future Without Project to Future With Project
LA Trade Tech Campus North East Corner: Flower at 23rd	15.4	15.3	-0.1
Flower St. Entrance to Orthopaedic Hospital South of Flower and 23rd Sts.	16.4	16.6	+0.2
Apartment Building South West Corner of Flower St and 23rd St.	16.6	16.8	+0.2
St. John's Church Flower St. at Adams	26.7*	28.4*	+1.7
Apartment Building: Flower at 30th St.	23.1*	23.1*	0.0
USC Hilton Exterior Walkway on East Side.	18.0	18.6	+0.6
USC Campus - Mudd Hall	16.9	16.9	0.0
Exposition Park Rose Garden	18.7	18.7	0.0
USC Parkside Apartments North East Corner of Vermont at Exposition Blvd.	21.7*	21.7*	0.0
Islamic Center on North West Corner of Vermont at Exposition	19.0	19.0	0.0
Note: * = Exceeds State Ambient Air Quality Standard of 20 ppm. a. 1-hour CO concentrations include an assumed ambient of 13.8 ppm based on the average of 2nd highest 8-hour measurements from the SCAQMD North Main Street Monitoring Station between 1986 and 1990. Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates			

**TABLE 5.4-3: YEAR 2010 EIGHT-HOUR CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS FOR
ALTERNATIVE 1a AND 2c (Parts Per Million)/a/**

Receptor Location and Description	Future Without Project	Future With Project	Change Future Without Project to Future With Project
LA Trade Tech Campus North East Corner: Flower at 23rd	10.5	10.4	-0.1
Flower St. Entrance to Orthopaedic Hospital South of Flower and 23rd Sts.	11.2	11.3	+0.1
Apartment Building South West Corner of Flower St and 23rd St.	11.3	11.4	+0.1
St. John's Church Flower St. at Adams	18.2	19.3	+1.1
Apartment Building: Flower at 30th St.	15.7	15.7	0.0
USC Hilton Exterior Walkway on East Side.	12.3	12.7	+0.4
USC Campus - Mudd Hall	11.5	11.5	0.0
Exposition Park Rose Garden	12.7	12.7	0.0
USC Parkside Apartments North East Corner of Vermont at Exposition Blvd.	14.8	14.8	0.0
Islamic Center on North West Corner of Vermont at Exposition	12.9	12.9	0.0
Note: a. 8-hour CO concentrations include an assumed ambient of 9.4 ppm based on the average of 2nd highest 8-hour measurements from the SCAQMD North Main Street Monitoring Station between 1986 and 1990. This ambient conditions currently exceeds the State 8-hour ambient air quality standard. Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates			

Western Segment

Alternative 2a - Part Aerial

The aerial alignment would beneficially affect the Flower and Exposition intersection. As a result, the 0.6 1-hour increase in carbon monoxide and the 0.4 8-hour increase for the USC Hilton receptor along this alignment would be eliminated. There would be no adverse air quality impacts along this segment of the route under this alternative.

Alternative 2b - Part Subway

The subway alignment would beneficially affect the Flower and Exposition intersection. As a result, the 0.6 1-hour increase in carbon monoxide and the 0.4 8-hour increase for the USC Hilton receptor along this alignment would be eliminated. There would be no adverse air quality impacts along this segment of the route under this alternative.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Short-term dust emissions would be controlled in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403; construction equipment would be maintained to reduce emissions; grading operations would be halted during first and second stage smog alerts.

At-grade light rail operations at the Adams and Flower intersection for both alternatives 1a and 1b shall be re-evaluated to ensure that delays and disruptions at this intersection are minimized. To achieve this, the degree of traffic signal pre-emption afforded to the light rail vehicle may need to be significantly reduced or eliminated. If reductions in vehicle delays cannot be achieved in this manner, consideration shall be given to the feasibility of grade separating light rail operations at this location. It should be noted from an aesthetic impact perspective, that an elevated structure for light rail may adversely conflict with the site setting of St. John's Church which is on the National Register of Historic Places.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Air quality impacts at the St. John's Church may be unavoidable.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

None anticipated.

5.5 NOISE

SETTING

The predominant source of noise in the project vicinity is vehicular traffic --including buses and trucks. Noise levels for major arterials such as Figueroa Street and Flower range from 65-70 decibels. These traffic sounds are further accentuated by traffic using the Harbor Freeway. Freeway traffic is clearly discernible in the project vicinity particularly in the segment of Flower Street from just north of Adams Boulevard to Exposition Boulevard. At locations where there is a direct line of sight to the freeway, ambient noise levels may reach 72-73 decibels. Based on existing surface street and freeway daily traffic volumes, existing Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNEL) were computed using the Federal Highway Administration's Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model at various sensitive locations along the route (see Table 5.5-1). The CNEL is a 24-hour noise measure that places special emphasis on noise levels during the evening (7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and nighttime periods (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.).

TABLE 5.5-1: EXISTING NOISE LEVELS (CNEL estimate)

No.	Location and Land Use Description	CNEL in decibels(a)
1	Los Angeles Trade Tech Classrooms north of 23rd Street	62
2	Orthopaedic Hospital	67
3	Apartments south of Flower Street and 23rd Street	69
4	St. John's Church	67
5	Apartments north of 30th Street at Flower St.	70
6	USC Hilton	68
7	Exposition Park Armory Site	65
8	Exposition Park Rose Garden	69
9	USC Mudd Hall	70
10	County Museum of Natural History	65
11	USC Parkside Apartments	67
12	Islamic Center	68
(a) Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNEL) based on existing daily surface street and freeway traffic volumes using the Federal Highway Administration Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model. Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates.		

IMPACTS

Noise

The assessment focuses on the noise impacts resulting from light rail operations. For a discussion of construction-related impacts see Section 5.7. The criteria used to assess the potential significance of noise impacts is the level of change in the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). The CNEL is a weighted 24-hour noise measure that places a 5 decibel penalty on noise during the 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. period and a 10 decibel penalty on noise during the 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. period when additional sound has been demonstrated to more intrusive and annoying.

The basic premise of the noise evaluation criteria used by the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission is that the allowable incremental change in additional noise levels decreases as the ambient noise level increases. Thus, when the ambient noise level is 55 decibels a 5 decibel change or more is considered a significant impact. However, when the ambient noise level is 65 decibels an incremental change of not more than one decibel would be considered significant. This relationship is best illustrated in **Figure 5.5-1** which shows the Draft Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) noise guidelines.

Using **Figure 5.5-1** as a guide, **Tables 5.5-2** through **5.5-6** illustrates the estimated change in ambient noise levels at sensitive land use locations along the proposed Blue Line Extension route as a result of rail transit operations for each of the alternatives. According to vehicle specifications developed by the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, the allowable noise from a light rail vehicle is specified to be 77 decibels at distance of 50 feet at a speed of 50 miles per hour. Changes in the overall CNEL at land uses along the route result from a combination factors associated with rail transit operations, including the fact that automobile traffic lanes have been shifted to one side of the right-of-way to accommodate light rail tracks. Specific details regarding the alternatives are as follows:

Northern Segment


Alternative 1a - Shared Bridge

The ambient CNEL level along the route ranges from 62 to 70 decibels. The increase in the CNEL resulting from this option would not exceed 2 decibels. Based on the evaluation criteria discussed above, the classroom building at Trade Tech would be adversely affected. The CNEL increase at this location would be from 62 to 64 decibels.

Alternative 1b - Separate Bridge

The ambient CNEL level along the route ranges from 62 to 70 decibels. The increase in the CNEL resulting from this option would not exceed 2 decibels. Based on the evaluation criteria discussed above, the classroom building at Trade Tech

Draft UMTA Noise Impact Criteria Based on Project vs Ambient CNEL



SOURCE: Urban Mass Transportation Administration



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.5-1
PROPOSED UMTA
NOISE IMPACT CRITERIA

would be adversely affected. The CNEL increase at Trade Tech would be the same as Alternative 1a (2 decibels). The CNEL increase at St. John's Church would be from 67 to 68 decibels (a 1 decibel change) which is not considered significant.

There would be a noise increase at the church under this option because the Shared Bridge Alternative would shift the light rail alignment further to the west as the route crosses Adams Boulevard. However, it should be noted that this change would occur during the weekdays when the trains are running about every 6 minutes. During the weekend the trains would run less frequently (about every 20 minutes). The estimated light rail CNEL on Sundays would be less than 50 decibels and as a result there would be no measurable change in the CNEL on Sundays.

TABLE 5.5-2: ALTERNATIVE 1A-SHARED BRIDGE NOISE IMPACTS

No.	Receptor Description	Existing CNEL	Light Rail CNEL	Combined CNEL	Change in CNEL	Impact Evaluation
1	LA Trade Tech Classrooms north of 23rd St.	62	59	64	2	Significant
2	Orthopaedic Hospital	67	62	68	1	Minimal
3	Apartments south of 23rd St.	69	60	70	1	Minimal
4	St. John's Church	67	51	67	0	Minimal
5	Apartments north of 30th St.	70	59	70	0	Minimal
	Maximum	70	62	70	2	NA
	Minimum	62	51	64	0	NA
	Average	67	58	68	1	NA

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates.

TABLE 5.5-3: ALTERNATIVE 1B - SEPARATE BRIDGE NOISE IMPACTS

No.	Receptor Description	Existing CNEL	Light Rail CNEL	Combined CNEL	Change In CNEL	Impact Evaluation
1	LA Trade Tech Classrooms north of 23rd St.	62	59	64	2	Significant
2	Orthopaedic Hospital	67	58	68	1	Minimal
3	Apartments south of 23rd St.	69	61	70	1	Minimal
4	St. John's Church	67	58	68	1	Minimal
5	Apartments north of 30th St.	70	61	71	1	Minimal
	Maximum CNEL	70	68	71	4	
	Minimum CNEL	62	58	64	1	
	Average CNEL	67	61	68	1	

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associate.

TABLE 5.5-4: ALTERNATIVE 2A - PART AERIAL NOISE IMPACTS

No.	Receptor Description	Existing CNEL	Light Rail CNEL	Combined CNEL	Change In CNEL	Impact Evaluation
6	USC Hilton	68	58	68	0	Minimal
7	Exposition Park Armory Site	65	56	66	1	Minimal
8	Exposition Park Rose Garden	69	60	70	1	Minimal
9	USC Mudd Hall	70	60	70	0	Minimal
10	County Museum of Natural History	65	51	65	0	Minimal
11	USC Parkside Apartments	67	50	67	0	Minimal
12	Islamic Center	68	42	68	0	Minimal
	Maximum CNEL	70	60	70	1	
	Minimum CNEL	65	42	65	0	
	Average CNEL	67	54	68	0	

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates.

TABLE 5.5-5: ALTERNATIVE 2B - PART SUBWAY NOISE IMPACTS

No.	Receptor Description	Existing CNEL	Light Rail CNEL	Combined CNEL	Change in CNEL	Impact Evaluation
6	USC Hilton	68	0	68	0	Minimal
7	Exposition Park Armory Site	65	0	65	0	Minimal
8	Exposition Park Rose Garden	69	53	69	0	Minimal
9	USC Mudd Hall	70	53	70	0	Minimal
10	County Museum of Natural History	65	51	65	0	Minimal
11	USC Parkside Apartments	67	50	67	0	Minimal
12	Islamic Center	68	42	68	0	Minimal
	Maximum CNEL	70	53	70	0	
	Minimum CNEL	65	0	65	0	
	Average CNEL	67	36	67	0	

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates.

TABLE 5.5-6: ALTERNATIVE 2C - ALL AT-GRADE NOISE IMPACTS

No.	Receptor Description	Existing CNEL	Light Rail CNEL	Combined CNEL	Change in CNEL	Impact Evaluation
6	USC Hilton	68	53	68	0	Minimal
7	Exposition Park Armory Site	65	54	65	0	Minimal
8	Exposition Park Rose Garden	69	58	69	0	Minimal
9	USC Mudd Hall	70	59	70	0	Minimal
10	County Museum of Natural History	65	51	65	0	Minimal
11	USC Parkside Apartments	67	50	67	0	Minimal
12	Islamic Center	68	42	68	0	Minimal
	Maximum CNEL	70	59	70	0	
	Minimum CNEL	65	42	65	0	
	Average CNEL	67	52	68	0	

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates.

Western Segment

Alternative 2a - Part Aerial

The ambient CNEL level along the route ranges from 65 to 70 decibels. The maximum light rail-related CNEL would be approximately 60 decibels. The increase in the CNEL resulting from this option would not exceed 1 decibels. Based on the evaluation criteria discussed above, no sensitive adjacent land uses would be affected, as existing noise levels would essentially mask over the sound of the light rail operations.

Alternative 2b - Part Subway

This option would also not result in significant impacts. The maximum light rail-related CNEL would be approximately 53 decibels. This noise level combined ambient noise levels would not measurably increase noise levels at adjacent sensitive receptor.

Alternative 2c - All At-Grade

This option would also not result in significant impacts. The maximum light rail-related CNEL would be approximately 59 decibels. This noise level combined ambient noise levels would not measurably increase noise levels at adjacent sensitive receptor.

Vibration

The assessment of ground-borne vibration impacts is based on the basic impact relationships identified for the San Fernando Valley Rail Project. The San Fernando Valley Assessment was based on measurements at existing transit properties and tests of several different transit vehicles at the Transportation Test Center in Pueblo, Colorado.¹ Typical ranges of ground-borne vibration from a light rail vehicle traveling at a speed of 35 mph are shown in Table 5.5-7. The characterization of the potential significance of ground-borne vibration impacts is based on the following criteria:

- Buildings where low ambient vibration is an important element in their intended purpose. This category would include buildings such as research facilities and or hospitals with highly specialized vibration-sensitive equipment. 65 dB.
- Residences and buildings where people normally sleep. 72 dB.
- Institutional land uses with primarily daytime use. 75 dB.

¹Harris Miller & Hansen, Inc., Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, San Fernando Valley Rail Project, October 21, 1989

- Churches, Auditoriums and Theaters. 72 dB.

TABLE 5.5-7: LIGHT RAIL GROUND-BORNE VIBRATION AS A FUNCTION OF SPEED AND DISTANCE		
Distance from Track Centerline (feet)	Reference Vibration Level at 50 mph (Velocity level, dB re 1 micro In./sec.)	Adjusted Vibration Level at 35 mph (Velocity level, dB re 1 micro In./sec.)
10	77 - 82	74 - 79
20	73 - 78	70 - 75
30	71 - 76	68 - 73
40	69 - 74	66 - 71
50	68 - 73	65 - 70
60	66 - 71	63 - 68
80	64 - 69	61 - 66
100	62 - 67	59 - 64
150	58 - 63	55 - 60
200	55 - 60	52 - 57
400	51 - 56	48 - 53
Note: Adjustment based on $20\log(35\text{mph}/50\text{mph})$ as discussed by Harris Miller Miller & Hansen, 1989. Source: Harris Miller Miller & Hansen, Inc., Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, San Fernando Valley Rail Project, October 21, 1989.		

Based on the land use and building criteria cited above, the assessment of potential ground-borne vibration impacts is based on the following characterizations:

- **Impact Unlikely.** The upper level of the light rail related vibration range does not exceed the criterion.
- **Impact Possible.** The upper level of the light rail related vibration range exceeds the impact criterion but the lower level below the criterion. More detailed projections of the vibration levels should be performed during the final design to ensure that the impact criterion will not be exceeded.
- **Impact Probable.** The lower limit of the light rail related vibration range exceeds the impact criterion. Although more detailed projections should be performed during the final design, adverse impact from ground-borne vibration is likely unless

vibration mitigation is incorporated into the final track work design.

Alternative 1a and 2c

Table 5.5-8 illustrates the findings for the all at-grade alternative (1a and 2c). Here it can be seen that the potential for vibration impacts is limited. The only possible location for vibration impacts may be at the Orthopaedic Hospital (see **Figure 5.5-2**). Typically a hospital would have a criterion level of 72 decibels and as a result impacts from the proposed light rail would be unlikely. However, it is possible that sensitive equipment may be used and until further detailed study of hospital operations are conducted, it is possible that impacts may occur.

It should be noted that preliminary discussions with hospital personnel during the scoping phase of this project did not indicate that there was sensitive equipment in use. However, it should be noted that the hospital raised concerns in the past pertaining to vibration with respect to various CALTRANS proposals for the Harbor Freeway Transitway in the vicinity of the hospital.

Alternative 1b

Alternative 1b would require construction of a new light rail bridge across the Harbor Freeway. This alignment would move the light rail track centerline closer to the apartment building (Receptor Location No. 3) and further away from Orthopaedic Hospital (Receptor Location No. 2). The alignment would also be brought closer to St. John's Church (Receptor No. 4) and the apartment building near Flower St and 30th St (Receptor No. 5). **Table 5.5-9** illustrates that the change in track alignment would not result in adverse impacts on adjacent properties although the predicted vibration velocity would increase slightly. The predicted vibration level at Orthopaedic Hospital would decrease from 66-71 decibels to 62 to 67 decibels, however, the issue of effects on sensitive equipment/activities would remain.

Alternative 2a

The aerial portion of Alternative 2a would be located adjacent to Receptor Nos. 6 and 7 (see **Table 5.5-10**). The elevated structure in general would produce ground-borne vibration approximately 10 decibels less than an at-grade track alignment. When compared to the applicable criterion, impacts from this alternative would be unlikely.


TABLE 5.5-8: PREDICTED LIGHT RAIL VIBRATION RANGES FOR ALTERNATIVES 1A AND 2C

No.	Location and Land Use Description	Criterion	Estimated Distance from Track Centerline (feet)	Predicted Ground-Borne Vibration (Velocity level, dB re 1 micro in./sec.	Impact Assessment
1	Los Angeles Trade Tech Classrooms north of 23rd Street	75	90	60-65	Impact Unlikely
2	Orthopaedic Hospital	65-72	45	66-71	Impact Possible if sensitive equipment in use, otherwise impact is unlikely.
3	Apartments south of Flower Street and 23rd Street	72	65	63-68	Impact Unlikely
4	St. John's Church	72	110	59-65	Impact Unlikely
5	Apartments north of 30th Street at Flower St.	72	75	62-67	Impact Unlikely
6	USC Hilton	72	170	55-60	Impact Unlikely
7	Exposition Park Armory Site	75	240	51-56	Impact Unlikely
8	Exposition Park Rose Garden	Not Applicable	100	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
9	USC Mudd Hall	75	75	62-67	Impact Unlikely
10	County Museum of Natural History	75	240	51-56	Impact Unlikely
11	USC Parkside Apartments	72	110	59-65	Impact Unlikely
12	Islamic Center	72	750/a/	44-49	Impact Unlikely

Note:

There would be no active light rail tracks directly in front of the center on the west side of Vermont Avenue.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates.



Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.5-2
PROXIMITY OF ORTHOPAEDIC HOSPITAL AND
APARTMENT BUILDING TO THE PROPOSED RAIL LINE

TABLE 5.5-9: PREDICTED LIGHT RAIL VIBRATION RANGES FOR ALTERNATIVE 1B

No.	Location and Land Use Description	Criterion	Estimated Distance from Track Centerline (feet)	Predicted Ground-Borne Vibration (Velocity level, dB re 1 micro in./sec.	Impact Assessment
2	Orthopaedic Hospital	65-72	70	62-67	Impact Unlikely under normal circumstances.
3	Apartments south of Flower Street and 23rd Street	72	50	65-70	Impact Unlikely
4	St. John's Church	72	80	61-66	Impact Unlikely
5	Apartments north of 30th Street at Flower St.	72	50	65-70	Impact Unlikely
Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates.					

TABLE 5.5-10: PREDICTED LIGHT RAIL VIBRATION RANGES FOR ALTERNATIVE 2A

No.	Location and Land Use Description	Criterion	Estimated Distance from Track Centerline (feet)	Predicted Ground-Borne Vibration (Velocity level, dB re 1 micro in./sec.	Impact Assessment
6	USC Hilton	72	170	45-50	Impact Unlikely
7	Exposition Park Armory Site	75	240	41-46	Impact Unlikely
Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates.					

Alternative 2b

The subway portion of Alternation 2b would be located adjacent to Receptor Nos. 6 and 7. It is not anticipated that vibration levels would be significantly different from that of an at-grade track alignment.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation of construction noise would be required of contractors to comply with local noise ordinances. A set of guidelines for the planning and operation of construction machinery will be provided by the contractor. To minimize or avoid operational noise impacts to Trade Tech classrooms north of 23rd and Flower (Alternatives 1a and 1b), the following measures would be implemented:

- Reduce the speed of light rail operations to 30 mph or less within 200 feet of the affected receptor locations such as Trade Tech classrooms.
- Should operational changes not be possible, then architectural retrofit measures should be considered to ensure that interior classroom noise levels are acceptable. According to City of Los Angeles EIR Manual Guidelines, an exterior CNEL less than 65 decibels would be acceptable for a school use.
- Orthopaedic Hospital operations shall be reviewed in detail to determine whether there is any vibration-sensitive equipment in use, or hospital activities that would be unusually sensitive to vibration.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

None anticipated.

5.6 GEOLOGY AND HYDROLOGY

SETTING

The proposed light rail route lies within the Los Angeles Basin. The basin is bounded on the north by the Santa Monica Mountains and Puente Hills, on the east by the Santa Ana Mountains and San Joaquin Hills, and on the west and south by the Palos Verdes Hills and the Pacific Ocean. The basin is made up of a great thickness of sediments that was deposited on an ancient sea floor. The rail route is underlain by Pleistocene era alluvium and sedimentary rocks.

The light rail route is characterized by generally flat terrain with elevations ranging from approximately 170 to 260 feet above sea level. There are no major hills or land forms along or adjacent to the proposed rail route.

The predominant soil type along the proposed light rail route is the Hanford Association. Soil properties that present a constraint to development include high shrink-swell potential, high corrosivity, high erosion potential and load limitations. The Hanford Association has high sand concentrations and good drainage and permeability. These soils have a low shrink-swell potential, low corrosivity, slight erosion potential, and moderate pressure load limitations. In general, this soil association is highly suitable for urban development.

Seismicity

The entire Los Angeles basin is seismically active. The closest known potentially active faults to the proposed alignment are the Santa Monica-Hollywood fault which lies approximately 5 miles to the north and the Newport-Inglewood fault which is located approximately 5 miles to the west of the route.

The Earthquake Planning Scenario for the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, indicates groundshaking estimates for a maximum credible earthquake to range between 7 to 9 on the Modified Mercalli scale.

In areas estimated to have groundshaking of 8 magnitude, the damage is estimated to be slight in structures (brick) built especially to withstand earthquakes. Considerable damage is expected in ordinary substantial buildings with partial collapse, racked, tumbled down, wooden houses in some case, and falling of walls, chimneys, columns, monuments, factory stacks, and towers. Those areas expected to experience groundshaking of intensity 9 would result in considerable damage in masonry and wood built structures especially designed to withstand earthquakes, great damage in substantial masonry buildings, some collapse in large part or wholly shifted frame buildings off foundations, racked frames, and sometimes broken underground pipelines.

There are no Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones in the site vicinity.

Liquefaction is a process by which water-saturated sediment temporarily loses strength, usually because of strong shaking, and behaves as a fluid. There is a low potential for liquefaction in the vicinity of the rail route.

Hydrology

There are no major surface water bodies near the proposed rail route. Surface drainage flows easterly from Flower Street to the Los Angeles River. Surface drainage north of Exposition Boulevard flows in a northeasterly pattern towards Ballona Creek. South of Exposition Boulevard it flows in a western and southern pattern towards Dominguez Channel.

The rate of surface flow is heavily influenced by the impervious character of the underlying land where there is little opportunity for percolation down to the groundwater tables. Most of the Flower Street portion of the route is covered by paved streets and buildings. The Exposition Boulevard portion of the route has a greater percentage of pervious services due to Exposition Park.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has identified areas affected by both the 100-year storm frequency flood and the 500-year storm frequency flood. The proposed rail route lies in an area identified as having little to no flooding potential.

Groundwater in the proposed light rail route vicinity is estimated between 60 to 80 feet below the surface.

IMPACTS

The soils in the site vicinity as noted earlier are highly suitable for urban development and therefore, there are no anticipated site engineering constraints related to soil suitability. (see also Section 5.7, Construction in this report regarding construction impacts related to grading).

While the proposed route does not cross any known major fault, seismic activity could affect construction or operation of the rail transit line. Recent experience in San Francisco with an earthquake of 7.1 magnitude, provides support for the contention that transit systems can be designed to withstand major earthquake impacts. The BART System in the Bay Area continued running on a 24-hour basis following an earthquake that closed the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, and Interstate freeways in Alameda County.

The proposed light rail project is not anticipated to have an adverse effect on local drainage patterns or ground water quantity or quality.

MITIGATION MEASURES

All Alternatives

Measures to reduce the potential for adverse impacts in the event of a major earthquake include the following:

- All structures above and below grade shall be designed and constructed to withstand the maximum probable earthquake predicted for the area (maximum magnitude estimated at 9).
- All structures and facilities must conform to the City of Los Angeles Seismic Safety Plan.
- A transit excavation plan will be prepared.
- Detailed geotechnical studies will be preformed prior to the final design and the issuance of building permits for the project.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

None are expected.

5.7 CONSTRUCTION

This section examines the impacts that can be expected to occur as a result of the construction of the light rail transit project. Key impact areas include traffic and access disruptions, circulation detours, noise and vibration, pollutant emissions, utility relocation, business disruption and visual impacts. It should be stressed that construction impacts will not occur simultaneously throughout the transit corridor, but would occur on a phased or sequential basis.

Construction Activities and Duration

The method of construction would differ between the alternatives considered. In general, at-grade construction is least disruptive while aerial and subway/cut and cover construction is the most disruptive. Specific construction phases/activities associated with each alternative are discussed below.

Northern Segment

Alternative 1a - Shared Bridge

This alternative would require that the street surface, curb, gutter and sidewalk along the east side of Flower Street be removed and replaced. Tracks and stations would be constructed. The surface of Flower Street would be repaved and lane markings repainted. In addition to these at-grade construction activities, the existing Flower Street overpass above the Harbor Freeway would have to be reconstructed to accommodate light rail tracks on the east side of the bridge. Bridge work would thus involve demolition of pavement surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk and railings. It is estimated that the maximum duration of construction along this segment would be 6-8 months. The rehabilitation of the bridge alone is estimated to take 5-6 months.

Alternative 1b - Separate Bridge

This alternative would have construction requirements similar to Alternative 1a. The primary exception would be that a new separate LRT bridge would be constructed across the Harbor Freeway. The duration of this construction is estimated to be 6-8 months. Work along the entire route is estimated to take 8-12 months.

Western Segment

Alternative 2a - Part Aerial

This alternative would include construction of an aerial segment as well as at-grade segments. The at-grade segment along Flower Street would be constructed in a manner similar to that discussed under Alternative 1a. The aerial segment would

require the construction of flyover type structures. These structures generally carry both tracks together on a cast-in-place or a precast, prestressed concrete box, which are in turn supported by cast in place reinforced concrete piers. The pier foundations consist of caissons, or spread footings on piles, depending on the loads and soil conditions. A typical construction sequence for aerial guideways would involve import of fill material, installation of foundations, installation of guideway supports and installation of guideway sections. It is estimated that the construction of the aerial portion would take 8-10 months. Installation of the at-grade portions of the alignment in the median of Exposition Boulevard is expected to proceed quickly, with the exception of the Exposition Park/Vermont station construction. The overall duration of construction in this segment would take about 10-12 months.

Alternative 2b - Part Subway

This alternative would include construction of a subway segment as well as at-grade segments. The at-grade segment along Flower Street would be constructed in a manner similar to that discussed under Alternative 1a. The subway segment would be constructed using a cut-and-cover technique. Boring is not economically feasible for the length of subway route to be constructed. Cut-and-cover would mean that existing street surface would be removed and a trench would be excavated and shored. Approximately 48,000 cubic yards of material would need to be exported. Following this process, a cast-in-place concrete box would be placed inside the excavated area and the tracks laid. The structure would be covered and the street repaved. It is estimated that the construction of the subway portion would take 12-14 months. Installation of the at-grade portions of the alignment in the median of Exposition Boulevard is expected to proceed quickly, with the exception of the Exposition Park/Vermont station construction. The overall duration of construction in this segment would take 14-16 months.

Alternative 2c - All At-Grade


This alternative would involve the construction of the rail facility at-grade along the east side of Flower Street and in the median of Exposition Boulevard. The Flower Street construction would follow the same sequence of activities as described for Alternative 1a. The Exposition Boulevard construction would require the removal of existing track and the laying of track for the light rail. Construction within the Exposition median is expected to proceed quickly with the exception of the Exposition Park/Vermont station. The duration of construction on this segment would take 8-10 months.

Overall, if there were no overlap between construction in the northern and western segments of the route, construction of this alignment would occur over a maximum of approximately 22-28 months.

IMPACTS

Utility Relocation: Existing utilities likely to be impacted were identified during the Concept Engineering phase of this study. **Table 5.7-1** identifies the utility relocations that would be required for each of the alternatives. The various alternatives would result in the necessary relocation of storm drains, sanitary sewers, water lines, natural gas lines, and communication lines, although each alternative would require the relocation of a different combination of utilities. **Figure 5.7-1** shows the approximate location of the utility line segments that would be impacted by the proposed rail route.

TABLE 5.7-1: UTILITY LINES REQUIRING RELOCATION						
Alternatives		Feet of Line Affected				
		Storm Drain (size)	Sanitary Sewer (size)	Water Line (size)	Gas Line (size)	Pacific Bell
I	1a Shared Bridge	725 ft. (28-inch)/1/2/	815 ft. (12-inch)	2,125 ft. (8-inch)	--	--
	1b Separate Bridge	725 ft. (28-inch)/1/2/	1,015 ft. (12-inch)	1,300 ft.(8-inch) 550 ft.(16-inch)	--	142 ft. (2-ducts)
II	2a Part Aerial	383 ft. (24-inch) 32 ft. (51-inch)/3/	1,100 ft. (44-inch)/4/	2,300 ft (8-inch)	--	500 ft. (1-duct)
	2b Part Subway	375 ft. (24-inch) 40 ft. (51-inch)/3/	1,100 (44-inch)/4/	2,300 ft (8-inch)	--	500 ft. (1-duct) 150 ft. (4-duct)
	2c All At-Grade	382 ft. (24-inch) 33 ft. (51-inch)/3/	1,100 (44-inch)/4/	2,300 ft (8-inch)	--	500 ft. (1-duct)
I = Northern Segment: Washington Boulevard to 30th Street II = Western Segment: 30th Street to Vermont Avenue /1/ 725 feet existing 28-inch storm drain to remain in place per Blue Line example. /2/ Modifications to existing storm drain catch basins and collector drains required along Flower Street at Washington Boulevard, 20th Street, 21st Street, 22nd Street, 23rd Street, and 30th Street. /3/ Modifications to existing storm drain catch basins and collector drains required along Flower Street at Jefferson Boulevard and Exposition Boulevard. /4/ Existing 44-inch outfall sewer to remain in place with protective concrete slab placed over it. Source: Benito A. Sinclair and Associates.						



Source: Los Angeles County Transportation Commission



Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.7-1

AFFECTED UTILITIES

The following is a summary of utility relocation impacts:

Northern Segment

Alternative 1a (Shared Bridge) would require the relocation of approximately 2,940 feet of sewer and water lines, and modification to existing storm drain catch basins and collector drains.

Alternative 1b (Separate Bridge) would result in the relocation of 3,007 feet of sewer, water lines, and Pacific Bell lines, and modification to existing storm drain catch basins and collector drains.

Western Segment

Alternatives 2a (Part Aerial) would result in the relocation of 3,215 feet of sewer, water, storm drainage, Pacific Bell lines, protection to 1,100 feet of existing sewer lines and modification to existing storm drain catch basins and collector drains.

Alternative 2b (Part Subway) would result in the relocation of 3,365 feet of sewer, water, storm drain, Pacific Bell lines, protection to 1,100 feet of existing sewer lines and modification to existing storm drain catch basins and collector drains.

Alternative 2c (All At-Grade) would result in the relocation of 3,215 feet of sewer, water, storm drainage, and Pacific Bell lines, protection to 1,100 feet of existing sewer lines and modification to existing storm drain catch basins and collector drains.

Traffic Impacts: Alternatives 1a, 1b, and 2c would require the temporary closure of up to two lanes of traffic along Flower Street for short periods of time, while roadways are widened, tracks are laid, and platforms are constructed. Alternative 1a could also require the closure of one lane across the Adams Boulevard freeway overcrossing to facilitate the widening of the bridge. Both Alternatives 1a and 1b would likely require the nighttime closure of one lane of Interstate 110 to complete either the bridge widening, as in Alternative 1a, or the separate bridge, as in Alternative 1b.

Alternative 2a would require the temporary closure of up to two traffic lanes along Exposition Boulevard for construction of the aerial guideway. In addition, aerial spans over Flower and Figueroa Streets would have to be phased and traffic phased, requiring some temporary re-routing of traffic during periods when guideway beams are placed on the guideway supports at these intersections. Temporary closures could also be required for the operation of construction equipment during difficult phases of construction.

Alternative 2b could require the temporary closure of one lane of traffic at various times to provide access for equipment to and from the subway excavation. Additionally, temporary closures could also be required for the operation of construction equipment

during difficult phases of construction.

A significant impact would be anticipated from each of these alternatives, due to the closure of traffic lanes to facilitate construction.

Air Quality Impacts: The construction process would result in the generation of fugitive emissions from removal of pavement, exposure and grading of soil, running of construction equipment, and the use of haul trucks and deliver trucks, as well as employee vehicles to the construction zone. Air quality emissions would be potentially significant for those construction areas adjacent to sensitive locations such as Orthopaedic Hospital, the St. John's clinic, apartment buildings, USC dormitories and areas around LA Trade Tech and USC where there is an extensive amount of daytime sidewalk pedestrian traffic. For Alternatives 1a, 1b, 2a and 2c the air quality impacts are anticipated to be quite similar. Pollutants generated by construction equipment would consist primarily of nitrogen oxides. Alternative 2b, however, is expected to generate an extensive amount of additional emissions due to the amount of soil to be excavated, stockpiled and exported. The export of soil is expected to generate additional emissions from haul trucks. The 48,000¹ cubic yards to be removed would likely require approximately 3,200 truck loads, which would result in added vehicle emissions.

Light and Glare Impacts: Alternative 1b could result in impacts due to nighttime lighting during those periods requiring nighttime closure of portions of Interstate 110. It is anticipated that these construction periods would be of short duration. No impacts due to light and glare are anticipated with implementation of the remaining alternatives, since construction activities would occur during daylight hours.

Noise and Vibration: Construction of the light rail system would produce a variety of noise sources, including pneumatic drills, pavement brakers, pavers, dozers, backhoes and pile drivers. It is expected that construction noise would be discernible and would exceed the 5 decibels noise change limits established in the City of Los Angeles Noise Regulations. Typical public works construction noise ranges around 85-90 decibels at a distance of 50 feet. Noise from construction activities could be particularly problematic at sensitive locations, including areas adjacent to Trade Tech classrooms, Orthopaedic Hospital, St. John's Clinic, apartment buildings, Hilton, USC classrooms, theaters and dormitories adjacent to Exposition Boulevard, and to various uses within the Exposition Park area such as museums and the Rose Garden.

Significant temporary noise and vibration impacts would be experienced during the construction of any of the alternatives. At-grade segments would require the use of pneumatic hammers and pavement brakers. Aerial segments would require pile driving and significant numbers of heavy concrete mixer trucks. The subway portions would require the use of heavy excavating equipment as well as an extensive number of 15-25 ton diesel

¹Approximately 80,000 cubic feet would be excavated. However, about 40% of this would be returned as cover.

engine haul trucks. It is anticipated that the most disruptive activity would be the driving of piles necessary for support structures for an aerial guideway or for the construction or expansion of the bridge over the Harbor Freeway near Adams on Flower. In both areas, noise could affect sensitive uses. Along Exposition Boulevard, this work could adversely affect museum and USC classroom activities. Near Flower and Adams, bridge construction/rehabilitation could adversely affect Orthopaedic Hospital. The apartment building across from the hospital and St. John's Church.

MITIGATION MEASURES

- A construction management plan shall be developed. This plan shall include provisions for prior public notification of construction activities, particularly those that will be disruptive or annoying. In addition, the plan shall address the location of construction worker parking areas, the location and maintenance of spoil and staging areas, security, signage to businesses, the maintenance of circulation and on-street parking spaces.
- The construction management plan shall be coordinated with the California Department of Transportation and the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation to minimize traffic disruptions and reduce lane closures.
- Given the number of pedestrians in the area, the construction management plan shall clearly provide for pedestrian access to major institutions in the area, including but not limited to LA Trade Tech, Orthopaedic Hospital, St. John's Church, USC, and Exposition Park. Construction sequencing shall be coordinated with local community officials (including USC, LA Board of Education, SCRTD, etc.) in order to minimize conflicts with student walk routes, and bus service.
- The emissions of fugitive dust and other pollutants shall be minimize by undertaking measures to reduce equipment idling while the equipment is not in use. Fugitive dust shall be reduced by implementing dust control measures consistent with SCAQMD Rule 403, including but not limited to periodic site wetting, and the covering or replanting of exposed or excavated areas.
- Construction shall be stopped during stage 2 and 3 smog alerts.
- The timing of noisy construction activities, particularly pile driving in the vicinity of Orthopaedic Hospital, apartment buildings, or USC shall be coordinated with this institutions to minimize adverse effects on their operations. To the extent feasible alternatives to pile driving shall be pursued including the drilling of piles. In the vicinity of sensitive land uses, temporary noise barriers shall be used to attenuate the noise from pneumatic hammers and pavement breakers.

- All construction equipment shall be maintained in proper tune to reduce operating emissions.
- The relocation and support of utilities shall require coordination with affected service providers to identify specific mitigation measures.
- Road signs will be provided to facilitate traffic detours or rerouting.
- Noise barriers should be used, where possible to minimize the effects of construction noise.
- Construction of the separate bridge at Adams Boulevard (Alternative 1b) would require nighttime lighting on I-110 indicating lane closures. Barriers could be used to help reduce spillover from the freeway lighting.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Mitigation measures would reduce, but not eliminate adverse impacts on traffic, air quality, noise, and vibration. These impacts would be temporary and of a reasonably short duration.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

No cumulative impacts are anticipated.

5.8 PUBLIC SERVICES

SCHOOLS

SETTING

There are two major educational facilities located immediately adjacent to the proposed rail route; Los Angeles Trade Technical College located at the southeast corner of Flower Street and Washington Boulevard and the University of Southern California (USC) located on the north side of Exposition Boulevard between Vermont Avenue and Figueroa Street. Mt. Saint Mary's Doheny Campus, located at Adams Boulevard and Figueroa Street and St. Vincent's grammar school is located at Adams Boulevard and Figueroa Street. There are no other public or private schools located within one-quarter mile of the proposed rail line.

Los Angeles Trade Technical College has an estimated 1991-1992 enrollment of 14,000 students. It is estimated that about 700 students and teachers currently use the Blue Line to and from school.²

USC currently has an estimated enrollment of about 29,000 students.³ The University of Southern California, School of Business Administration, completed a study in May of 1991, which analyzed the student ridership of the DASH program. The DASH program is a shuttle between downtown Los Angeles and Exposition Boulevard, serving USC and residents in the area. The study found that 38 percent of the respondents to the survey do not use public transportation. The survey sample included people in the Hoover Redevelopment area, USC Area, and downtown commuters. The respondents are sensitive to the timelines of the route and 68 percent of the commuters would be lost if the length of the trip were extended from the current 23 minute schedule to an estimated 24.5 minute schedule. Thus, this survey indicates the importance of timing from the commuters view.

Mt. Saint Mary's Doheny Campus currently has an estimated enrollment of 300 students.⁴ There is no current estimate of the number of these who use public transportation to and from the campus.

A new school is being developed in Exposition Park in conjunction with the museum. An

²Telephone Conversation, Jerry Potras, Administrative Analyst, Los Angeles, Trade-Technical College, January 1992.

³Telephone conversation, Chris Lowe, Administrative Assistant, Department of External Affairs, University of Southern California, January 1992.

⁴Mount St. Mary's College, Admissions Office, Telephone conversation, January 1992.

exact location has not as yet been determined.⁵

IMPACTS

Impacts of the proposed rail line on pedestrian access to LA Trade Tech and USC are discussed in the Transportation/Circulation Section 5.3 of this EIR. Impacts of the proposed rail line on vehicular access to these properties is discussed in the Land Use section 5.1 of this EIR. It is anticipated that the proposed rail line would be used by the same students and teachers as those who currently use the Blue Line. Students currently using the Blue Line would likely exit at either the Washington or 23rd Street station.

It is not possible to estimate the number of students at Mt. St. Mary's, USC or the new school to be located in Exposition Park who might take the proposed rail, however it is anticipated that at least some of the students at these schools would use the future facility.

The safety of students and faculty is a concern in identifying impacts of the proposed route on school campus boundaries. The proposed rail line would have designated, signalized pedestrian crosswalks across Flower Street and Exposition Boulevard which would assist in pedestrian safety (see the Transportation/Circulation section of this EIR).

MITIGATION MEASURES

LACTC has developed safety criteria designed to protect students in rail transit project areas from rail lines, substations and construction activities. These criteria should be made available to schools adjacent to the light rail project for distribution to students and teachers. In addition, several other safety measures can be taken to protect students during the construction and operation of the rail system as follow:

- Construction sequencing should be coordinated with local community officials in order to minimize conflicts with student walk routes, school buses and carpools.
- Pedestrian rights-of-way near the rail line should be clearly demarcated by the use of landscaping, fences, walks and curbing to help define clear routes and minimize trespass and shortcut attractions.
- Barriers and security guards should secure maintenance areas during construction to prevent accidents from trespassing and vandalism.
- Conspicuously posted warnings and barriers should be erected near overhead power sources, power substations, crossing areas and

⁵Sue Glad, Deputy Director For External Affairs, California Museum of Science and Industry, letter, September 17,1991.

construction sites to deter unauthorized access.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

It is anticipated that the rail line would serve many of the proposed project sites. There would be no taking of any school properties listed as related projects. No cumulative adverse effects are anticipated.

POLICE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

SETTING

The rail route is primarily within the Police Department's Southwest Area. The Southwest Area Station of the LAPD, which is located at 1546 W. Martin Luther King Boulevard is approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the portion of the line on Exposition Boulevard. The Southwest Area has an estimated 248 officers which patrol the area's 9.8 square miles. The current average response time to emergency calls in the Southwest area is 6.9 minutes.⁶ Predominant crimes in the area are auto theft and burglary from motor vehicles.

IMPACTS

The rail line would maintain a separate transit police network. However, the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) would be called upon, as required, to respond to emergencies and to perform related activities. Increased commuter and pedestrian traffic may result in an increased number of crimes or accidents and transit police may require backup from the LAPD.

Transit police would be responsible for overall security along the rail line. Specific security responsibilities would involve insuring the safety of riders, attendants, and fare patrons.

During off-peak travel hours and evenings, trains would consist of single car configurations with an operator at the front. Passenger assistance telephones located in each rail car would allow direct communication between passengers and the operator. The operator would be in radio contact with the central control facility at all times and would have access to a silent alarm which sets off flashing lights on top of the rail car roof. These lights would be readily visible to police on the ground and to helicopters above.

Fare inspectors riding the lines and monitoring station platforms would have walkie-talkies

⁶Final Environmental Impact Report, USC Plaza Development, Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, 1990.

at all times and would be able to report problems to central control from any location along the route. Closed circuit cameras would monitor train platform access at station locations and relay images back to central control. Local LAPD would be called upon only when back-up support is required. The provision of a separate rail transit police force and the implementation of general safety and security measures for the rail line should keep external law enforcement services and intervention to a minimum. Therefore, potential impacts to the local LAPD is not anticipated to be significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Security of the LRT should be incorporated into the design features of the system. These design features should enhance the perceived, as well as the actual security of the buildings, equipment and patrons. In addition, the following mitigation measures should be implemented:

- Two-way voice communication on-board the trains between the passengers and the train operator should be installed.
- Closed-circuit television should be provided at high-risk and security areas throughout the system.
- An alarm system shall be installed to prevent unauthorized entry and tampering with equipment, such as fare vending machines.
- In order to eliminate dark or obscured areas, the design of all passenger stations and shelter stops should be open with long, unbroken lines of sight.
- Where practical, rights-of-way shall be protected from encroachment of people, objects thrown, or unauthorized vehicles.
- At-grade street crossings provide access for emergency vehicles.
- Interior finish of the vehicles shall be of vandal-resistant materials.
- A "silent alarm" device shall be installed so the car operator may summon police or alert the central control to a problem on the train.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The proposed project in combination with other planned projects in the site area would result in the potential for increased police protection services from the Southwest Area.

However, because the proposed rail project would have its own security force and because many of the related projects are within the University of Southern California, which has its own security, it is not anticipated that related projects would result in a significant cumulative effect on LAPD services in the area.

FIRE PROTECTION

SETTING

Fire protection for the City is provided by the Los Angeles City Fire Department (LAFD). The LAFD is responsible for fire suppression, fire protection, design consultation, inspection, planning and review. In addition, the Fire Department responds to certain medical emergencies. The nearest fire station in the vicinity of the proposed rail route is Station No. 15, located at 915 W. Jefferson Boulevard. This is a Task Force Station with an engine and truck company, and a paramedic ambulance. Current staff at the station is about 12 and the response time to incidents is one minute or less between the time an emergency call is received and when the fire team leaves the station.

IMPACTS

The Los Angeles Fire Department continually evaluates fire station placement and overall department services for the entire city. Implementation of the proposed rail project could effect fire protection, emergency medical services, with increased inspection loads and potential incidents of false alarms.

Increased concentrations of pedestrian and vehicular traffic within the proximity of the transit stations during commuter rush hours may lengthen response times by interfering with the movement of emergency fire vehicles. This impact would be heightened at street/track intersections for the at-grade alternatives (Alternatives 1a, 1b and 2c). Of primary concern would be riders exiting the trains and stations as well as emergency access to all areas of the rail system.

The adequacy of fire protection for the rail system is based on required fire-flow response, distance from existing fire stations and the LAFD's judgement regarding the needs in the area. Fire-flow, or the quantity of water necessary for fire protection, would vary with the type of land use adjacencies, life hazard potential, occupancy and the degree of fire hazard. Equipment and personnel needs would be determined by the LAFD upon the selection of the rail alternative and operations plan for the project.

MITIGATION MEASURES

From the outset, fire/life/safety criteria shall be established and used during the preliminary engineering, final design, construction and operation of the rail transit system. Transit stations and power substations shall be designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable fire codes. Final plans would be reviewed by the fire department and inspections

would be scheduled during construction and operation.

In addition, the following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the final design of the rail transit route:

- Access for fire equipment must be maintained at all times during construction and operation of the rail system.
- Use of fire retardant materials on trains and in stations.
- Adequate public and private fire hydrants shall be required and improvements made to provide the required fire flow along the route.
- Smoke detectors, fire alarms and fire retardant materials shall be used in the stations, on trains and at power substations.
- Installation of automatic sprinkler systems and the availability of hand held fire extinguishers would be at all stations and on all trains along the route.
- Clear access to telephones in stations to report emergencies to the Fire Department.
- The Fire Department recommends there be continuous, through streets. If a cul-de-sac is created, such as proposed for 27th Street at Flower Street, all fire lanes or dead-ending streets shall terminate in an approved turning area.
- When required access is provided by an improved street, fire lane or combination of both which results in a dead-end in excess of 700 feet in length from the nearest cross street, at least one additional ingress-egress roadway shall be provided in such a manner that an alternative means of ingress-egress is accomplished.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The proposed project in combination with other planned projects in the site area would result in the potential for increased fire protection services in the vicinity of the cumulative projects. Each station would be required to meet its own fire flow requirements and the LAFD would review each project's design and fire prevention suppression mitigation measures.

5.9 ENERGY CONSERVATION

SETTING

CEQA defines energy impacts as project characteristics that result in substantial additional use of existing energy sources.

Transportation is a major consumer of energy in the Los Angeles region. Vehicle trips within the region are estimated to involve over 234 million miles of travel per day.⁷ Fuel consumption from vehicle trips with origins or destinations in the region amount to about 4.9 billion gallons of fuel per year.⁸ About 89 percent of the fuel is gasoline and 11 percent is diesel.⁹ Transportation energy consumption is equivalent to about 739 trillion Btu per year, or about 126 million barrels of oil.

IMPACTS

Based on projections by the Southern California Association of Governments, there would be 310.2 million miles of daily vehicle travel by the year 2010 in the Los Angeles region. This would result in the consumption of approximately 14.2 million gallons of fuel, equivalent to 2,030 billion Btu's. As noted earlier, in the Transportation, Circulation section, implementation of the rail line would reduce vehicle miles traveled and result in energy savings. It is difficult to estimate the number of miles which would be saved due to the development of this 1.8 mile segment; it is estimated that about 15,000 persons would ride this segment per day and not all of these would be new riders.¹⁰ Thus, there would be some transportation energy savings which would result from those persons who would be new to public transit; those switching from private cars to public transit, as well as those switching from diesel buses to electric trains.

Energy requirements for the rail transit system and associated stations is estimated in **Table 5.9-1. Energy Consumption for Stations and Traction Power** illustrates that the overall increase in consumption would be approximately 0.24 billion Btu's regardless of the alternative considered. It should be recognized that there would also be additional energy consumption at power plants in the region that would be supplying the needed electrical energy. It is anticipated that this type of increase would be negligible.

⁷South Coast Air Quality Management District, Air Quality Management Plan 1988 Revision, Draft Appendix III-A, 1985 Emissions Inventory South Coast Air Basin, March 1988, Table IV-32.

⁸A fuel consumption rate of 17 miles per gallon is assumed.

⁹South Coast Air Quality Management District, AQMP, Appendix III-A, Table IV-32.

¹⁰Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, "Proposed 30-Year Integrated Transportation Plan, (Revised)", August 26, 1991.

The energy requirements for operation of the line and the stations would be off-set by transportation energy savings created by those persons who would switch from private automobile to public transit and thus the energy requirements of the proposed project are not anticipated to be significant.

TABLE 5.9-1: ENERGY CONSUMPTION RELATED TO STATIONS AND TRACTION POWER			
All Alternatives	Traction Usage/1/	Station Usage/2/	Billion Btu Equivalent
Rail Line 1.8 miles	2,250	---	0.0002
Stations			
23rd Street	---	79,785	0.0797
Jefferson	---	79,785	0.0797
Exposition Park/ Vermont	---	79,785	0.0797
Subtotal	2,250	239,355	0.2393
Optional Stations			
Washington	---	79,785	0.0797
Figueroa	---	79,785	0.0797
TOTAL	2,250	398,925	0.3987
/1/ Consumption rate is assumed to be 1,250 kilowatt hours per mile per year of track based on factors presented in the Pasadena Light Rail Alternatives EIR prepared by LACTC. /2/ Consumption assumes 19.7 kwh/sf/year for at-grade stations. Source: LACTC and Terry A. Hayes Associates.			

MITIGATION MEASURES

The light rail transit would result in an overall benefit in energy conservation for the region. Examples of energy conservation measures which will be incorporated into the system design include:

- Regenerative braking
- Coordination of traffic and rail signal systems.

The following measures should be employed to further limit the energy demands of the rail transit system:

- Implement station design features that would meet or exceed the requirements of Title 24.
- Separate electric meters at stations.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Development of other related projects would result in the incremental use of energy resources in the region.

5.10 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

SETTING

The project route is located in a highly urbanized area and therefore biological resources are limited to urban tolerant species of plants and animals.

Flower Street is lined on both sides with palm trees at about 30 foot intervals. There are also some small shrubs and grass along the sidewalk between the roadway and the sidewalk on both sides of the street.

The Exposition Boulevard median, the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way, is limited in plant species to small shrubs, grasses, palms and Italian Cypress trees.

Animal species in the site area are limited to urban tolerant species including small mammals and birds. There are no Federally listed endangered or threatened species in the project area.

IMPACTS

All Alternatives

The proposed light rail project would result in the removal and elimination of 75 palm trees along the east side of Flower Street between Washington Boulevard and Exposition Boulevard. Along the Exposition Boulevard median about 26 palms and 17 Italian Cypress would be eliminated.

The Jefferson Street Station, proposed at the northeast corner of Jefferson and Flower Street would result in the removal of about another 10 palm trees and several Eucalyptus trees (see **Figure 5.10-1**). These trees are located along the Harbor Freeway right-of-way.

Due to the existing urban nature and traffic volumes along both Flower Street and Exposition Boulevard it is not anticipated that the proposed project would effect any animal habitat or migratory patterns of either small rodents or birds in the site area.

MITIGATION MEASURES

- The proposed light rail line shall include landscaping along the entire route. Landscaping shall consist of native California draught tolerant plant species and as many relocated palms as feasible (see **Figure 5.10-2** which is a rendering of the proposed rail line looking north on Flower Street).



Existing vegetation at the northeast corner of Jefferson Boulevard and Flower Street.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.10-1
PROPOSED JEFFERSON
BOULEVARD STATION



SOURCE: Gruen Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.10-2

VIEW LOOKING NORTH ON FLOWER

- A licensed landscape architect shall be retained to assess how many of the existing trees to be removed can be retained and incorporated into the project landscaping plan for the rail corridor as well as at the Jefferson Street station.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The proposed project would result in the removal and relocation of 111 palms, 17 Italian Spruce and several Eucalyptus trees along the entire 1.8 mile route. The greater number of trees which could be relocated along the rail line or at the stations would reduce this negative impact.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Other projects in the site vicinity could result in the loss of urban plant species at each respective site. Due to the highly urbanized nature of the site area it is not anticipated that there would be a negative cumulative effect on plant or animal species as a result of related projects.

5.11 RISK OF UPSET

Risk of upset is defined by CEQA as any risk of explosion or the release of hazardous substances in the event of an accident or natural disaster.

SETTING

Most of the proposed light rail route would be constructed entirely within the public right-of-way and therefore, it is unlikely that there would exist hazardous substances or sites underneath the public right-of-way. Within 500 feet of the rail route there are no known or reported underground tanks cited by the California Department of Health Services for the release (or possible release if the case is still under investigation) of hazardous materials. There are also no known or listed sites in the project vicinity listed with the EPA Superfund Program.

Other sources of hazardous substances include gas supply lines, and sewage lines. Major gas supply lines and sewage lines are depicted in **Figure 5.11-1**. Damage to any of these facilities by natural disasters such as earthquakes, or by accidents such as subsurface rupture could cause the release of hazardous substances.

Other safety hazards are associated with oil fields and oil wells. The proposed rail route extends through the La Cienega oil field. However, there are no recorded active or abandoned wells in proximity to the project.

As the proposed light rail line turns westward on Exposition Boulevard, it is lined by the University of Southern California to the north and Exposition Park to the south. Since most of the proposed rail line is to be constructed with the public right-of-way along Flower Street and Exposition Boulevard, it is unlikely that any hazardous materials or hazardous waste sites exist within the boundaries of the rail line. However, several potential sources of off-site contamination exist near the rail line. These sites consist of existing and former gas stations and an auto dealership which exist along Figueroa Street one block west of Flower Street and at the intersection of Exposition Boulevard and Vermont Avenue. The potential sources of contamination along Figueroa Street are the Chevron gas station at the northeast corner of Washington Boulevard and Figueroa; the Mobil gas station at the southeast corner of Adams Boulevard and Figueroa Street and the Felix Chevrolet auto dealership at the northeast corner of Jefferson Boulevard and Figueroa Street. The potential sources of contamination along Exposition Boulevard are the Chevron gas station at the northeast corner of Exposition Boulevard and Figueroa Street; the Arco gas station at the southeast corner of Exposition Boulevard and Vermont Avenue and a former gas station site (which is currently vacant) at the northwest corner of Exposition Boulevard and Vermont Avenue.

Although these sites are not located directly within the boundaries of the proposed rail line, any leakage from existing underground storage tanks (USTs) at these facilities could have migrated underneath the proposed rail line. A subsurface investigation would have to be

devised and implemented to determine if the rail line has been impacted by the leakage of hazardous materials from these existing USTs. However, such an investigation is not recommended at this time based on information obtained from pertinent hazardous waste databases to be discussed below.

Hazardous Waste Regulations and Identified Sites

Regulatory compliance is a primary element of an environmental investigation. Failure to comply with governmental regulations can result in expensive fines and can expose businesses or individuals to liabilities from which the law would otherwise shield them. Certain land uses may also be restricted by the presence on-site, or at neighboring sites, of hazardous wastes or hazardous materials.

The information provided below is a summary of relevant regulatory databases which relate to the proposed light rail line and the identification of any hazardous waste sites located within or along the proposed light rail line.

1. The Federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), also known as the Superfund Act, protects the victims and the environment in the event of a hazardous materials spill. This act primarily addresses cleanup of designated Superfund hazardous waste sites. To achieve its stated purpose, CERCLA established a Hazardous Substances Trust Fund, the Emergency Response Trust Fund, and the Post-Closure liability Trust fund. These funds compensate the victims and provide money necessary for the decontamination of the environment.

A list of known contaminated sites that are under consideration for the Superfund list is compiled by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); it is known as the CERCLIS database. A review of the July 15, 1991 version of that document indicates that no known contaminated sites which require action by the EPA exist within a quarter mile radius of the site.

2. The EPA maintains the National Priority List (NPL) under CERCLA 42 U.S.C. Section 9601 (1985). Once a site has been designated on the CERCLIS, the EPA ranks it to determine the potential risks to human health and the environment. Only those CERCLIS sites which present the greatest risk are added to the NPL, which qualifies the sites to receive CERCLA remedial funding. A review of the April 24, 1991 edition of this document indicates that no such sites exist within a quarter mile radius of the site.
3. The EPA also has the authority under Section 107(l) of CERCLA 42 U.S.C. Section 9607(1) to file Federal Superfund Liens against real property to receive cleanup, response, and any other expenditures made by the EPA under the CERCLA program. The March 1, 1991 edition of the Federal Superfund Liens list does not indicate that any such sites exist within a

quarter mile radius of the subject property.

4. The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (HWSS) list is published annually by the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research under government Code Section 2.65962.5. This list identifies potential and confirmed hazardous waste sites throughout the State of California. A review of the November 190 version of this document indicates no such sites exist within a quarter mile radius of the site.
5. The Bond Expenditure Plan (BEP) contains a listing of all verified hazardous waste sites that are or will be targeted for abatement by the California Department of Health Services (DHS) under the Hazardous Substances Cleanup Bond Act of 1984 (Health and Safety Code Section 25356) and the Hazardous Substance Account. The January 10, 1991 edition of the BEP indicates that no such site exists within a quarter mile radius of the subject property.
6. The DHS may designate real property as either a "Hazardous Waste Property" or a "Border Zone Property" pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Sections 25220-25241. "Hazardous Waste Property" is land at which hazardous waste has been deposited creating a significant existing or potential hazard to public health and safety. A "Border Zone Property" is one within 2,000 feet of a hazardous waste deposit. Property within either category is restricted in use, unless a variance is obtained from the DHS. A "Hazardous Waste Property" designation results in a prohibition of new uses, other than a modification or expansion of an industrial or manufacturing facility on land previously owned by the facility prior to January 1981. A "Border Zone Property" designation results in the prohibition of a variety of uses involving human habitation, hospitals, schools and day care centers. As of June 1, no such sites were known to exist within a half mile radius of the site.
7. The DHS maintains the Abandoned Sites Program Information System (ASPIS) database of potential hazardous waste sites identified by the historical Abandoned Site Survey Program and compiled data from county health agencies, local fire departments county agricultural commissioners and other local agencies that could be reasonably expected to have information regarding potential waste sites. According to the January 4, 1991 edition of this document, no abandoned hazardous waste sites are known to exist along the proposed rail line.
8. The Toxic Substances Control Division of the DHS maintains the Hazardous Waste Information System (HWIS) database. This database is a list of hazardous waste generators and TSD facilities pursuant to the Hazardous Waste Control Law (Health and Safety Code Section 25100 et seq.) and the

Hazardous Waste Management Act of 1976 (Health and Safety Code Section 25179.1 et seq.). According to the January 30, 1989 edition of the HWIS database, no hazardous waste generators are located along the proposed rail line.

9. The California Waste Management Board maintains the Solid Waste Information System (SWIS) database. This database is a list of open, closed and inactive solid waste disposal facilities and transfer stations pursuant to the Solid Waste Management and Resource Recovery Action of 1972, government of the SWIS database indicates that no solid waste disposal facilities exist within a quarter mile radius of the proposed rail line.
10. The California Water Resources Control Board (CWRCB) has compiled a list of all known leaks of hazardous substances from underground storage tanks (USTs) in the State of California pursuant to Section 25295(b) of the Health and Safety Code. The July 1, 1991 edition of this list indicates no sites with leaking USTs exist within a quarter mile radius of the site.
11. The Los Angeles County Environmental Health Department monitors known hazardous waste sites and enforces various environmental laws which govern these sites. No such sites are known to exist within a quarter mile radius of the site.

IMPACTS

During this data base survey, no direct evidence was identified which would indicate that the proposed rail line has been exposed to environmental contamination. Potential sources of contamination are the USTs which exist at several nearby gas stations and an auto dealership. A subsurface investigation would have to be conducted to determine if the subject property has been impacted by leakage from these tanks. However, based on the information obtained from available regulatory databases, the proposed rail line is not known to be impacted by any hazardous materials. Therefore, a subsurface investigation is not recommended at this time.

Based on the site inspection and the review of relevant federal, state and local data bases, the site is not known to be impacted by any environmental contamination associated with hazardous waste treatment, storage or disposal facilities. Based on the current available information regarding the site, it appears that the potential for significant environmental liabilities associated with the site is relatively moderate. However, due to the presence of the La Cienega oil field in the site vicinity further geotechnical studies are recommended prior to permit approvals.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Detailed geotechnical investigations would be performed as part of the detailed engineering phase of the project and prior to the issuance of construction permits. These studies would provide more detailed data on the potential for upset. Nonetheless, mitigation measures which will be incorporated into the design of the subway alternative 2b to reduce the potential for upset include:

- All underground structures shall be designed with adequate ventilation to allow dissipation of underground gas accumulations. Impermeable membranes shall be installed surrounding tunnel, deep trench and subterranean station structures.
- Relief wells shall be employed to remove underground methane gas if and where necessary.
- Gas sensing systems to be employed to identify gas infiltration and allow for sealing of such infiltration.
- Although the possibility for future problems during construction from unrecorded or abandoned oil and gas wells is remote, if such a well should be encountered during project construction the California Department of Conservation's Division of Oil and Gas should be contacted to obtain information on the requirements for and approval to perform remedial operations.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Other related projects will require individual evaluation regarding the potential risk of upset at each individual site. No cumulative effects are anticipated.

5.12 AESTHETICS

SETTING

Visual Character:

The proposed light rail route has two distinct visual characters; the primarily low-rise buildings, the palm lined right-of-way of Flower Street, and the park and university lined Exposition Boulevard. **Figure 5.12-1** shows the locations of photographs included in this section.


Flower Street, between Washington Boulevard and the Orthopaedic Hospital is characterized by a series of low-rise buildings (one to three stories) primarily concrete with few windows or ornamental features (see Photo 1, **Figure 5.12-2**). There are also several older brick structures along the west side of Flower Street south of the Harbor Freeway overpass with commercial uses on the ground floor and residential units above. The Orthopaedic Hospital is a six-story structure fronting on Flower Street, just north of Adams Boulevard and bridge crossing the Harbor Freeway (see Photo 2, **Figure 5.12-2**). Directly across from the Hospital is a four-story grey concrete apartment building (see Photo 3, **Figure 5.12-3**). South of the apartment building, looking south down Flower Street, is St. John's Church and some more low-rise buildings on the west side of Flower Street to Exposition Boulevard. (see Photo 3, **Figure 5.12-3**).

Exposition Boulevard is bordered on the south by Exposition Park and on the north by the University of Southern California (USC). The rail road right-of-way which extends along the center of the Exposition Boulevard is sparsely landscaped. The width of the Boulevard in combination with the park gives the Exposition Boulevard an open, park like visual character along the southern side of Exposition Boulevard between Figueroa Street and Vermont Avenue, while USC gives the Exposition Boulevard an institutional character along the north side of the Exposition Boulevard. (see Photos 5 and 6, **Figure 5.12-4**).

Views:

Flower Street is a north/south running street and provides views, looking north, of Downtown Los Angeles along most of it's length between Washington Boulevard and Exposition Boulevard (see Photos 7 and 8, **Figure 5.12-5**). Views looking south are limited to the immediate adjacent uses and there are no scenic views or vistas looking south along Flower Street.

Exposition Boulevard is an east/west street. The views along the Boulevard are of the adjacent park and university uses described above. Exposition Boulevard is designated as a Scenic Highway in the City of Los Angeles Scenic Highways Plan. There are no scenic views or vistas looking east or west along the boulevard in the area of the proposed rail route.



Source: Los Angeles County Transportation Commission



**Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route**

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.12-1

PHOTO LOCATION MAP



Photo 1: View looking north on Flower Street.



Photo 2: View looking north on Flower Street at Adams Boulevard.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.12-2
FLOWER STREET RAIL SEGMENT
PHOTOS 1 AND 2



Photo 3: View looking north on Flower Street showing 4-story apartment building on Flower Street and just north of the Harbor Freeway Overpass.



Photo 4: View looking south on Flower Street at Harbor Freeway overpass.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.12-3
FLOWER STREET RAIL SEGMENT
PHOTOS 3 AND 4




Photo 5: View looking east on Exposition Boulevard at Menlo Drive.



Photo 6: View looking east on Exposition Boulevard west of Vermont Street.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.12-4
EXPOSITION BOULEVARD RAIL SEGMENT
PHOTOS 5 and 6



Photo 7: View of downtown Los Angeles looking north on Flower Street.



Photo 8: View looking north on Flower Street at the intersection of Flower Street and Exposition Boulevard.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.12-5
FLOWER STREET RAIL SEGMENT
PHOTOS 7 and 8

IMPACTS

The proposed light rail line would result in a change in the visual character of Flower Street and to a lesser degree Exposition Boulevard. **Figure 5.12-6** is a rendering of the proposed rail line looking south down Flower Street and **Figure 5.12-7** is a rendering of the proposed rail line from the Jefferson Street station south to and along Exposition Boulevard. Both renderings show the all at-grade Alternative 1a and 2c. The following describes the visual effects of each alternative:

Northern Segment


Alternative 1a and 2c (All At-Grade with Shared Bridge). When trains are passing, the rail line would result in a visual barrier between the east and west sides of Flower Street. In addition, the line would have a physical barrier approximately three feet high on the sidewalk side of the track on Flower Street and on both sides along Exposition Boulevard to discourage pedestrian crossings at undesignated crosswalks. The most sensitive adjacent uses, from a visual standpoint are the residential uses on the west side of Flower Street (upstairs from the commercial uses and the apartment building across from the Orthopaedic Hospital) and Orthopaedic Hospital where the trains would come to about fifty feet from the building under alternative 1a.

The proposed light rail line would extend down the rail road right-of-way in the center of Exposition Boulevard where there are existing rail road tracks and some sparse landscaping. Thus, the proposed line would not significantly change the visual character of Exposition Boulevard.

Alternative 1b and 2c (All At-Grade with Separate Bridge). Under this alternative (a separate bridge crossing the Harbor Freeway) the line would be up to 50 feet away from Orthopaedic Hospital. The visual character of this alternative rail line would be similar to those described above for Alternative 1a and 2c. With the exception of the overhead catenary lines and outside poles, the separate light rail bridge structure would not have any design characteristics or features that would make it stand out from the existing Flower Street bridge.

Western Segment

Alternative 2a (Part Aerial). The aerial alternative would create the most significant type of visual changes along the proposed route. The aerial structure would be a dominant visual element. Typically the elevated guideway structure would rise from the existing ground level to about 22 feet at the top of the rail. The underside of the guideway platform would need to provide 16 feet of clearance to allow for vehicles to pass. The guideways would be supported by 5 to 7 foot diameter piers spaced at 80 foot intervals. Catenary poles at 120 foot intervals and overhead wires would extend another 25 feet above the guideway. The impact of the aerial




SOURCE: Gruen Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.12-6
VIEW OF PROPOSED RAIL LINE
LOOKING SOUTH ON FLOWER



SOURCE: Gruen Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.12-7
VIEW OF PROPOSED RAIL LINE
LOOKING SOUTH TO EXPOSITION

guideway would not be considered significant because of the presence of existing buildings and the elevated portions of the Harbor Freeway and transitway structure (adjacent to Flower Street) which serve to either obstruct views of, or provide a backdrop for the guideway from adjacent areas.

Alternative 2b (Part Subway). The subway alternative would have the least impact to the existing visual setting along the corridor. The proposed rail line would not result in the obstruction of any scenic views or vistas. The view of Downtown Los Angeles, looking north on Flower Street would remain unobstructed.

Light and glare impacts that would be common to all alternatives (except the part subway alternative 2b) include lighting at the stations and from the cars as they pass by. High beam front head lights on the transit vehicles could affect vehicles on adjacent roadways when transitioning over these streets. However, due to the existing presence of street lights and automobile lights on existing adjacent streets, the added train lights and station lighting is not expected to create a significant negative light or glare impact.

The above mentioned visual changes are not considered significant visual impacts.

MITIGATION MEASURES

- The re-landscaping of palms along Flower Street would mitigate the changes in visual character along Flower Street resulting from the proposed rail line.
- Station lighting shall incorporate directional shielding and would be designed to reduce spill-over light and glare on adjacent sensitive uses.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Other proposed projects in the site vicinity would result in visual changes to each respective property and will require individual impact analysis. No cumulative visual effects are anticipated.

5.13 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural resources for the purpose of this report can be described as recorded archaeological and historic sites which would be affected by the construction and operation of the rail project.

An archival records search for cultural resources within a one mile radius of the route was conducted by the Archaeological Information Center at the University of Los Angeles (UCLA).

SETTING

Prehistoric Resources: No prehistoric sites have been identified within a one-mile radius from the proposed rail line. Due to the early development of the area, there is a potential for prehistoric material to be present.

Historic Resources: There is one historic structure located immediately adjacent to the proposed rail route:

- St. John's Episcopal Church at 514 West Adams Boulevard, listed on the City of Los Angeles list of Historic-Cultural Monuments (#516) and on the National Register of Historic Places (#20958) (see **Figure 5.13-1**).

There are three additional properties located in the vicinity of the proposed rail line listed on the National Register including:

- Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum
3911 S. Figueroa St.
- Natural History Museum
900 Exposition Boulevard
- The Stimson House
2421 South Figueroa Street

In addition, the street lights along Flower Street between Washington Boulevard and Exposition Boulevard were installed in 1932 (see **Figure 5.13-1**). The lights, identified as Union Metal 1806 Electrolier are located at about 100 foot intervals on both sides of the street. Though they are not specifically designated as a historic monument nor are they within any designated historic district they could be considered as an example of early street lighting in Los Angeles. According to the Bureau of Street Lighting of the City, there are




Photo 1: Street lights along Flower Street.

Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates




Photo 2: St. John's Church.



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 5.13-1
HISTORIC RESOURCES
PHOTOS 1 and 2

few areas where these lighting fixtures remain intact.¹¹ Many of these types of lights have been replaced in the past when areas are redeveloped primarily because they do not meet current illumination standards for street lighting and because of the cost to update the lamps versus replacement. For example, the same type of street lights were removed along Flower Street north of Washington Boulevard when the Blue Line was constructed. Some of those lights were salvaged and remain in City storage for use in other parts of downtown.

Religious Institutions and Hospitals: There are a number of religious institutions and hospitals adjacent to the proposed rail route including:

- St. John's Episcopal Church (noted above).
- Orthopaedic Hospital, on Flower Street between 23rd Street and Adams Boulevard.
- Omar Ibn Al-Khattab Islamic Foundation Mosque at 1025 West Exposition Boulevard (northwest corner of Exposition Boulevard and Vermont Avenue).

IMPACTS

No environmental impacts caused by the construction and operation of the rail system are anticipated to affect either of the historic buildings discussed above. The street lights, however along the east side of Flower Street would be removed and would be lost as a historic resource of this street and of the City in terms of areas with examples of this 1932 vintage of street lights.

Flower Street will become a one-way, southbound street. One northbound contra-flow lane would be provided to serve Orthopaedic Hospital. Therefore, access to and from the hospital is not expected to be significantly impacted. The rail line would not affect the mosque at Exposition and Vermont. Rail tracks associated with the project would be located in the median of Exposition Boulevard. Access to the mosque would not be affected. St. John's Church would be affected by the loss of portions of its parking lot. This effect is not anticipated to be significant, however, Flower Street driveway access may be restricted to the church lot under alternative 1b.

¹¹ Stan Horowitz, Division Manager, City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Lighting, telephone conversation, January 1992.

MITIGATION MEASURES

- LACTC should work with the Bureau of Street Lighting, Assessment Engineering Division regarding the design of the proposed replacement street lights. At that time the potential of reusing and updating the lights should be considered as an alternative to removal and replacement with new lights.
- The design of the route alignment adjacent to St. John's Church should be coordinated with the church to ensure that safe and efficient circulation and access to the church parking lot is provided. The replacement of on-street and off-street parking spaces should also be resolved.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are anticipated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Other related projects will require individual evaluation regarding the potential loss of cultural resources at each individual site. No cumulative effects are anticipated.

CHAPTER 6

OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS/ FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

6.1 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

The potential exists for the proposed rail route to result in induced growth adjacent to the proposed line, particularly in the area between Flower and Figueroa Streets from Washington Boulevard to Jefferson Boulevard. This area is characterized by older, mostly one- and two-story buildings on land that is zoned for greater density. The area is generally, therefore considered underutilized. The following describes the existing development density and the potential development density, as per the Zoning, on the blocks between Flower Street and Figueroa Street from Washington Boulevard to Jefferson Boulevard.

- **Exposition Boulevard to 22nd Street.** As shown on **Figure 6.1-1**, this area is zoned M1-2, Limited Industrial with a floor area ratio six times the buildable lot area. In general, most of the structures within this area are one-story with the exception of some 3-6 story structures along Figueroa Street between 21st and 23rd Streets. This M1-2 zoned area comprises about 303,900 square feet, less the 34,100 square feet of area built with a mid-rise building, for a total buildable area of about 269,800 square feet. At the allowed 6:1 FAR, this area could accommodate up to 1.2 million square feet of development.¹ It is estimated that the existing one-story buildings in this area comprises about 115,600 square feet of development.² Therefore, under the existing zoning there is a development potential for up to an additional 1.1 million square feet in this area.
- **22nd Street to 27th Street.** This area is zoned C2-2 also with a floor area ratio six times the buildable lot area. This area, excluding St. John's Church on the southwest corner of Adams Boulevard and Flower Street, is estimated to have about 204,400 square feet of existing development. Excluding the mid-rise building on Flower Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets, this area would have a development potential of almost 800,000 square feet based on the existing C2-2 zoning of this area.³ It is estimated that this area includes about 36,000 square feet of existing development or 764,000 square feet less than what would be allowed under the existing C2-2 zoning.

¹Assumes a site area of 269,800 square feet less 25 percent of the area for setbacks and landscaping, for a total developable area of 202,350 square feet.

²Based on aerial photographs taken in September of 1991.

³Assumes a total lot area of 177,600 square feet less 25% for setbacks.

LEGEND:

COMMERCIAL ZONES


-  C2-1 Retail business, limited manufacturing, auto services, churches, etc... Floor area ratio may not exceed 3 times buildable lot area.
-  C2-2 Same as above Floor area ratio may not exceed 6 times buildable lot area.

INDUSTRIAL ZONES

-  M1-2 Limited industrial uses, no hospitals or schools Floor area ratio may not exceed 6 times buildable lot area.
-  M2-2 Light industrial uses, storage lots of all kinds, animal keeping, no residential uses of any kind. Same as above.

RESIDENTIAL ZONES

-  R4-2 Floor area ratio may not exceed 6 times buildable lot
-  RD2-1 Two-family apartment houses, multiple dwellings. Floor area ratio may not exceed 3 times buildable lot area.



Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 6.1-1
ZONING ADJACENT TO THE
PROPOSED RAIL LINE

- **27th Street to Jefferson Boulevard.** This area is designated C2-1 with a floor area ratio three times the buildable lot area. Most of the structures along this strip are one-story with several two-story buildings between 29th and 33rd Streets. This area comprises about 602,900 square feet. At a 3:1 FAR, this area could have a maximum development potential of up to 1.3 million square feet.⁴ The existing development comprises about 250,000 square feet of buildings. Therefore, under the existing zoning there is a development potential for up to an additional million square feet in this area.

In summary, there is a substantial potential for the redevelopment of some of the existing parcels located along the Flower Street portion of the rail line between Washington Boulevard and Jefferson Boulevard. The degree to which such potential would be realized is dependent upon a complex interplay of actual pressure for development, existing and emerging growth controls, and local attitudes toward such growth.

6.2 LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

6.2.1 Relationship Between Local Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity

Construction of the proposed project would entail short-term impacts which must be weighted against the achievement of long-term objectives. The short-term impacts consist primarily of required property acquisition and displacement of current uses, construction-related impacts, and the possibility of creating pressure for land use changes in the project vicinity. In addition the project would create short-term employment opportunities during construction of the rail line.

In the long-term, implementation of the project would further achieve the Countywide Transit Plan, the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (by reducing vehicle trips in the region), and the Hoover Redevelopment Plan. The project would also provide some energy savings in terms of daily trips traveled by car in the region and would offer additional modes of transportation for the region's residents. Long-term employment opportunities would also be created for operation of the facilities.

Considerations favoring construction of the project now, rather than at some later time include:

- Increasing cost of development, rising labor and material costs
- Increased employment opportunities

⁴Assumes 602,900 square feet of lot area less 25% for setbacks and landscaping for a total developable area of 452,175 square feet.

6.2.2 Significant Irreversible Changes

Implementation of the proposed project would require the long-term commitment of non-renewable resources for the construction and operation of the project including right-of-way, manpower, energy and construction materials. Most significant is the long-term commitment of right-of-way for transportation use.

CHAPTER 7

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that as part of the disclosure process, that decision-makers and other interested parties in the EIR be made aware of other alternatives that were considered that reasonably attain the objectives of the proposed project. In this case, the overall objective of the project has been to extend Blue Line rail transit service to serve primarily the employment, residential, educational and cultural centers in a portion of downtown Los Angeles to the Exposition Park, USC campus area and neighborhoods adjacent to Vermont Avenue. CEQA requires that the No Project Alternative also be discussed. CEQA also requires that when environmental effects of the alternatives are taken into account, that the environmentally superior alternative be identified.

This report has been organized to fulfill these requirements. First, the body of this report provides a comparative assessment of five alternatives for each environmental impact topic. The alternatives carried in this assessment or those that emerged from an extensive screening and evaluation process carried out by the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission and the Consultant Team in conjunction with a Technical Advisory Committee composed of major stakeholders in the Flower-Exposition Corridor Area. The screening process included consideration of the following factors:

- Engineering feasibility and order of magnitude costs.
- Minimize right-of-way acquisition.
- Minimize disruption to adjacent land uses and other adverse environmental effects.
- Compatibility with local plans and projects, with special consideration given to the urban design setting and character of the corridor area.
- Provide a stimulus for community development.
- Maximize rail transit patronage (daytime and residential population concentrations served).

The project alternatives that emerged from this screening and evaluation process are listed below. The environmental impacts of these alternatives is discussed in Chapter 5 of this report, including the identification of mitigation measures.

Northern Segment

- **Alternative 1a - Shared Bridge.** This alternative would extend from Flower Street at Washington Boulevard to Flower Street near 29th Street.
- **Alternative 1b - Separate Bridge.** The alternative would extend from Flower Street at Washington Boulevard to Flower Street near 29th Street.

Western Segment

- **Alternative 2a - Part Aerial.** This alternative extends from Jefferson Boulevard to a point approximately 1,000 feet west of the Exposition Boulevard/Figueroa Street intersection.
- **Alternative 2b - Part Subway.** The alternative extends from Jefferson Boulevard to a point approximately 1,000 feet west of the Exposition Boulevard/Figueroa Street intersection.
- **Alternative 2c - All At-Grade.** This alternative extends from Jefferson Boulevard to Vermont Avenue.

Other alternatives were also considered, but not addressed in detail in this report because these options failed to satisfy one or more of the overall screen and evaluation criteria. The alternatives in this category are as follows:

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would mean that the Blue Line rail transit extension would not be implemented. Transit service to/from the Exposition Park area and the Los Angeles Central Business District would continue to be accomplished by existing Southern California Rapid Transit District Bus Routes and DASH service provided by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation, and by the future Harbor Transitway project.

This alternative would not satisfy the basic objectives of the project to provide rail transit service between downtown and Exposition Park. Continuation with existing transit services would not require the taking of property or the physical disruption of adjacent land uses. Continuation of the current level of bus/shuttle transit service to the Exposition Park area would not likely reduce vehicle trips --particularly in the travel corridor between downtown and Exposition Park on streets such as Figueroa Street, Flower Street, Grand Avenue and Main Street. As a result, by the Year 2010 increased vehicular congestion and resulting increased air pollution would be anticipated. Failure to provide improved transit service in the area would provide no stimulus for continued private investment and community development, particularly in the underutilized corridor between Figueroa Street and Flower Street extending from Jefferson Boulevard to Washington Boulevard.

ALL AERIAL ALTERNATIVE

The purpose of this alternative would be to maximize rail transit service and minimize street traffic disruption by constructing an elevated light rail alignment that would be grade separated from surface traffic street intersection operations. The advantages of this option would be primarily in the area of transit travel time and eliminating transit/vehicular conflicts at surface streets. This option was not carried forward for detailed analysis because of the following deficiencies:

- The elevated structure would create a variety of adverse urban design and visual effects, including:
 - Disruption of the north-south view corridor along Flower Street.
 - Disruption to the site setting for St. John's Church a National Register of Historic Places property near Flower and Adams.
 - Creating a dominant visual barrier effect along Exposition Boulevard between Exposition Park and the USC campus. Such an effect would be in conflict with the design objectives articulated in the on-going Exposition Park Master Plan process as well as with the preliminary master plan concepts articulated by the University of Southern California's facilities planning management and staff.
- The elevated structure could also result in adverse environmental effects due to its proximity to sensitive land uses.
 - Increased noise level in the vicinity of Trade Tech classrooms. Compared to the alternatives evaluated in the body of this report, an elevated structure would likely result in additional noise impacts. With at-grade operations, noise levels would result in significant impacts at this location. Rail operations on an elevated structure would further increase this impact because of the inherent higher noise generating characteristics of elevated structures (3 decibels higher than at-grade) as well as from the noise of the rail transit operating at higher speeds.
 - Orthopaedic Hospital and 4-Story Apartment Building. Depending on whether the east side or the west side of Flower Street would be used, the alternative would bring an elevated structure in close proximity to either the Orthopaedic Hospital or the 4-story apartment building across the street. In both cases, noise levels would be increased compared to the proposed at-grade alternatives in the same area. Noise levels would be increased by at least 3 decibels because of the higher noise generating characteristics of light rail vehicles using an elevated structure. In addition, noise levels at the hospital or apartment building would further be increased because of the higher light rail speeds attainable on a fully grade separated alignment.
 - St. John's Church. If proximity impacts on Orthopaedic Hospital are to be avoided, the elevated structure would have to be aligned along the west side of Flower Street near the Adams and Flower Street intersection. This alignment would likely create an adverse noise effect at St. John's Church due to proximity of the elevated structure and the higher rail transit operating speeds.

- Apartment Buildings and Second Story Apartments on Flower Street. Between Adams Boulevard and Jefferson Boulevard there are a number of apartments. While it is anticipated that the elevated alignment would be on the east side of the Flower Street, the potential for increased noise exists. In these locations there would be a cumulative effect of increased noise from street traffic, freeway traffic, elevated transitway traffic and rail transit operations.

AT-GRADE WEST SIDE OF FLOWER STREET ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would place the light rail tracks along the west side of Flower Street at a point just south of the Washington and Flower intersection. This option would require the transition of the rail tracks from the east side of Flower Street, north of Washington Boulevard to the west side of Flower Street, south of Washington. The primary disadvantage of this Alternative would be the extensive disruption to access to businesses and residences located on the west side of Flower. The west side alignment would also increase noise impacts for apartments located along this segment of Flower Street.

EAST SIDE OF FREEWAY ALTERNATIVE

The scoping and public meeting process revealed that there was some interest in selecting a rail transit alignment that followed on the east side of the Harbor Freeway. The rail alignment would likely follow Flower Street from Washington Boulevard until it reached the Harbor Freeway near Adams Boulevard. At Adams, the alignment would not cross the freeway, but rather follow the eastern edge of the freeway right-of-way until it reached the railroad tracks and then passed westward under the Harbor Freeway and would join Exposition Boulevard.

The advantages of this option include the availability of either CALTRANS right-of-way on the east side of the freeway or the acquisition of industrial property beyond the Caltrans right-of-way limits. In addition, this alternative could avoid effects on heavily traveled streets by shifting the alignment to the east where there is a significant drop off in traffic volumes. The alternative could also be grade separated at east-west streets. Compared to the west side of the freeway alternatives, public comments raised suggested that this option would provide a better connection to the proposed Caltrans Exposition Park transitway station as well as provide an opportunity to directly tie into the railroad right-of-way now owned by LACTC to provide transit service to the east.

The primary disadvantages of this alternative are as follows:

- Extensive Right-of-way would be required at Orthopaedic Hospital to provide for the transition from Flower Street to the east side of the Harbor Freeway.

- The east side alignment would not satisfy community development objectives. The Figueroa-Flower corridor land uses would not benefit from an alignment where stations would be largely in an industrial area on the east side of the freeway.
- Access along Hope Street to uses such as the new USC parking structure and the Department of Motor Vehicles may be significantly disrupted due to the limited right-of-way available on Hope Street.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In terms of minimizing community disruption during both the construction and the operation phase, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to alternatives addressed in this report. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet regional transportation needs. The No Project Alternative would also result in continued congestion and air pollution in the project area. It would also not fulfill the intent of the Transit Improvement Measures contained within the Air Quality Management Plan.

Of the alternatives discussed in this report, alternatives 1a and 1b would have similar effects in most environmental impact categories, particularly construction-related disruption, right-of-way acquisition, air quality, etc. It should be noted that Alternative 1a would bring the light rail alignment closest to the Orthopaedic Hospital property where the hospital has raised concerns regarding potential impacts. This assessment has found, however, while there may be adverse effects they would likely not be significant.

When alternatives 2a (part aerial), 2b (part subway) and 2c (all at-grade) are compared, the construction effects would be greater for Alternatives 2a and 2b than for 2c. The major environmental advantage would relate to the impacts at the Figueroa/Flower/Exposition/37th Street intersection complex. In this case, the grade-separated alternatives would have distinct traffic operating benefits over the at-grade alternative. Between alternative 2a and 2b, the major environmental factor would be the effect on the urban design character and historic/visual setting of Exposition Park, the Rose Garden, and Natural History Museum. In this case, alternative 2b (part subway) would be environmentally superior because of its reduced visual effect along Exposition Boulevard.

CHAPTER 8

LIST OF PREPARERS, PERSONS CONTACTED, AND REFERENCES

8.1 LEAD AGENCY

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission;

Neil Peterson, Executive Director

A.R. de la Cruz, Director, Central Area

James L. de la Loza, Project Manager, Central Area

Nancy Michali, Project Manager, Central Area

Manit Churanakoses, P.E., Supervisor, Facilities Engineering

8.2 LIST OF PREPARERS

Gruen Associates, Design and Project Management

John Stutsman, Vice President, AICP

Rick Abelson, Urban Designer, ASLA

Don Holloway, P.E., Traffic Engineer

Terry A. Hayes Associates

Terry A. Hayes, AICP, Principal-in-Charge

Ellen LaPorte, Senior Planner, Manager

Cynthia Van Empel, Planner

Fedolia Harris, Assistant Planner

Janet Murphy, Technical Editor

Vanessa Smith, Executive Assistant

Benito A. Sinclair & Associates, Civil and Structural Engineering

Peter P. Zimmerman, P.E., Project Engineer

Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc., Transportation Engineers

Michael P. Meyer, P.E., Traffic Engineer

Abbas Mohaddes, Project Manager

Gannett Fleming

Don Steele, P.E., Project Manager

Manuel Padron Associates

Manuel Padron, Principal

Bruce Emory, Senior Associate

8.3 PERSONS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

California Museum of Science and Industry, Administration, Sue Glad.

California Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, John L. Lewis.

City of Los Angeles, Office of the Mayor, Michael Bodaken.

City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Lighting, Stan Horowitz.

City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Robert Duenas.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Robert Horii.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Fire, Donald O. Manning.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation, Wilford Melton and James Okazaki.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power, Edward Karapetian.

Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, John Spaulding.

Expo Rail, Exposition Rail Committee, Alan Fishel and Darrell R. Clarke.

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, Admissions Office, Jerry Potras and James Grivich.

Natural History Museum of the City of Los Angeles, Mark Rodriguez.

Orthopaedic Hospital, Richard McCarthy.

Saint Vincent de Pauls Church, Sister Diane Donohue.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, Connie Day.

State of California, Governor's Planning and Resource Office, David Nunenkamp.

State of California, Department of Conservation, Stephen Oliva.

State of California, Office of Historic Preservation, Mary Cohn.

University of Southern California, Department of External Affairs, Chris Lowe.

8.4 REFERENCES

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and geology, Special Report 93 "Early Pliocene Sedimentary History of the Los Angeles Basin, California" 1967.

City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Southeast Los Angeles District Plan, January 7, 1980 and amended June 17, 1981.

City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, South Central Los Angeles District Plan, June 1977.

County of Los Angeles, Environmental Health Department, Active and Inactive Landfill Listings and Site Mitigation Log, May 1, 1991 and June 6, 1991.

Department of Conservation, California Division of Mines and Geology, Planning Scenario for a Major Earthquake on the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone, Special Publication 99, 1988.

Hart, Earl W., Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, Revised 1988. Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, Revised 1985.

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, Proposed 30-Year Integrated Transportation Plan (Revised), August 26, 1991.

Orthopaedic Hospital, Cal Trans Impact Report, Cal Trans Impact Workshop Members.

Southern California Association of Governments. Air Quality Management Plan: South Coast Air Basin. 1990.

South Coast Air Quality Management District. A Climatological Air Quality Profile: California South Coast Air Basin. 1980.

State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (HWSS), November 1990.

State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Wildcat Map W1-5, 1988.

State of California, Department of Health Services, Bond Expenditure Plan (BEP), January 10, 1990.

State of California, Department of Health Services, Hazardous Waste Properties and Border Zone Properties (HWP), June 1, 1991.

State of California, Department of Health Services, Abandoned Sites Program, January 4, 1991.

State of California, Department of Health Services, Hazardous Waste Information System (HWIS), August 2, 1990.

State of California, Department of Transportation, Harbor Freeway Transitway, 37th Street Ramps, Supplemental Report, Historic Property Survey and Finding of Effect, May 1990.

State of California, Integrated Waste Management Board, Solid Waste Information System (SWIS), October 1, 1991.

State of California, Water Resources Control Board, Leaking Underground Storage Tank List (LUST), July 1, 1991.

Tinsley, J. C. and Youd, T. L., "Liquefaction-Related Ground Failure in Evaluating Earthquake Hazards in the Los Angeles Region," U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1360, 1985.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Report and General Soil Map, Los Angeles, California, 1969.

United States, Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS), July 15, 1991.

United States, Environmental Protection Agency, National Priority List (NPL), October 25, 1991.

United States, Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Superfund Liens Database (Liens), March 1, 1991.

University of Southern California, Graduate School of Business Administration, The Downtown Area Shuttle Hop: A Ridership Study, May 8, 1991.

Zimmer-Gunsul-Frasca Partnership, Exposition Park Master Plan, November 6, 1991.

9.0 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES

MITIGATED ALTERNATIVE 1b

During the public review period a number of issues were raised regarding the impacts of Alternative 1b, Washington Boulevard to 29th Street (Separate Bridge). As a result of issues raised during the public review process, the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission has developed a modified Alternative 1b which would mitigate the impacts and concerns raised. The mitigated Alternative 1b is presented in this section of the EIR, and hereby replaces Alternative 1b presented in the Draft portion of this EIR. The Draft EIR portion of this report remains unchanged except for the Summary Section 1.0 which has been revised to incorporate this mitigated Alternative 1b as well as any new mitigation measures which have been developed in response to comments raised.

WRITTEN COMMENTS

The following public and private organizations and individuals have provided written comments on the Draft EIR:

- City of Los Angeles Fire Department
- City of Los Angeles, Wastewater Program Management Division
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works
- State of California, Department of Transportation
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- State of California, Public Utilities Commission
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation
- Los Angeles Unified School District
- Southern California Association of Governments
- Orthopaedic Hospital
- Albert C. Martin and Associates
- Fadem & Douglas
- Latham & Watkins
- Eloise Helwig
- Antenna Research Company
- Sierra Club - Angeles Chapter
- Automobile Club of Southern California
- Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission
- Los Angeles Conservancy
- Cox, Castle & Nicholson
- California Museum of Science and Industry
- Zimmer, Gunsul, Frasca Partnership
- University of Southern California
- Expo Greenbelt Bicycle Trail Committee
- Johanna Rosenthal
- T.A. Nelson
- Stef Arnheed
- Mrs. Lois E. Thompson
- Ron Fechter
- Robert Gluckstein

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

A public hearing was held on the Draft EIR on Tuesday, June 23, 1992 at the Los Angeles Trade Technical College's Grand Theater, located at 400 West Washington Boulevard. The following individuals presented testimony at that hearing:

- Michael Madison
- Patsey Carter
- Jaimi Handy
- Eloise Helwig
- H. Randall Stoke
- Mirta Ocana
- Elson Trinidad
- Craig Thompson
- Tut Hayes
- Sister Diane Donoghue
- Bill Hunter
- Charles Hobbs
- James Washington
- Pat Moser
- Robert Richmond
- Sue Glad

ORGANIZATION OF THIS SECTION

This section is divided into two parts in the following order:

PART I - Mitigated Alternative 1b.

PART II - Comments and Responses

Comment letters are presented and specific comments are numbered. Responses to the numbered comments are provided on the pages immediately following the comment letters. The transcript of the public hearing can be found with response to comments at the end of this section of the report.

PART I

MITIGATED ALTERNATIVE 1b

ALTERNATIVE 1B WASHINGTON BOULEVARD TO 29TH STREET (SEPARATE BRIDGE) DESCRIPTION

This mitigated alternative replaces Alternative 1b presented in the Draft EIR in response to issues raised during the public review and comment period. This mitigated alternative would be at-grade and would extend along the east side of Flower Street from the Washington Street Station to about 22nd Street. At 22nd Street it would cross Flower Street where the proposed 23rd Street Station would be located on the west side of Flower Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets. At 23rd Street, the line would curve further west behind the four-story apartment building located on Flower Street. Just south of the Harbor Freeway crossing, the line would curve to the east and would run along the east side of Flower Street from Adams Boulevard to the Jefferson Street Station. The LRT line would become elevated just south of the apartment building and would continue on an elevated structure across the depressed Harbor Freeway surface to about 33rd Street where it would again be at-grade at the proposed Jefferson Street Station. This alignment is shown on **Figure 9.0-1**.


ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Land Use

This mitigated alternative would require the acquisition of the property located on the west side of Flower Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets as well as the four-story apartment building located on the west side of Flower Street, south of 23rd Street. The property between 22nd and 23rd Streets contains a one-story industrial type building on the northern portion and a parking lot on the southern portion. This mitigated alternative would therefore result in the displacement of this industrial building and the surface parking spaces south of the structure. This mitigated alternative would require a taking of the building and displacement of the residents in the building (see Population and Housing discussion which follows).

This alternative would mitigate several impacts and concerns of Orthopaedic Hospital related to land use including the following:

- The LRT line would not interfere with pedestrian access to the hospital entrance nor with the vehicular circulation into the two driveway entrances into the hospital (see Transportation and Circulation discussion which follows).



LEGEND:

- At-grade
- - - Above-grade
- Station Location



Source: Gruen Associates



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 9.0-1
ALTERNATIVE 1b
With Mitigation

Population and Housing

As discussed under Land Use, this alternative would result in the displacement of one industrial building located on the west side of Flower Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets and the apartment building located at 2315 Flower Street, south of 23rd Street. The industrial building is currently leased by the Spaghetti Factory where food manufacturing occurs. This use would be displaced resulting in the need for the company to move this operation elsewhere. Employees of this business would likely be relocated with the company rather than eliminated. The apartment building has a total of 63 rental units and one retail tenant. Assuming the average household size of 3.5 persons for the census tracts in this area, it is estimated that up to 221 persons could reside in the building. All residents and the retail tenant would be displaced under this alternative compared to Alternative 1a and the previous 1b which would not displace any industrial businesses or residential units. The LACTC is committed to providing relocation housing as well as compensation to the property owner and business occupant of the industrial building/property as described in the mitigation measures below. Implementation of the mitigation measures which follow would eliminate significant displacement impacts of this alternative.

The following mitigation measures are incorporated into this Final EIR for this mitigated Alternative 1b:

- The LACTC will be required to provide compensation to the occupant and owner of the industrial building/property as per the Federal Uniform Relocation Act & Real Estate Acquisition & Relocation Policies Act of 1970 and California's Government Code Section 7260. The LACTC will consult with the owners/occupants of the building/property to develop appropriate mitigation/compensation for the displacement of the business and the taking of the property.
- The LACTC will implement a relocation plan for tenants of the apartment building located at 2315 Flower Street. The relocation plan will be developed as a result of a study currently being completed by a relocation consultant in coordination with the tenants of the building and with the Esperanza Community Housing Corporation.
- The Relocation Consultant will provide an analysis of the potential displacement of the apartment building located at 2315 Flower Street which will determine the following:
 - The aggregate relocation needs of all persons to be displaced and a detailed explanation as to how those needs are to be met.

- An analysis of relocation housing resources (private housing, subsidized housing, and special housing problems), and identification of any social services that the tenants may need.
- A detailed description of the LACTC's relocation advisory services program, including specific procedures for locating and referring eligible persons to comparable decent, safe and sanitary replacement housing.
- A detailed plan by which any last resort housing is to be provided.
- Estimated relocation costs.

Transportation and Circulation

This alternative would place the LRT line on the east side of Flower Street from 23rd Street to about Adams Boulevard. This would result in eliminating and thereby mitigating several transportation impacts as follows:

- The 23rd Street Station would be located on the west side of Flower Street, north of 22nd Street and thus would not interfere with the pedestrian circulation into the L.A. Trade Tech building and would not require the closure of the exit driveway from L.A. Trade Tech's parking lot, north of 23rd Street.
- The LRT line would not interfere with pedestrian access to the hospital entrance nor with the vehicular circulation into the two driveway entrances into the hospital (see Transportation and Circulation discussion which follows). Vehicular access would be provided via a contra-flow lane on the east side of Flower Street on the block adjacent to the hospital. The street capacity on Flower Street, adjacent to the hospital would be maintained without interference of the LRT line. Both Alternatives 1a and the previous Alternative 1b would require signalized warning devices at the hospital driveway entrances which could result in a negative impact to the traffic flow on Flower Street (see EIR Section 5.3).
- The LRT line would be on the east side of Flower Street south of Adams Boulevard. Therefore, the existing 77 parking spaces on the west side of Flower Street would not be restricted as they would be under the previous Alternative 1b.
- The LRT line would transition to the east side of Flower Street at about Adams Boulevard as an aerial structure. The LRT line would remain an aerial structure to about the Jefferson Street Station and would not impact vehicular movements at the surface level along this portion of the line segment. The prior Alternative 1b would have required the signal at 28th Street to control the traffic on Flower during the train transition to the east side of Flower Street.

This alternative would also mitigate impacts and concerns of St. John's Church related to land use including:

- This alternative would not require the acquisition of any land from St. John's Church as it would be located on the east side of Flower Street from about Adams Boulevard. Therefore, this alternative would not displace any of the church's surface parking spaces as would the prior Alternative 1b.

Air Quality

This alternative would mitigate the air quality impacts of the previous Alternative 1b at St. John's Church because the previous LRT line would have been at-grade and on the same side of the street as St. John's Church. Under this mitigated Alternative 1b, the LRT line would be elevated and on the opposite side of Flower Street adjacent to St. John's Church. This alternative would thus eliminate and therefore mitigate the previously identified significant air quality impact to St. John's Church.

Noise

This alternative would mitigate several impacts to Orthopaedic Hospital, L.A. Trade Tech., and St. John's Church related to noise including the following:

- The LRT would be located about 200 to 300 feet west of the hospital building thus eliminating potential noise and vibration impacts that could occur under Alternative 1a or the previous Alternative 1b.
- The 23rd Street Station would be located on the south side of Flower Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets and would place the station and line about 150 to 200 feet away from L.A. Trade Tech. classrooms, on the east side of Flower Street thus eliminating and mitigating the noise impacts expected from the prior Alternative 1b.
- As noted above, under this mitigated Alternative 1b, the LRT line would be elevated and on the opposite side of Flower Street, adjacent to St. John's Church. This alternative would eliminate and therefore mitigate the previously identified minimal noise impacts to St. John's Church.

Geology and Hydrology

This alternative, like all other Alternatives discussed in the EIR is not expected to result in any adverse effects on local geology or hydrology in the project area.

Construction

The aerial portion of this mitigated alternative would likely require more construction time due to the elevated portion compared to the previous Alternative 1b (at-grade, separate bridge).

This alternative would have the same utility relocation impacts as Alternative 1a, except there would be no sewer line relocations required for this alternative.

Public Services

Schools. Same impacts as discussed for the prior Alternative 1b in this EIR except for the noise and driveway changes at L.A. Trade Tech noted under the Transportation Circulation and Noise discussions above.

Police and Law Enforcement. Same impacts as discussed for the prior Alternative 1b in this EIR.

Fire Protection. The elevated portion of this alternative, from about Adams Boulevard to 31st Street, would be located on the east side of Flower Street and thus would not impair fire protection or emergency access at the cross streets between Adams Boulevard and 30th Street as would the previous Alternative 1b (where the line would be at-grade on the west side of Flower Street between Adams Boulevard and 31st Street).

Energy Conservation

Similar impacts as discussed for the prior Alternative 1b in this EIR.

Biological Resources

This mitigated Alternative 1b would place the rail line on the east side of Flower Street from Adams Boulevard to about 31st Street immediately adjacent to the existing retaining wall of the Harbor Freeway. It is likely that the existing palms on the east side of this section of the route could be retained compared to the prior Alternative 1b where the palms on the west side of Flower Street in this same section of the route would require removal and relocation.

Risk of Upset

Similar impacts as discussed for the prior Alternative 1b in this EIR.

Aesthetics

The aerial portion of this mitigated alternative would create a less significant visual effect along this portion of the route than the prior Alternative 1b. Under this alternative the

LRT would be adjacent to and parallel to the existing retaining wall of the Harbor Freeway. It would be at a lower height than the I-110 Transitway and it would tend to blend in with that existing retaining wall and future I-110 Transitway structure rather than creating a new dominant physical feature along this stretch. No significant visual effects are anticipated from this mitigated alternative.

Cultural Resources

Similar impacts as discussed for the prior Alternative 1b in this EIR.

PART II
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Response to the Los Angeles Fire Department

1. Comment acknowledged. If either the aerial or subway alternative is selected in addition to the mitigated Alternative 1b, which has an aerial portion, the Rail Construction Corporation's Metro Rail Fire/Life Safety Criteria would be used for the project. This mitigation measure has been added to the Summary Table 1.4-1 in this Final EIR.
2. Comment acknowledged. Should this alternative be selected, the LACTC would work with the Hilton Hotel as well as the Fire Department to develop an alternative and acceptable emergency access to the hotel. This has been added to the mitigation measures for Alternative 2c in the Summary Table 1.4-1 of this Final EIR.
3. Comment acknowledged. Should this Alternative be selected, any necessary improvements to the water system or to the existing fire hydrants due to the construction or any street ending in a cul-de-sac would be at the applicant's expense. This has been added to the mitigation measures in the Summary Table 4.1-1 of this Final EIR.

Response to the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering

4. The proposed rail project is in the conceptual planning stage at the present time when Alternatives are being considered as presented in the EIR. Once a preferred alternative is selected then preliminary engineering analysis would have to be completed and later a construction schedule would be developed. It is not possible at the present time to provide an estimated construction schedule as the preferred alternative has not as yet been chosen. As noted in Section 5.7 Construction of the EIR, the construction would vary between alternatives from 6 to 12 months for the northern leg (Alternatives 1a and 1b) and between 10 to 16 months for the southern leg (Alternatives 2a, 2b and 2c). All of the alternatives would affect some portion of the sewer line segments along the LRT route. The LACTC shall be responsible for coordinating with the Bureau of Engineering regarding these alterations as well as the expected timing, construction schedule, once an alternative has been selected and the preliminary engineering work is completed.
5. LACTC will continue to inform and coordinate with the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering as to the selected rail alternative as well as the eventual construction schedule as the proposed rail project will require construction and other permits from the Department of Public Works. Should the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way along Exposition Boulevard be selected by the Bureau of Engineering as the preferred alternative route for the East Central Interceptor Sewer, coordination would be required with the LACTC as they are the current owners of the Southern Pacific Railroad Right-of-way where the proposed LRT line would be located.

6. Comment acknowledged. As noted in Response #5, the LRT line would require permits and approvals from the Bureau of Engineering in regard to any relocations. Access to the local sewers would be maintained and the Bureau's Central District would be responsible for reviewing the proposed engineering drawings for any sewer relocations to accrue that the project would meet all of the Bureau's requirements.

Response to the California State Department of Transportation

7. Comment acknowledged. Under Alternative 1a, the rail would share the existing Flower Street Bridge. LACTC would have to coordinate with CALTRANS to accommodate future widening plans as well as the northward extension of the I-110 Transitway and upgrading of the structure to meet current earthquake standards.
8. The mitigated Alternative 1b, includes a separate bridge on the west side of Flower Street which will accommodate the future widening and northward extension of the I-110 Transitway, and eliminates conflicts with the southbound on-ramp to the I-110 Transitway. See also Part I of this Chapter 9.0 which describes in detail this mitigated alternative.
9. The Draft EIR acknowledges on page 5-54 that a bus layover facility for the I-110 Transitway may be possible in the Adams Boulevard to 23rd Street area. Coordination between CALTRANS and LACTC would be necessary to further explore these possibilities.
10. Comment acknowledged. In response to the issue raised which was also identified in the EIR on page 5-15, an additional mitigation measure has been included in this Final EIR which would facilitate pedestrian access from the Jefferson Street Station to the I-110 Transitway Station. The mitigation measure identified below would be applicable to all of the Alternatives identified in the EIR as well as the mitigated Alternative 1b discussed in Part I of this Section. This measure would allow pedestrian access from the Jefferson Street Station via a surface sidewalk south along Flower Street to Exposition Boulevard. From about Exposition Boulevard there would be an elevated pedestrian crossing, across the freeway off-ramp to the east then south across Exposition Boulevard. The elevated crossing would then extend south halfway between Exposition Boulevard and 37th Street where it would step down to surface level and provide access east to the I-110 Transitway station.

If Alternative 2b (Part Subway) were selected as the preferred alternative another option for access to the Transitway would be to extend the portals from the optional Exposition Boulevard subway station east to provide pedestrian access east to meet with the Transitway station.

Both these options have been include in this Final EIR as mitigation measures herein and in the Summary Table 1.4-1 of this Final EIR.

11. See Response #10 above.
12. Item 27 on **Table 4.6-1** shall be modified to include the future northward extension of the transitway as a component to this Related Project.
13. See Response #10.
14. **Figure 5.5-2** is intended to convey the general relationship of the rail line to the adjacent buildings for purposes of public presentation. This figure is a summary of detailed engineering cross sections that accompany the plan and profile for the alignment. The plan and profile sheets are scaled drawings that also show right-of-way widths. The plan and profile sheets are available for review at LACTC.
15. It is acknowledged that portions of the proposed project would affect State Right-of-Way. All appropriate agreements and permits will be obtained once CEQA clearance has been obtained, preferred alignments have been identified and the project proceeds into final design.
16. Comment acknowledged.
17. LACTC will consider shade trees along the route between Exposition Boulevard and 23rd Street. As noted in the EIR on page 5-102, the proposed light rail shall include landscaping along the entire route. Landscaping shall consist of native California draught tolerant plant species and as many relocated palms as feasible. As noted on page 5-124 of the EIR, the LACTC will work with the Bureau of Street Lighting, Assessment Division in regard to the design and possible replacement of street lights along the rail route.
18. Comment acknowledged.

Response to the South Coast Air Quality Management District

19. The text on page 5-62 shall be revised as follows to reflect 1991 air quality monitoring data from the North Main Street Station:
 - **Carbon Monoxide** - The maximum recorded one-hour concentration in 1991 was 12 ppm. The State 1-hour standard of 20 ppm was not exceeded in 1991 nor in the preceding five years. The 8-hour standard was not exceeded in 1991 but was exceeded an average of 2 days per year in each of the preceding five years.
 - **Ozone** - The 1991 maximum recorded one-hour concentration was 0.19 ppm. The State one-hour standard of 0.09 ppm was exceeded for 59 days in 1991.

- **Nitrogen Oxides** - The maximum one-hour concentration recorded in 1991 was 0.38 ppm and the 1-hour standard of 0.25 ppm was exceeded on 5 days during that year. During the 1986-1991 period, the greatest number of days the standard was exceeded occurred in 1986 (7 days).
 - **Total Suspended Particulates** - The maximum 24-hour concentration recorded in 1991 was 183 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).
 - **Sulfate** - The maximum 24-hour concentration in 1991 was $23.1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. State standards were not exceeded.
 - **Lead** - The maximum 24-hour concentration in 1991 was $0.21 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. Federal and State standards of $1.5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ were not exceeded in 1991 or during the preceding five-year time period.
 - **Particulate (PM_{10})** - The maximum 24-hour concentration recorded in 1991 was 151 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The State standard of $50 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was exceeded for 31 days in 1991.
20. The Draft EIR acknowledges that there may also be localized negative air quality impacts.
21. Construction of the project would occur over an approximate eight month period. Construction activities required to complete the proposed project include removing the existing asphalt, performing minor grading over some portions of the site, laying tracks, laying concrete in the trackbed and asphalt to cover exposed soil surfaces. Station construction would occur concurrently, but is anticipated to constitute a minority of construction emissions, relative to asphalt laying. For the purposes of performing a worst case analysis, it has been assumed that construction would occur in 500-foot-long segments and that each segment would be completed before moving to the next segment. As noted, emissions would be highest during asphalt laying, which would exceed the reactive organic gas threshold. The particulate threshold would be exceeded during right-of-way grading. The table below outlines potential construction-related emissions from construction of the project.

Construction mitigation measures are presented on p.5-91 to 5-92 of the EIR which includes the appropriate measures from Attachment 2.

TABLE 1: CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

Phase	Source	Pounds Per Day				
		CO	ROG	NOX	SOX	PM10
Pavement Demo						
	Equipment	51.52	7.73	61.82	5.15	7.73
	Area Source	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.66
	Haul Trucks	19.28	1.99	6.14	0.41	122.75
	Vehicles	8.51	0.53	0.88	0.07	43.05
	TOTAL	79.32	10.25	68.85	5.63	176.19
ROW Grading						
	Equipment	51.52	7.73	61.82	5.15	7.73
	Area Source	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	224.80
	Haul Trucks	23.79	2.45	7.57	0.50	151.42
	Vehicles	0.85	0.05	0.09	0.01	0.79
	TOTAL	76.16	10.23	69.49	5.66	384.74
Tracks/Re-paving						
	Equipment	25.76	3.86	30.91	2.58	3.86
	Area Source	0.00	113500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Cement Trucks	19.28	1.99	6.14	0.41	11.31
	Vehicles	0.85	0.05	0.09	0.01	0.79
	TOTAL	45.89	113505.91	37.14	2.99	15.96
Station Erection						
	Equipment	51.52	7.73	61.82	5.15	7.73
	Area Source	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Haul Trucks	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Worker Vehicles	6.38	0.40	0.66	0.05	5.92
	Other Vehicles	11.21	0.90	2.20	0.15	52.47
	TOTAL	69.12	9.02	64.68	5.36	66.12
Station Finishing						
	Equipment	25.76	3.86	30.91	2.58	3.86
	Area Source	0.00	4.24	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Haul Trucks	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Worker Vehicles	8.51	0.53	0.88	0.07	7.90
	Other Vehicles	11.21	0.90	2.20	0.15	52.47
	TOTAL	45.48	9.53	33.99	2.80	64.23
Worst Case		79.32	113505.91	69.49	5.66	384.74
Percent of Threshold		14%	151341%	69%	4%	256%
Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates						

22. The carbon monoxide analysis contained in the Draft EIR contains an assessment of the impacts at 10 representative sensitive locations along the route that may be affected by delays at intersections. It does not address air quality impacts at intersections where there is no adjacent sensitive land use.
23. Special events at the Coliseum or USC are not part of the proposed rail transit project and are not included as part of the air quality assessment. It is acknowledged that when these events occur --particularly Coliseum events -- there is considerable traffic congestion in the project vicinity. It is envisioned that the proposed project would lessen these conditions by providing additional transit service to the area as well as by providing a link between downtown parking areas and the Coliseum and possibly reducing event-related vehicle trips from the project area.
24. The determination of the location of grade separations is not solely based on an air quality assessment or on an arbitrary level of service criteria of "E". A variety of factors are involved in determining the feasibility and cost effectiveness of proposed grade separations. The alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR have included grade separations where warranted by traffic conditions and which are feasible to construct.
25. Page 5-55 through 5-61 of the Draft EIR discuss traffic impact mitigation measures. With the exception of the Figueroa/Exposition intersection, the mitigation measures proposed would obtain a LOS D.
26. The nature of the proposed project as an extension of the Blue Line through a highly developed area precludes the inclusion of parking at station areas. Thus, the Draft EIR contains no mitigation measures associated with park and ride lots. It is acknowledged, however, that Coliseum parking areas could be made available for such use and that the LACTC would coordinate with the Coliseum Commission to achieve that purpose.
27. See Response #26 above.
28. Pages 5-99 to 5-100 of the Draft EIR addresses energy impacts at Stations and associated mitigation measures. It should be recognized that light rail stations are kiosk-type structures and are not buildings with substantial energy requirements.

Response to the State of California Public Utilities Commission

30. The at-grade Alternative 1b has been modified in this Final EIR to mitigate a number of issues raised in the public response period to the Draft EIR. The mitigated Alternative 1b would place the LRT line on the east side of Flower Street from about Adams Boulevard to Exposition Boulevard. The LRT would also be elevated along this segment from about Adams Boulevard to about 31st Street. This

mitigated alternative would result in the least number of streets which will cross the light rail tracks and minimize LRT/vehicular conflicts.

31. Comment acknowledged. Crossing warning devices for vehicular and pedestrian crossings would be consistent with the crossing warning devices used on the existing Blue Line.
32. Please see the modified Alternative 1b discussion in Part I of this section 9.0 which would place the LRT line primarily on the east side of Flower Street with two crossings; one at-grade from east to west at about 22nd Street and one grade separated from west to east at about Adams Boulevard.
33. See Response #10.
34. It is envisioned that at-grade crossings will be controlled by a combination of traffic signals, and/or crossing gates and bells.
35. LACTC will be responsible for maintaining the warning devices.
36. The proposed Blue Line Extension utilizes railroad right-of-way owned by the LACTC. The project will not cross any other active rail service. Where warranted by traffic conditions and where feasible to construct, the proposed project includes grade separations at major arterials.

Response to City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation

37. The Draft EIR did evaluate the feasibility of providing a 70-foot curb-to-curb width along Flower Street. North of 23rd Street, the existing 90-foot right-of-way will accommodate at-grade rail operations and the three southbound lanes plus parking. Thus, the project does not cause a significant traffic impact in that segment. From 23rd Street to approximately 30th Street, the project is now proposed to be elevated as a mitigation measure, and this will lessen the need to utilize right-of-way for at-grade operations, thereby leaving room within existing right-of-way for the three southbound lanes and parking. Between 30th Street and Jefferson Boulevard, there is not adequate right-of-way available to accommodate the three lanes plus parking, together with the Jefferson Street Station. It was felt that the land use impacts associated with having to purchase the additional right-of-way would outweigh the impacts associated with parking prohibition in this segment of the alignment. South of Jefferson Street, there is adequate room to provide the three lanes plus parking, however, the traffic volumes justify utilizing the curb lane for a travel lane, at least during the peak period. The project also proposes widening at the intersection with Exposition Boulevard to provide dual right turn lanes from southbound Flower Street onto Exposition.

38. The mitigated Alternative 1b will shift the alignment from the eastside to the westside between 21st and 22nd Streets. This will require that a signal be installed north of the train crossover. The most logical place for such a signal would be at 21st Street. A signalized pedestrian crossing therefore could also be provided at 21st Street.
39. In order to provide dedicated left turn lanes at each location where turns are permitted across the tracks, an additional 10 feet of right-of-way would be required on the westside of the street for several hundred feet in advance and beyond each such turn lane. It would not be feasible to obtain these turn lanes simply through parking removals and at the same time maintain three southbound through travel lanes. The additional right-of-way takes would cause significant land use impacts. The alternative of prohibiting left turns at the intersections was evaluated in the EIR and found to worsen levels of service due the redistribution of left turning vehicles to alternate routes. It is proposed that the turns across the tracks be controlled by signal indications and that driveways also be signalled with electric signs similar to the ones in place along Flower Street north of the Santa Monica Freeway along the existing Blue Line.
40. The station location near 23rd Street has been shifted to the westside of the street and is now located outside of the existing Flower Street alignment. The roadway between 23rd Street and Adams Boulevard will not be impacted by mitigated Alternative 1b as the line would be grade separated at that point. The roadway width and lane configurations between 23rd Street and Adams Boulevard will be those proposed by LADOT.
41. See Response #40 above.
42. The mitigated Alternative 1b with the elevated segment extending to south of the Transitway on-ramp will have no impact on the 28th Street intersection. The previously proposed at-grade alignment had been assumed to include signalization of the 28th Street intersection, but that will no longer be required as part of the revised mitigated Alternative 1b.
43. The four lanes can be accommodated within the existing right-of-way by prohibiting parking in advance and beyond 30th Street.
44. Flower Street is proposed to be widened to four through lanes at Jefferson Boulevard to mitigate the increased traffic at this location rather than a grade separation which would be more costly. The provision of a separate left turn lane at Jefferson, in addition to the three through lanes proposed, will require additional right-of-way on the westside of Flower and result in land use impacts along the westside of the street.
45. See Response #44 above.

-
46. The proposed light rail alignment has been located as close to the CALTRANS right-of-way as possible, taking into consideration CALTRANS' plans to widen the freeway as part of the Harbor Freeway Transitway project.
 47. The EIR concludes that the intersection of Figueroa and Exposition will be at level of service F in the future, either with or without the proposed project, but that the project does create an impact at this intersection which requires mitigation. The subway and aerial alignments are potential mitigation alternatives that were evaluated in the EIR. The prohibition of left turns from eastbound Exposition to northbound Figueroa Street was another potential mitigation measure evaluated. Mitigation measures were proposed at the Flower/Exposition intersection to allow it to operate at an acceptable level of service with the trains. These measures include restriping the freeway off-ramp, widening Exposition Boulevard under the Harbor Freeway to create a third westbound lane, and widening flower to provide four through lanes, one exclusive right and one optional through/right lanes at Exposition. None of the alternatives will impact the grade of the off-ramp from the Harbor Freeway.
 48. The project has been designed to maintain 10-foot sidewalks wherever possible.
 49. Detailed Worksite Traffic Control Plans and Circulation Plans will be prepared as part of the final design plans for the project. The plans will specify the construction staging and identify the minimum number of lanes to be maintained as travel lanes at all times and during peak periods. They will also detail the signing and striping changes and any detour plans necessary to accommodate the construction activity. The plans will also stipulate the hours during which construction activity may occur, and will discourage major construction activity in the hours preceding and following major sporting events at Exposition Park. LADOT, CALTRANS and the California Highway Patrol will be given the opportunity to review the Worksite Traffic Control Plans prior to their finalization.
 50. Traffic signal controls will be provided at crossover locations.
 51. Comment noted. Please see revised text on page 1-7.
 52. The correct meaning one three-car trains. Please see revised text on page 1-7.
 53. With the exception of the Optional Vermont Station, all stations are planned as three-car platforms. At the current time, it is not feasible to provide a three-car platform at the optional Vermont Station without closing the median break at Menlo Avenue and Exposition Boulevard. The two-car platform should be adequate for early year operations. In the long-term, possible circulation changes in this area may allow lengthening of the platform; or, the station may be moved to the west of Vermont Avenue.

-
54. See revised **Table 1.4-1**
 55. Comment noted.
 56. See Response #53.
 57. The lane configurations used in the traffic analysis are consistent with those mentioned in the comment, and were based on plans provided to LACTC by LADOT. The terminology describing Figueroa and Flower Streets as a one-way couplet was not technically correct, as noted. While Flower will be predominantly one-way southbound, with the exception of the block between Adams and 23rd, Figueroa will be two way, but with more northbound lanes than southbound lanes (off-center operation).
 58. It is not anticipated that the closure of the driveway on Flower Street and conversion of the driveway on 23rd Street to two-way operation would have resulted in any significant impacts, but the closure will no longer be necessary with the mitigated Alternative 1b, incorporating the elevated segment. The train crossover (from eastside to westside) will occur north of the Trade Tech driveway, so it will no longer need to be closed due to the location of the station.
 59. The description of Alternative 1b can be reworded to state that positive control will be provided at the mid-block crossover, as required by LADOT (See Comment #50.). The most logical form of positive control would be a traffic signal which could also control vehicles turning into and out of the hospital and pedestrians who now cross at a mid-block crosswalk where the train crossover is proposed. The design of the positive control will be finalized during project design to the satisfaction of LADOT.
 60. Comment noted. See errata sheet in this EIR.
 61. **Figures 5.3-1 and 5.3-2** correctly depict Figueroa Street as having left turn channelization. The text is an abbreviated description of the street.
 62. The intersection is repeated on the next page as noted by the commentor.
 63. The text in the Final EIR should note that Secondary Highways have rights-of-way that are approximately 84 feet wide with 66 feet curb-to-curb, as noted on Bureau of Engineering Standard Drawing D-22549. See errata sheet.
 64. Adams Boulevard and Jefferson Boulevard both have left turn channelization. See Response #61.
 65. Comment noted. See errata sheet in this EIR.

- 66. Comment is noted. See Response #61.
- 67. Comment noted. The description of Dash Route C will be added to the Final EIR.
- 68. The words "contra-flow" will be deleted from the Final EIR.
- 69. See Response #57.
- 70. The lane configurations reflected on **Figures 5.3-3** and **5-3.4** were based on the "Advanced Plan; Harbor Freeway (I-110) Transitway Figueroa Street - Flower Street 38th Street to 21st Street" provided to LACTC by LADOT at the outset of this EIR process, as well as existing geometrics along Washington Boulevard. The See Response #49.
- 71. See Response #70.
- 72. See Response #70.
- 73. See Response #70.
- 74. See Response #70.
- 75. See Response #70.
- 76. See Response #70.
- 77. See Response #70.
- 78. See Response #70.
- 80. Comment noted. The analysis was conducted with the lane configurations available at the time of the Draft EIR. See also Response #49.
- 81. The introduction to the Impact Section (page 5-28) outlined the approach to the methodology and described the planned transportation improvements which will be implemented through projects other than the Exposition Park Branch Line. This includes the double left turn lanes on Exposition Boulevard at Figueroa Street. The impact of the changes in lane configurations and signal phasing changes were taken into account in the level of service calculations upon which the impact analysis is based. It was concluded in the EIR that the at-grade operation of the light rail line through the Figueroa/Exposition intersection would cause a significant negative impact.
- 82. See Response #39.

-
83. The analysis of the train movements through the Washington Boulevard/Flower Street intersection was based on the assumption that a dedicated southbound left turn lane would be maintained. There currently is a dedicated left turn lane. If the conversion of Flower Street to one-way southbound operation would result in the redesignation of this exclusive left turn lane to an optional through/left turn lane, the mitigation measure for the proposed rail project would be to convert it back to a dedicated left turn lane so that it would operate in the manner described in the EIR. This would be consistent with LADOT's earlier comments requesting dedicated left turn lanes wherever vehicles will turn across the tracks.
84. The lane configurations at Flower Street and 37th Street are the same on these two figures because the proposed project does not include any changes to the lane configurations at this intersection.
85. The eastbound lanes on Exposition Boulevard will go through to 37th Street, not Exposition Boulevard (similar to **Figure 5.3-4**). Both Exposition Boulevard and 37th Street will be operated as one-way streets between Figueroa Street and Hope Street, in conjunction with the implementation of the Harbor Freeway Transitway improvements, in accordance with plans provided to LACTC by LADOT.
86. The southbound left turns were prohibited at this intersection as part of the proposed alternative in order to make the Adams/Flower intersection operate at an acceptable level of service with the northbound lane between Adams and 23rd Street.
87. The figure shows the proposed lane configurations for this alignment alternative. It was noted earlier that LADOT desires to have separate left turn lanes and that this will require additional right-of-way.
88. See Response #38.
89. The assumption in the Draft EIR was that all four-legged intersections, where the trains would cross through the intersection, would have to be signalized if they were not already signalized. This would provide a positive means of controlling vehicles crossing the tracks. It was assumed that 30th Street would have been signalized, but it is a minor street and was therefore not one of the key streets included in the level of service analysis. The mitigated Alternative 1b, with the elevated segment to south of 30th Street makes this a moot point, since the trains will no longer cross this intersection at-grade.
90. In Comment #76, it was stated that there would be separate left turn and right turn lanes on northbound Flower Street at 23rd Street. This comment states that there will be a combined lane. The mitigated Alternative 1b, with the elevated segment and westside alignment between 22nd Street and Adams Boulevard will not effect the lane configurations at Flower Street and 23rd Street.

-
91. The lane configurations described here are those that were proposed for this alternative. It has been noted elsewhere that LADOT desires separate left turn lanes and phases at many of these intersections. The mitigated Alternative 1b makes this a moot point at this location, since the project will now be grade separated above Adams Boulevard and have no impact on this intersection.
 92. See Responses #39, #45, and #46.
 93. See page 5-25. The definition of significant impact utilized in this report was the officially adopted LADOT policy which only recognizes significant impacts at levels of service E or F. The proposed definition which includes a sliding scale for v/c ratio changes at intersections operating at levels better than E, has not yet been officially adopted as city-wide policy and was therefore not utilized in this analysis.
 94. The description of the mid-block crossing on page 5-42 and its potential use as a signalized pedestrian crossing on page 5-52 are consistent with the observations made by LADOT in this comment. The distance from the crosswalk to 23rd Street is approximately 250 feet, so if mid-block pedestrian crossings were prohibited, it would increase pedestrian walking distances by about 500 feet (250 to/from 23rd Street in each direction). However, this would be for the prior Alternative 1b. the mitigated Alternative 1b would not require pedestrians to cross the tracks twice between 23rd Street and Adams Boulevard.
 95. A mid-block signalized pedestrian crossing at Orthopaedic Hospital would be required to accommodate Alternative 1a. This signal would be required to be interconnected with the Flower and 23rd Streets signal. Level of service calculation for the mid-block crossing are not included because of the interconnection
 96. The mitigated Alternative 1b will provide a grade separation above the 28th Street intersection, so this intersection will not be significantly impacted by the proposed project.
 97. The decision to organize the analysis with the combined segments rather than each alternative in each segment analyzed individually was made by the LACTC project EIR team. The intention was to present a proposed alignment for the entire corridor first (Alternative 1a and 2c), and then provide the comparison of alternatives to the proposed project in each segment. The impact at 28th Street and Flower Street is due to the need to add an all-red phase to the signal to accommodate the transition of trains across the street from the westside to the eastside, just south of 28th Street. This would not be required for the mitigated Alternative 1b.
 98. The word "westbound" will be replaced with the word "eastbound."

-
99. The placements of columns supporting the aerial structure was carefully evaluated in order to identify a geometric plan that would accommodate the dual left turn lanes from eastbound Exposition to northbound Figueroa. The narrower lane widths are what cause the impact, based on the operations methodology of calculating level of service.
100. This comment is correct in noting that the impacted intersections are located in the Segment 1 portion of the alignment.
101. It may not be "clear" that the Branch Line will help alleviate some of the weekend traffic and parking impacts associated with events at Exposition Park, but in the opinion of the EIR authors, it is probable. There is a significant resource of unused parking in the downtown area on weekends which will become directly accessible to the Exposition Park area following implementation of the Branch Line. There will undoubtedly be some people who will find it more attractive to park in an uncongested area, particularly downtown employees who may have paid for monthly parking at their work sites, and travel via the light rail line, than to drive through the Exposition Park area congestion to/from events. Experience at other stadiums (e.g., Oakland Coliseum with BART access) indicates that a substantial number of people will take rail transit to sporting events if it is convenient, and this is not predicated on restricted parking or unreasonably high parking charges.
102. Preliminary discussions with the operators of these parking facilities indicates that they will be available for Branch Line riders.
103. The abbreviations in Table 5.3-9 are stated in lay persons' terminology and were not intended to reflect the precise wording of the signs. The comment is correct to note that the precise wording on the signs will likely be "Tow Away, No Stopping Anytime" rather than "No Parking."
104. Comment acknowledged. As noted earlier, it is assumed that there will be a separate southbound left turn phase. The Final EIR text will be revised to state that the pedestrian crossing would be timed to coincide with the southbound through Flower Street traffic.
105. Comment acknowledged.
106. Along most of the alignment south of 23rd Street, the elimination of crossing opportunities at "T" intersections would result in pedestrians potentially having to walk up to one block (about 350 feet) further to reach a signalized crosswalk. It is correct, that with the previously proposed plan, north of 23rd Street, this additional walking distance could have been up to two blocks (700 feet), but with the mitigated Alternative 1b, this potential impact will be reduced. With the installation of a signal at 21st Street to control vehicles north of the train crossover, a pedestrian

signal could also be installed which would reduce the maximum potential extra walking to a crosswalk to the 350 feet stated in the EIR.

107. The potential maximum increase in the walking distance from one side of the freeway to the other could be as much as 1,000 feet, not the 500 feet stated in the Draft EIR, for persons traveling from 35th Street on one side of the freeway to 35th Street on the other side of the freeway. They would have to walk the complete maximum 500 feet on either side of the freeway. For other pedestrians with origins and/or destinations somewhere mid-block, the extra walking distance would be reduced.
108. It is understood that LADOT's desired minimum sidewalk width is 10 feet. The project has been designed to provide 10-foot sidewalks wherever possible. The placement of columns in the sidewalk and the resulting restriction in clear sidewalk width to as little as six feet was identified as an impact associated with the aerial alternative.
110. Restriping can be an effective mitigation measure if the restriping provides an additional lane, thereby increasing capacity, or if it results in lane designations which more closely reflect the turning movement demands at the intersection.
111. One additional southbound lane is proposed.
112. These lanes would be provided through roadway widenings.
113. The intersection of Flower Street/Southbound I-110 Off-Ramp/Exposition Boulevard was assumed to operate as a three phase signal prior to the implementation of the Branch Line to reflect the fact that all three approaches will be one-way streets in the future, following implementation of the Harbor Freeway Transitway improvements. The proposed redesignation of the lanes is intended to better reflect the future distribution of traffic following the one-way street conversions.
114. The purpose of installing this signal would be to accommodate the double right turn lanes from westbound 37th Place to northbound Figueroa and to prevent northbound vehicles on Figueroa from blocking this intersection when stopped at Exposition Boulevard. The new signal would have to operate as part of the Exposition/Figueroa signal given the close proximity of the two intersections.
115. The Draft EIR clearly states that in order to mitigate the impacts of the at-grade crossing of the Figueroa/Exposition intersection, all eastbound left turns from Exposition to Figueroa would have to be prohibited and redirected to 37th Street, Flower Street and 37th Place. This would definitely require well located advance warning signs and directional signs to guide motorists.
116. See Response #39.

117. The lane configurations will be incorporated in the Final design to reflect the most current LADOT and CALTRANS plan for the implementation of the Harbor Freeway Transitway Figueroa and Flower Street mitigation measures.
118. No, the bridge will not be widened. A separate bridge for the Branch Line will be constructed parallel to the existing bridge.
119. A southbound left turn lane on Figueroa Street at 27th Street is proposed as part of LADOT's improvements related to the Harbor Freeway Transitway mitigation package and the redesign of Figueroa and Flower Streets from 38th to 21st Streets.
120. Yes, the calculations were based on the 120 second cycle length.
121. The placement of columns was carefully evaluated in the development of this alternative. The columns did not result in the need for any additional mitigation measures, although they do result in restrictions in clearance along the sidewalk on Exposition Boulevard between Flower and Figueroa to six feet in some locations.
122. The widening is required adjacent to the dual eastbound left turn lanes at Figueroa Street.
123. Twelve-foot curb lanes were recommended along Exposition Park due to the high volumes of pedestrians at times on the sidewalk. If LADOT feels that 10-foot lanes are acceptable, this would reduce the cost of the project and be desirable to LACTC.
124. The reference to Washington Boulevard will be revised to read "Exposition Boulevard."
125. See Response #45.
126. This comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the project design team.

Response to the Los Angeles Unified School District

127. The District is included in the circulation mailing list for the Draft and Final EIR. Please see Response #128 below.
128. The proposed rail line would include certain safety features as described in the EIR on page 5-49 including a railing along the curb on Flower Street to prevent pedestrians from stepping off the sidewalk onto the tracks and to prevent mid-block crossings. Along Exposition Boulevard, fencing would be placed on both sides of the track to prevent pedestrian mid-block crossings of the tracks. Crossings of the tracks would be accommodated at marked crosswalks at signalized intersections where the pedestrian signals would regulate pedestrian movements. Three existing

pedestrian crosswalks would be eliminated as a result of the proposed rail line, as identified on page 5-49 of the EIR, 5th paragraph. These three include the unsignalized 21st Street intersection, the mid-block crosswalk opposite Orthopaedic Hospital and the mid-block crosswalk between Jefferson and Exposition, serving the pedestrian undercrossing of the Harbor Freeway. All other existing signalized pedestrian crosswalks would be maintained. Pedestrian crossings would be prohibited at "T" intersections along Flower Street, at 20th 21st, 22nd, 27th, 29th, 31st, 33rd, and 35th Streets (as noted in paragraph 2, page 5-50 in this EIR).

Based on the Pedestrian Routes to the Norwood Street School and Thirty-Second Street School it can be seen that all of the recommended crossings would be maintained with the construction of any of the alternatives and in addition there would be a new signalized crosswalk at the 28th/Flower intersection which would provide an additional safe crossing for students heading west from the east side of Flower Street. The mitigated Alternative 1b described in Part I of Section 9 of this EIR would result in a part aerial structure which would eliminate pedestrian crossing issues for that portion of the line from about Adams to 31st Street.

Given the proposed rails and fences along the LRT line, clear demarcation of the line and rails to prevent crossings at "T" intersections and the maintenance of all existing signalized crosswalks it is not expected that the proposed line would impact student routes to schools in the site vicinity.

129. The five district schools noted by the commentor shall be included in the list of "local community officials" and is hereby incorporated into the EIR as shown in the Summary Table 1.4-1 in this Final EIR.
130. Comment acknowledged.
131. As noted in the EIR on page 5-27, LADOT has proposed roadway improvement plans for Flower and Figueroa Streets which would change the pedestrian crossings and circulation patterns at the Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard intersection. This reconfiguration would restrict pedestrian crossings to the west and south legs of the intersection. This restriction would be a result of the redesign of the proposed Flower/Exposition intersection planned by CALTRANS and LADOT, however, not as a result of the proposed rail line (as noted in the EIR on page 5-50, 1st paragraph).

Response to the Southern California Association of Governments

132. The proposed project has been considered as an extension of the Blue Line terminating at Vermont Avenue. Design speeds for the proposed project reflect engineering constraints and also reflect the special destination character of the Exposition Park area. Further westward extension along Exposition Boulevard is being considered as one of several alternatives in another study being conducted by

LACTC and during the course of this study it was not reasonable to assume that light rail would be extended west of Vermont.

133. Comment noted.
134. With the incorporation of Mitigation for Alternative 1b, the Adams and Flower intersection will be grade separated and the overall speed of the light rail service will be improved. It should be noted however, that there are vertical and horizontal curve constraints that will reduce the design speed below 55 mph.
135. The mitigated Alternative 1b included in Part I, of Section 9.0 of this EIR would provide a separate bridge crossing the I-110 Harbor Freeway and a guideway which would remain elevated to about 31st Street. This alternative would accommodate the future HOV-lane on-ramp and would grade separate the line from traffic on Flower Street thus minimizing vehicular crossings of the LRT.
136. Mitigated Alternative 1b would be essentially the same as the alignment suggested except that the line would remain aerial on the east side of Flower Street to about 31st Street. Fencing and a gate at 30th Street would not, however, be required for this alternative.
137. This alternative would result in the taking of both structures noted by the commentor and has been discussed in detail in Part I of Section 9.0 of this Final EIR.
138. Comment acknowledged. The aesthetic impact of the mitigated Alternative 1b has also been discussed in Part I of Section 9.0 of this EIR.
139. Comment acknowledged.
140. The EIR identifies two alternatives for the northern leg of the line and three alternatives for the western leg of the line. In Section 7.0 the EIR discusses the screening criteria used by the LACTC, the Consultant team and the Technical Advisory Committee in developing alternatives. In addition to the five alternatives presented in the EIR four additional alternatives are discussed in the Alternatives Section 7.0 of the EIR.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Environmental Impact Report is required to compare impacts of the proposed project to those of alternatives which could feasibly achieve the objectives of the proposed project [CEQA S15126(d)]. The project goals, or objectives are listed on page 2-1 to 2-2 of the EIR. As noted on page 7-4 to 7-5 the East Side of Freeway Alternative would not meet a number of the project's objectives. According to the CEQA, the discussion of alternatives should focus on optional development strategies which would be capable of reducing some or all of the significant adverse impacts

associated with development of the proposed project to a level of "not significant". This alternative would not eliminate or reduce significant impacts of the project to a level of "insignificant". For the above mentioned reasons this alternative was identified and briefly discussed in Section 7.0 of the EIR rather than presentation of a detailed analysis.

141. Comment acknowledged. While this alternative has been identified as having disadvantages compared to the alternatives presented in the EIR, it will be up to the decision-makers as to which alternative will be selected. The decision-makers can select any of the Alternatives presented in the EIR including the No Project Alternative or the East of Freeway Alignment.
142. Comment acknowledged.
143. If the East of Freeway Alignment is selected as the preferred alternative, the crossing of the Harbor Freeway would need to be evaluated and an engineering solution would be required.
144. See Response #143 above.
145. Comment acknowledged.
146. Comment acknowledged. Please see mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I, Section 9.0 of this Final EIR.
147. The visual and physical presence of the rail line are important factors contributing to the inducement of redevelopment adjacent to the redevelopment area. An LRT line on the east side of the Harbor Freeway would be physically and visually removed from the redevelopment area and would not provide as great an incentive to redevelopment as having the line physically located on Flower Street immediately adjacent to and partially within the redevelopment area.
148. Comment noted.
149. Comment noted.
150. Comment noted, however, a west side Flower Street alignment is not currently proposed as an alternative.
151. Comments noted. Mitigated Alternative 1b would also provide a grade separated line at Adams Boulevard, and would place the LRT line on the east side of Flower Street at the historic St. John's Church.

Response to Orthopaedic Hospital

152. Comments noted. Please see mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I, Section 9.0 of this Final EIR.
153. See comment #152 above.
154. Please see mitigated Alternative 1b, in Part I, Section 9.0 of this EIR, which would place the 23rd Street station on the west side of Flower Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets.
155. See Response #154 above.
156. See Response #154 above.

Response to Don Toy and Jon Zeigler

157. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.
158. Under the mitigated Alternative 1b, the palms located on the east side of Flower Street adjacent to Orthopaedic Hospital would not be impacted by the line. The palms on the west side of Flower Street where the line crosses to the west would be removed and relocated, when feasible.
159. Increased noise at the hospital is identified in the EIR as an impact on pages 5-69 to 5-74. Please also see mitigated Alternative 1b, Part I, Section 9.0, discussion under "Noise".
160. The EIR identifies the vibration impacts expected from the proposed rail line on pages 5-77 to 5-80. Please also see mitigated Alternative 1b, Part I, Section 9.0, discussion under "Noise".
161. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.

Response to Fadem & Douglas

162. The EIR identifies the impacts of all five alternatives under consideration in every environmental category of the EIR. It is unclear as to what additional impact disclosure the commentor is referring to.
163. CEQA Guidelines Section 15002(a)(3) states the following:
 - (a) Basic Purposes of CEQA. The basic purposes of CEQA are to:

- (3) Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible.

The EIR includes five alternative LRT options as well as four alternatives in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR and numerous mitigation measures throughout the EIR.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Environmental Impact Report is required to compare impacts of the proposed project to those of alternatives which could feasibly achieve the objectives of the proposed project [CEQA S15126(d)]. According to the CEQA, the discussion of alternatives should focus on optional development strategies which would be capable of reducing some or all of the significant adverse impacts associated with development of the proposed project to a level of "not significant". In addition, a "No Project" alternative must be evaluated.

The range of alternatives to be addressed in an EIR, according to CEQA, shall be governed by the "rule of reason". The document is required to address only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The key issue in determining the range of alternatives evaluated is whether or not the selection and discussion of alternatives fosters informed decision-making and public participation. Five alternatives have been considered in the text of the EIR as well as four additional alternatives in Section 7.0 of the EIR.

164. Mitigation measures are provided in each environmental category of the EIR.
165. Without specific reference to the technical information requested by the commentor, it is impossible to determine what technical data is requested.
166. Again without specific reference to the part of the EIR which the commentor claims are not easily understood by lay readers it is impossible to revise the text of the EIR or respond to the comment.
167. Several alternatives are currently under consideration for the proposed LRT line. The LRT project and alternatives under consideration are described in detail in Section 3.0 of the EIR.
168. The environmental impacts of the proposed LRT project to Orthopaedic Hospital is discussed in virtually every section of the EIR including, but not limited to the following: 5.1 Land Use, pages 5-1, 5-6, 5-8, Section 5.2, Population and Housing, page 5-19, Section 5.3 Transportation and Circulation, pages 5-42, 5-50, 5-52, Section 5.4, Air Quality, pages 5-63, 5-65, 5-66, Section 5.5, Noise, pages 5-68, 5-71, 5-72, 5-76, 5-77, 5-78, 5-79, 5-80, 5-81, Section 5.7, Construction, pages 5-90, 5-91, and Section 5.12, Aesthetics, pages 5-111, 5-117.

169. The EIR notes that the Alignment Plans and Profiles as well as Station Design Plans are under separate cover, EIR page ii. The EIR includes five alignment alternatives based on the most recent set of Alignment Plans and profiles at the time the EIR was prepared. Without specific reference to the discrepancies inferred by the commentor between the EIR and the alignment plans, it is not possible to either verify or deny such discrepancies.
170. The statement on page 7-5 is based on the conclusions drawn in each of the respective impact categories, air quality, noise and vibration which are based on accepted impact criteria and impact analysis methodologies as described in each section.
171. **Figure 3.3-2** is a summary map showing all of the alternatives under consideration. Each alternative is again presented in larger scale in Section 3.3, **Figures 3.3-1 to 3.3-5**.
172. Page 5-68, indicates that the CNEL is used which is a 24-hour noise measure that places special emphasis on noise levels during the evening. The CNEL presumes the "A" scale weighting system which is based on the noise levels perceptible to the human ear.
173. As noted on page 5-63 of the EIR the proposed rail project is anticipated to have regional air quality benefits because automobile trips to the area would be reduced. Localized impacts are described on pages 5-64 to 5-67. The impacts of noise resulting from the proposed line is modeled and documented in Section 5.5. Impacts with regard to vibration are noted also in this section.
174. In some cases there would be impacts, but they would not necessarily be considered significant as they would not exceed established threshold levels of significance.
175. The sixth paragraph on page 5-50 of the EIR states that the sidewalk on the east side of Flower Street would be eliminated from a point just south of Orthopaedic Hospital, not in front of the hospital as noted by the commentor.
176. CEQA Section 15168(b)(1) states that the advantages of a program EIR is that it provides an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an individual EIR. Thus, a program EIR could provide a more exhaustive analysis of the cumulative overall effects, not of the individual effects as seems to be construed by the commentor.
177. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.

-
178. Within each of the alternatives presented there are numerous variations which could be applied. Again the rule of reason has been applied when identifying a range of feasible alternatives. See Response #163.
179. Impacts to the hospital in regard to air, noise, vibration, traffic safety and access were not found to be significant as noted in each of the respective sections of the EIR. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15121 describes contents of EIRs. Section (c) Mitigation Measures proposed to minimize the significant effects, it states "The discussion shall identify mitigation measures for each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR."
180. See Response #179 above.
181. Without a specific reference to the items the commentor feels were not considered by the EIR, it is impossible to respond to the comment.
182. See page 5-77, paragraph two, in the EIR which identifies possible vibration impacts to Orthopaedic Hospital from the proposed rail line.
183. See page 5-75, last point on page, which identifies institutional land uses, which includes hospitals.
184. The train would not exceed speeds of 35 mph as indicated on page 3-1, second paragraph. Also, since the train would be within a short distance of the proposed 23rd Street station it would be impossible for it to have a speed of 55 mph at the hospital which is one block south of the proposed station.
185. Vibrations would not exceed those predicted. See Response #184 above.
186. Mitigated Alternative 1b would place the rail line on the west side of Flower Street and no vibration impacts to the hospital are anticipated. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR.
187. The commentor has failed to complete the quote from page 5-77, 2nd paragraph which in entirety states: "It should be noted that preliminary discussions with hospital personnel during the scoping phase of this project did not indicate that there was sensitive equipment in use. However, it should be noted that the hospital raised concerns in the past pertaining to vibration with respect to various CALTRANS proposals for the Harbor Freeway Transitway in the vicinity of the hospital."

In addition, paragraph one on the same page states, "It is possible that sensitive equipment may be used and until further detailed study of hospital operations are conducted, it is possible that impacts may occur".

-
188. Comment acknowledged. See Response #187 above.
189. The potential vibration to the hospital is identified in the EIR as noted in Response #187. In addition, a mitigation measure is included in the EIR, page 5-81, last measure, which would require further study of interior operations at the Hospital if either Alternative 1a or 1b were selected. The mitigated Alternative 1b, would be on the west side of Flower Street and vibration impacts are not expected. Therefore, this mitigation would only be required for Alternative 1a.
190. **Figure 5.5-1**, page 5-70 of the EIR shows in graphic form what would constitute a minimal, significant and severe impact with respect to noise.
191. The EIR uses CNEL which is discussed and identified as the measure used in the analysis on page 5-68 of the EIR.
192. Page 5-69 indicates that a single event rail car passing will produce a noise level of 77 decibels at a distance of 50 feet.
193. It is not envisioned that horns would be used along the Blue Line Extension. At-grade crossings would be controlled by traffic signals and/or gates.
194. The reference of 72-73 decibels is to CNEL levels.
195. Orthopaedic Hospital was selected as a sensitive land use in the noise and air quality analysis. Implicit in the identification of the hospital as a sensitive use is that there are sick patients inside the hospital building.
196. The Draft EIR on page 5-68 indicates that the existing exterior CNEL for the hospital is 67 decibels. This level exceeds the guideline standard of 60 decibels established for such uses recognized by the City of Los Angeles EIR manual. The commentor's reference to 40 decibels is, in all likelihood an interior noise level that is consistent with an exterior noise level of 60-65 decibels. Moreover, the UMTA noise guidelines used in the noise assessment do incorporate a sliding scale that acknowledges that the threshold of significant change is less if the ambient noise level is high.
197. Page 5-23 describes the number of lanes and general operating characteristics of Flower Street. Existing lanes and lane configurations are shown on **Figures 5.3-1 and 5.3-2**.
198. Pedestrian impacts including crossings (safety), travel patterns, station access, and special event pedestrian traffic are discussed in detail on page 5-49 to 5-53 of the EIR.

-
199. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.
200. See Response #199 above.
201. Comment acknowledged.
202. Comment acknowledged.
203. This would be true for Alternative 1a, but not for the mitigated Alternative 1b.
204. Driveway access to the hospital would be impaired as noted by the commentor but would not be with the mitigated Alternative 1b. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.
205. The definition of level of service is provided on pages 5-25 and 5-26. An attempt has been made to describe levels of service A through F in lay person's terminology as follows, "good operating conditions with no delay to motorists (LOS A), to LOS F, in which the arrival of vehicles exceeds the capacity of the intersection, and motorists are faced with excessive delay in travel." Perhaps it would have been more clear to add that level of service F is often described as "jammed traffic." **Table 5.3-6** clearly indicates that with the project, the level of service at the Flower/Adams intersection declines from level of service C to Level F. The text on pages 5-40 and 5-41 describes this as a significant impact. Conversely, the table and text also reflect the fact that the project will not have a significant impact at Flower/23rd Streets.
206. Comments acknowledged and concurred with respect to Alternative 1a. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.
207. Page 5-67, third paragraph states that "At-grade light rail operations at the Adams and Flower intersection for both alternatives 1a and 1b shall be re-evaluated to ensure that delays and disruptions at this intersection are minimized. To achieve this, the degree of traffic signal pre-emption afforded to the light rail vehicle may need to be significantly reduced or eliminated. If reductions in vehicle delays cannot be achieved in this manner, consideration shall be given to the feasibility of grade separating light rail operations at this location." This statement remains true for Alternative 1a but not for the mitigated Alternative 1b. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.
208. See Response #207 above.

-
209. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.
210. The traffic analysis has taken this into consideration in the analysis.
211. As the two projects are in the conceptual planning stages, it is not possible to describe in detail how the interface would occur at this time.
212. Comment noted.
213. Page 5-63 of the Draft EIR discusses potential emissions related to all criteria pollutants.
214. Comment acknowledged.
215. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.
216. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital and would result in the taking of the apartment building and compensation for the tenants as described.

Response to Latham & Watkins

217. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.
218. Please see revised **Table 1.4-1** in this Final EIR which includes the mitigated Alternative 1b. See also Response #217 above.
219. The CALTRANS project underwent its own EIR process which included extensive traffic analysis and the impact of the project on the hospital. This EIR analyzes the proposed rail line and includes in that analysis the CALTRANS project to the extent of the detail that is known about the project at the time the EIR was prepared.
220. See Response #217.
221. See Response #217.
222. See Response #168.

223. The EIR recognizes the northbound contra-flow lane on the east side of Flower Street in many sections particularly Traffic. Also see Response #217.

224. Without a specific reference to inconsistencies by the commentor it is impossible to respond to the comment.

225. See Response #217.

Response to Eloise Helwig

226. See Response #217.

Response to Lathim & Watkins

227. See Response #217.

Response to Orthopaedic Hospital

228. See Response #217.

Response to Antenna Research Company

229. Comments acknowledged.

230. See Response #217.

231. See Response #217.

Response to Sierra Club - Los Angeles Chapter

232. Comments noted.

Response to Automobile Club of Southern California

233. The EIR discusses the impacts of the proposed 1.7 mile Flower/Exposition Street line with various alternatives. A future extension of the line to the Santa Monica Corridor is beyond the scope of this EIR and would require conceptual planning, preliminary engineering feasibility studies and a detailed EIR. That extension would not result in a negative traffic impact in the site vicinity, but rather could further reduce traffic in the site vicinity by drawing more patrons to the LRT line. Therefore, the EIR on the Exposition Park Branch Line is considered a worst case analysis in terms of traffic conditions in the site vicinity.

234. The mitigation for Alternative 1b will require that Adams and Flower intersection be grade separated. Thus, light rail transit will have no direct impact on the operations of this intersection. The Draft EIR for the Branch Line was coordinated with the "Final Environmental Assessment" for the Northern Terminus of the I-110 Transitway, dated 2/11/92. The traffic analysis in the Draft EIR utilized the traffic forecasts prepared by CALTRANS for the Transitway itself and the ramp terminals. The background traffic forecasts for the City of Los Angeles intersections were developed in coordination with LADOT and followed the same methodology that had been utilized when LADOT prepared the background forecasts for the intersections in CALTRANS' document, with the following differences; (1) The Branch Line traffic data was updated based on peak hour turning movement counts collected in 1991, (2) the Branch Line study utilized a background growth factor of 1.5 percent per year, but also explicitly added traffic generated by related projects in the study area (e.g., USC Plaza), whereas the forecasts in CALTRANS' document were based on a 2 percent per year growth factor, (3) The Branch Line study utilized the updated intersection lane configurations provided by LADOT, which included the widening of the Adams Bridge to include three through lanes on Adams across the freeway. The assumptions utilized in developing the background traffic forecasts were reviewed and approved by LADOT prior to conducting the impact analysis.
235. See Response #127.
236. It is not anticipated that stations along the Blue Line would have significant auto access. No parking is associated with any station location. As noted in the comment, the Draft EIR focused on pedestrian circulation and parking issues around the station areas rather than traffic circulation issues adjacent to the stations. Pedestrian circulation issues were felt to be the most important circulation issue because the stations along the Branch Line are primarily destination stations, where riders would disembark from the trains and walk to their destinations, and not park-and-ride stations which would generate a significant amount of vehicular traffic around the stations. It is correct to note that there will be bus operations and kiss-and-ride activity around the stations, as well as park-and-ride activity at the Exposition Park/Vermont Avenue station. LACTC did not have available any patronage forecasts upon which vehicular traffic forecasts or bus movements could be based. The Final EIR will include a mitigation measure that requires that when the Branch Line project proceeds into the design phase and patronage estimates are available, that a more detailed analysis of kiss-and-ride, park-and-ride and bus circulation be completed. The analysis will identify the locations for kiss-and-ride and bus stops at each station.

Response to the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission

237. Comments acknowledged.

-
238. With the exception of the Optional Vermont Station, all stations are planned as three-car platforms. At the current time, it is not feasible to provide a three-car platform at the optional Vermont Station without closing the median break at Menlo Avenue and Exposition Boulevard. The two-car platform should be adequate for early year operations. In the long-term, possible circulation changes in this area may allow lengthening of the platform; or, the station may be moved to the west of Vermont Avenue.
239. Based on the analysis contained in the EIR, pages 5-69 to 5-75, operation of the LRT under Alternatives 2a and 2c would not result in significant noise impacts to any properties adjacent to that portion of the line. This is partially due to the fact that the line would run along the center median of Exposition placing it quite some distance from buildings adjacent to Exposition Boulevard.
240. Comments acknowledged. See the Aesthetics Section 5.12, the Noise Section 5.5, and the Traffic Section 5.3 of the EIR.
241. As noted on page 5-50, of the EIR, paragraph four, on Exposition Boulevard, pedestrian crossings would be provided at signalized intersections at Figueroa Street, at the mid-block signal opposite the Rose Garden, at Watt Way and at Vermont Avenue, west of the proposed rail line terminus. The pedestrian crossing for Alternative 2b would be east of the portal, or essentially over the subway portion before it emerges from the portal.
242. The line LRT line would be fenced along the entire portion of Exposition Boulevard, except at the stations. The fence will be designed to prevent mid-block crossings as well as prevent access to the portals by others.
243. Comments acknowledged. The Draft EIR described the impacts of at-grade operations at this intersection and proposed the mitigation measures reflected diagrammatically in **Figure 5.3-10**. The conversion of Exposition Boulevard and 37th Street to one-way operations between Figueroa Street and Hope Street, which will be completed as a mitigation measure for the Harbor Freeway Transitway, and will simplify the operation of this intersection. However, in order to accommodate at-grade operations through this intersection, it would be necessary to prohibit left turns from eastbound Exposition Boulevard onto northbound Figueroa Street. Motorists desiring to make this movement would be directed to circle the block via 37th Street, Flower Street, and 37th Place to reach northbound Figueroa Street.
244. The reference to "tail" tracks on pages 2-1 and 3-11 is correct. It is referring to the end of the LRT tracks on Exposition Boulevard.
245. See Response #238. Since the proposed project's track work has been aligned for expansion to a three-car platform at the optional Vermont Station, it should be

- relatively straightforward to extend the platform. It is estimated that this effort should take no longer than six months to accomplish and should not disrupt service.
246. The cost of the expansion now versus at some future date is part of the economic analysis of the project and not part of the EIR analysis or scope.
247. The sentence shall be revised to read "Landforms."
248. The anticipated subway depth would be approximately 30 feet.
249. Section 4.0 provides the reader with an overview of the Environmental setting in the site vicinity. For more detailed discussion of other uses in the site vicinity please see Section 5.1, Land Use, in the EIR. This paragraph describes the general types of uses in the Exposition Park-Vermont Square area rather than all uses. The northeast portion of this subarea is part of the park.
250. This paragraph discusses the types of land uses along Exposition Boulevard. See first sentence of Response #249.
251. The 6,368 is a net gain as noted on page 4-7.
252. The Coliseum Renovation project is on indefinite hold and may or may not ever be completed.
253. Exposition Park is zoned residential, (RD2-1 and RD1.5-1 as noted in the EIR page 5-11.
254. This paragraph refers to the location of parking lots which are located on Hoover.
255. This paragraph refers to the parking impact rather than the current users. Current parking uses/demand is discussed on pages 5-24 to 5-25 of the EIR.
256. Comment acknowledged. Please see the first three mitigation measures in Section 5.7, Construction, which requires a construction management plan to be developed including construction sequencing coordination with local community officials.
257. Comment noted.
258. Please see the first paragraph on page 105 which is a mitigation measure which would require a landscape architect to develop the landscaping plan and determine how many of the existing palms could be saved and moved. The option of placing the trees at other places if they could not be used along the route has been added to this mitigation measure in the Summary Table 1.4-1 of this EIR.
259. The La Cienega oil field extends to the western segment of the line.

260. Comment noted. The fourteenth line of the second last paragraph of page 5-106 is amended to read: "the Arco gas station at the southwest corner of Exposition Boulevard and Vermont Avenue...".
261. The Rose Garden is not listed as a Historical Landmark. The community Center was not listed on any list with the City or State as a Historical-Cultural Monument. However, it should be noted that the proposed LRT line would not impact this structure.
262. Comment acknowledged.

Response to the Los Angeles Conservancy

263. Page 5-124 of the Draft EIR indicates that as a mitigation measure, the re-use of the existing street lights is to be considered.

Response to Cox, Castle & Nicholson

264. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.
265. Impacts of the proposed Alternatives 1a and 1b on the apartment building in regard to land use, air quality and noise are discussed on pages 5-19, 5-63, 5-65, 6-69, 5-715-72, 5-75 and 5-77 of the EIR.
266. Section 4.0 provides the reader with an overview of the Environmental setting in the site vicinity. For more detailed discussion of other uses in the site vicinity, please see Section 5.1, Land Use, in the EIR; specifically as mentioned by the commentor, page 5-1, fourth paragraph which identifies the apartment building. The proposed alternatives 1a and previous 1b, would not result in land use impacts to the apartment building. It would result in air quality, noise and safety impacts described in each respective section of the EIR.
267. As noted in the EIR, and in Response #266 above, neither Alternative 1a nor the prior Alternative 1b would result in the displacement, or taking of the apartment building. The mitigated Alternative 1b presented in the beginning of Section 9.0 of this EIR would result in the taking of the building and relocation measures are included for this mitigated alternative.
268. A railing would be placed on the curb on Flower Street in front of the apartment building for pedestrian safety. See page 1-10 Table 1.4-1, under column 1a.
269. As shown in Table 5.4-2, the increase in carbon monoxide at the apartment building would be +0.2 ppm, which is below the SCAQMD one-hour threshold of 1.0 ppm

and therefore a significant impact at the apartment building is not anticipated. In addition, see the air quality mitigation measure on page 5-67 and the Construction mitigation measures on pages 5-91 and 5-92 of the EIR. See also Response #264.

270. A noise analysis was conducted and is presented in the EIR on pages 5-68 to 5-75. The apartment building was included in the analysis specifically in **Tables 5.5-1, 5.2-2, and 5.5-3**. The analysis explains what criteria was used to determine a "minimal" impact (see **Figure 5.5-1** of the EIR). See also Response #264.
271. The analysis concludes that there would be an increase in CNEL of 1 decibel which is typically an imperceptible change to the human ear with normal sensitivity.
272. Groundborne vibration from street traffic or freeway traffic is considerably less than that caused by a rail vehicle. The differential between the two sources is such that when the two sources are added, the rail vehicle would have a masking affect.
273. See Response #264.
274. See Response #264.
275. See Response #264.

Response to California Museum of Science and Industry

276. Comment acknowledged. Alternative 2c includes a station near Vermont and a Station at Figueroa both on Exposition Boulevard.
277. Comment noted.
278. Comments noted.

Response to Zimmer-Gunsul-Frasca Partnership

279. The station would accommodate three car trains. See Response #238.
280. Station locations have been selected to achieve a balance between users of the park, Exposition Park and the adjacent local community (which has high transit dependency).
281. Comment noted.
282. Comment noted.
283. Alternative 2b would not eliminate parking spaces for the subway segment. Other parking loses for this alternative would be the same as for Alternative 2a.

284. The additional parking spaces are shown on Table 4.6-1, pages 4-12 and 4-13.
285. Comment noted. Items 21 through 26 of the table were based on existing known plans at the time of the preparation of the Draft EIR. This preparation was prior to the issuance of the Exposition Park Master Plan where the configuration of various components of the park have been amended.
286. Comment noted.
287. Please see the last two paragraphs on page 5-14 of the EIR which provides a discussion of the relationship of the proposed stations and pedestrian access points across Exposition Boulevard to the Exposition Park Master Plan.
288. Comment noted.
289. Comment noted.
290. Comment noted.
291. Comment noted.

Response to University of Southern California University Park

292. This intersection configuration is described in Section 5.3 on pages 5-28 and 5-29 which are part of the transitway project.
293. Comments noted. See the aesthetic section of the EIR which discusses the proposed landscaping and streetscape design along the route.

Response to EXPO Greenbelt Bicycle Trail Committee, Johanna Rosenthal

294. Comments noted.

Response to T.A. Nelson

295. See pages 7-4 to 7-5 of the EIR which discusses the East Side of Freeway Alternative.

Response to Stef Arnheed

296. Comments noted.

Response to Mrs. Lois E. Thompson

297. Comments noted.

Response to Ron Fechter

298. Comments noted.

Response to Robert Gluckstein

299. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital and would result in a taking of the apartment building.

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY**Response to Michael Madison**

300. The rail line would be located on the east side of Flower Street opposite the USC Plaza Site. Access would be provided by the Jefferson Street Station. There would be no negative access impacts to the USC Plaza from the proposed Alternatives. Option 2c proposes that the light rail trains operate at-grade along the eastern side of Flower Street and cross diagonally through the Exposition/Flower intersection. The trains would not directly impact access to USC Plaza, as it would be located across the street. There would be no impact on USC Plaza driveways, nor the travel lanes directly adjacent to the development. However, LADOT is suggesting a left turn lane from Flower Street onto Jefferson Boulevard which would require taking of property from the USC Plaza site.

The Draft EIR quantified the impact of the at-grade operations on intersections in the vicinity of USC Plaza and proposed mitigation measures to lessen those impacts, so it is not expected that the trains would negatively impact accessibility of the development. The proximity of the Jefferson Street Station adjacent to USC Plaza will enhance the accessibility of the site via transit. On the whole, the Branch Line would be expected to have a net beneficial impact on access to USC Plaza.

301. Access to the Rose Garden would be provided at the existing mid-block signal crossing on Exposition Boulevard. Special Event pedestrian traffic is discussed in detail in the EIR on pages 5-51 to 5-54. The Draft EIR evaluates the effect of the proposed project on pedestrian traffic, specifically for special events at Exposition Park, on page 5-51. The signalized crossing on Exposition Boulevard opposite the Rose Garden will be maintained and the Draft EIR concludes that the crossing needs to be a minimum of 35 feet in width to accommodate the volume of pedestrians who cross at that location. The operation of the trains in the median on Exposition Boulevard will result in the installation of fencing along the median to prevent pedestrians from jaywalking and crossing the tracks at unprotected locations. This will enhance pedestrian safety along Exposition Boulevard.

Response to Patsy Carter

302. Although a station is proposed at 23rd and Flower Streets, it is not envisioned that a significant increase in traffic along 23rd Street west of Figueroa would result from the station location. No parking will be provided at this station. Station-related traffic along that portion of 23rd Street would more than likely be primarily composed of local residents desiring to use the Blue Line. Should station-related traffic pose problems west of Figueroa Street, the LACTC in coordination with LADOT would work with the local neighborhood to identify an acceptable solution.

Response to Jaimi Handy

303. Comments noted.

Response to Eloise Helwig

304. Comments noted. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.

Response to H. Randall Stoke

305. Comments noted. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.

Response to Mirta Ocana

306. The apartment building on at 363 Flower Street is not proposed to be taken as part of this LRT project. As noted in the EIR on pages 6-65, 5-66, 5-71 and 5-72 the alternatives proposed would not result in significant air quality or noise impacts to this building nor would it require right-of-way acquisition from this building.

Response to Elson Trinidad

307. Comments noted.

Response to Craig Thompson

308. Comments noted.

Response to Tut Hayes

309. Comments noted. There was overwhelming public support for a station at or near Vermont Street that would serve the park as well as the campus.

Response to Sister Diane Donoghue

310. Comments noted. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital. As part of mitigated Alternative 1B, a housing relocation plan would be prepared and implemented.

Response to Bill Hunter

311. The mitigated Alternative 1b would result in the taking of the apartment building on the corner of Flower and 23rd Streets. This would result in the relocation of the tenants of that building as described in Part I of Section 9.0 of this EIR.

Response to Charles Hobbs

312. Comments noted. Please see the mitigated Alternative 1b in Part I of Section 9.0 in this Final EIR which would place the line on the west side of Flower Street in the vicinity of the hospital.

Response to James Washington

313. Comments noted.

Response to Pat Moser

314. There are three options for the crossing of the line at Figueroa Street, at-grade, subway or aerial.

Response to Robert Richmond

315. Comments noted.

Response to Sue Glad

316. A two station approach would be possible with both the at-grade Alternative 2c, and subway option, Alternative 2b.
317. The subway alternative would provides the same pedestrian access across Exposition as currently exists at signalized crosswalks.
318. Comment noted.

PDS13

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

BOARD OF
FIRE COMMISSIONERS
485-6032

JAMES E. BLANCARTE
PRESIDENT

CARL R. TERZIAN
VICE-PRESIDENT

AILEEN ADAMS

NICHOLAS H. STONNINGTON

KENNETH S. WASHINGTON

EVA WHITELOCK
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT



TOM BRADLEY
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF FIRE

200 NORTH MAIN STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

DONALD O. MANNING
CHIEF ENGINEER
AND
GENERAL MANAGER

218491

June 18, 1992

Mr. Jim De La Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. De La Loza:

The following items are of major concern to this Department and they should be included in the Final Environmental Impact Report:

Table 1.4-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Land Use - Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 2c, Page 1-9

If either the aerial or subway alternative is selected, the Rail Construction Corporation's Metro Rail Fire/Life Safety Criteria should be used for the Exposition Park Line Rail Transit Project. ①

Alternative 2c proposes the closure of a driveway at the Hilton Hotel on Flower Street due to required street widening. This action may affect emergency access to the hotel and fire department operations. ②

Table 1.4-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Transportation and Circulation - Alternative 1b, Page 1-11

Alternative 1b proposes to cul-de-sac 27th Street. Any necessary improvements to the water system or to the existing fire hydrants due to construction or to any street dead-ending in a cul-de-sac will be at the applicant's expense. ③



Mr. Jim De La Loza
June 18, 1992
Page 2

For any additional information, please contact our Hydrant Unit,
at (213) 485-5964.

Very truly yours,

DONALD O. MANNING
Chief Engineer and General Manager


Dal L. Howard, Assistant Fire Marshal
Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety

DLH:ASM:vg/3140E

cc: Councilman Mark Ridley-Thomas
Councilwoman Rita Walters
Battalion Chief Robert L. Aaron
Environmental Affairs Commission
Fire Department Planning Section

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS
MEMBERS

FELICIA MARCUS
PRESIDENT
DENNIS N. NISHIKAWA
VICE-PRESIDENT
PERCY DURAN, III
M. E. "RED" MARTINEZ
JOHN MURRAY, JR.
JAMES A. GIBSON
SECRETARY

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



TOM BRADLEY
MAYOR

JUL 09 1991

221425

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS
BUREAU OF
ENGINEERING
ROBERT S. HORII
CITY ENGINEER

ROOM 800, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West 7th Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. Jim de la Loza:

**SUBJECT: EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE:
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

We have reviewed the above referenced document and submit the following comments:

The Bureau of Engineering is responsible for the provision of sewer capacity and is currently planning several sewer projects, including the East Central Interceptor Sewer in the vicinity of the Blue Line branch extension. The LACTC would need to coordinate the construction of the Blue Line branch extension with the Bureau. An approximate construction schedule in the Final EIR would be helpful with such coordination. (4)

The East Central Interceptor Sewer is a proposed 150-inch diameter sewer pipe to be tunnelled beneath City streets at an average depth of 55 feet. The project is currently in the preliminary engineering phase with the alignment selection process underway (4 possible alignments). One of the four alignments would be constructed beneath Exposition Boulevard (see attached map). For coordination purposes and additional information regarding the East Central Interceptor Sewer, please contact Baron Miya at (213) 687-0259. (5)

Additionally, since the extension project would require the placement of a protective concrete slab over a section of a 44-inch diameter sewer as well as the relocation of other sewers (DEIR, Table 5.7-1 on page 5-87), the Final EIR should thoroughly discuss the projects's potential to affect the local sewers. Access to the local sewers by maintenance and repair crews must not be diminished in any way. If the project would affect such access, the Final EIR must disclose this and develop measures to mitigate the impacts to insignificant levels. Coordination with the Bureau's Central District would be necessary. (6)

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO THE CITY ENGINEER

AN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY - AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER

Recyclable and made from recycled waste



Mr. Jim de la Loza


Page 2

If you have any questions, please contact Louis Utsumi of my staff at (213) 485-8272.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. HORII
City Engineer

By




WAYNE M. SAVARIA
Division Engineer
Wastewater Program
Management Division

RSH/WMS/LU
ENV-2-1

Attachment

cc: Gene McPherson, Central District
Sam Furuta, Bureau of Sanitation
Ramon Jellison, Bureau of Sanitation

a:lactc-1cmt



ROUTE

COLOR

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

EAST CENTRAL
INTERCEPTOR SEWER

1" = 2000' ± E2000456 006 A

PRELIMINARY

6/92 RS

57

SEE MAP

58

SEE MAP

DE 300
PD 513

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS
MEMBERS

FELICIA MARCUS
PRESIDENT
DENNIS N. NISHIKAWA
VICE-PRESIDENT
PERCY DURAN, III
M. E. "RED" MARTINEZ
JOHN MURRAY, JR.
JAMES A. GIBSON
SECRETARY

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



TOM BRADLEY
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS
BUREAU OF
ENGINEERING

ROBERT S. HORII
CITY ENGINEER

ROOM 800, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

222141

JUL 14 1992

Mr. Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West 7th Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. de la Loza:

PROPOSED METRO BLUE LINE EXTENSION TO EXPOSITION PARK - DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

We have received a copy of the draft Environmental Impact Report for a proposed Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route and a set of half-size drawings for proposed alternate routes for our review and comments.

Comments were due on July 13th, 1992. We request a 2 week extension on this due date. We will send our comments to you by July 27th, 1992.

Our Wastewater Program Management Division, Bureau of Engineering, will be sending their comments separately to your office.

Refer any questions to Mr. Michael Stafford at (213) 362-5040 or Ms. Jignasha Pandya at (213) 362-5043, of my staff.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. HORII
City Engineer

By

Gene D. McPherson
GENE D. MCPHERSON
District Engineer
Central Engineering District

MS/JP:mmy-SS1-54

cc: Mr. Mike May, LADOT, Stop 599
Mr. Wallace Stokes, WPMD, Stop 549

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO THE CITY ENGINEER

AN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY - AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER

Recyclable and made from recycled waste



Memorandum

To Mr. Tom Loftus
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

Date July 15, 1992

File No. TCR/CEQA
DEIR; City of
Los Angeles
I-110/Exposition
Metro Blue Line
Exposition Branch
Vic. LA-110-20.00

Wilford Melton - District 7

From : DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

222251

Subject Project Review Comments

SCH# 91101009

Caltrans has received the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission's proposed Metro Blue Line Exposition Boulevard Branch Extension. This response will confirm the Caltrans meeting of June 24, 1992 with LACTC and LACTC's consultant regarding Caltrans concerns relating to the proposed rail project as it affects the Harbor Freeway. We request that LACTC adequately address and respond to the following concerns in the DEIR.

At Flower Street and Adams where the rail crosses the Harbor Freeway. Caltrans should be an active participant as the rail crosses the freeway. If rail is to use the existing Flower Street bridge, Caltrans will want to reconstruct the entire Flower/Adams bridge to accommodate the future widening and northward extension of the 110 Transitway and upgrade the structure for current earthquake standards. Rail is recommended to be on the west side of Flower Street to minimize conflict with the southbound on ramp to the 110 Transitway.

If rail is to cross the Harbor Freeway on a separate bridge, the horizontal and vertical alignment must be considered to accommodate the future northward extension of the 110 Transitway. The Flower/Adam structure may still be impacted to be reconstructed (i.e. to be lengthened and widened to accommodate both the rail and the future 110 Transitway extension).

A close coordination with the future northward extension of the 110 Transitway project is needed in order to minimize the community impact between Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street. A cooperative project at this location may be needed to ensure a workable design to extend the 110 Transitway northward.

Mr. Tom Loftus
July 15, 1992
Page Two

Caltrans 110 Transitway project will install a station between 37th Street and Exposition Boulevard. The DEIR shows no rail station connection with the 110 Transitway station. The rail and the 110 station should have an interface to allow service between the Harbor area and Santa Monica. All alternatives should provide for this transit interface.

Although the rail is designed in a curved alignment at this location, innovate design with pedestrian concourse or tunnels may be needed to interface with the Figueroa Street rail station. An interface is justified even with some cost increase to have the two systems serve each other.

The future northward extension of the 110 Transitway from 28th Street to the 4-level interchange should be identified as a project on Page 4-13 on the DEIR. Caltrans contact person for the project is Deborah Mah, (213) 897-4593.

The bus and rail interface at 23rd Street as stated on Page 5-15 is inadequate when the 110 Transitway is extended northward from 28th Street. All efforts and cost should be concentrated to have the interface on 110 at Exposition station, since rail will be extended east of the Harbor Freeway in the future. The interface at the 110 Exposition station and rail project should be well coordinated to allow for the rail to be extended east of the Harbor Freeway.

Typical cross-section (Figure 5.5-2) opposite Page 5-78 should be marked with the Flower Street widths and lane widths. Full analysis of the cross-section cannot be made unless existing widths and proposed widths are shown.

Projects within State right-of-way and cost over \$300,000 will require a Caltrans Project Study Report (PSR). A Cooperative Agreement should also be considered for this project.

Freeway lane closures, during the placement of construction barriers and falsework, will require coordination with Caltrans Traffic Operations Branch as part of the Caltrans Permit process.

Each of the alternatives mentioned in this document has the potential of causing a negative impact to the community along the proposed route. The effort taken by the agencies involved will not only set the stage for this project's success or failure, but it will also establish the course for future projects of this type.

Mr. Tom Loftus
July 15, 1992
Page Three

We have the opportunity to build and expand on the enhancement already planned on Figueroa Street. Here, the use of shade trees will be planted throughout the length of the project from 23rd Street to Exposition Boulevard. We suggest that LACTC also consider similar aesthetic enhancements between Exposition Boulevard and 23rd Street by planting the same type of shade trees. The City of Los Angeles has already agreed to use the 1932 vintage light standards or their equivalent reproductions to punctuate the architecturally historic Figueroa Street and Adams Boulevard. (17)

The combination of these three planning efforts is the type of urban planning that encourages pedestrian use and promotes sensitive small business and residential development.


Finally, on Page 8-2, Mr. Wilford Melton was incorrectly listed as representing the City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation. Mr. Melton represents the State of California, Department of Transportation, District 7's Advance Planning Branch, IGR/CEQA Unit, in Los Angeles. (18)

If you have any questions regarding this response, please call me at (213) 897-1338.

Original Signed By

WILFORD MELTON
IGR/CEQA Coordinator
Advance Planning Branch

cc: James de la Loza, Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100, Los Angeles, CA 90017





South Coast
AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

21865 E. Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4182 (714) 396-2000

July 15, 1992

Mr. Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County
Transportation Commission
818 West 7th Street # 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

222337

Dear Mr. de la Loza:

**Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Exposition Park Branch Rail
Transit Corridor Route SCAQMD NO. LAC920605-02**

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (District) is responsible for adopting, implementing, and enforcing air quality regulations in the South Coast Air Basin. The District reviews and analyzes environmental documents for projects that may generate significant adverse air quality impacts and thereon, advises the Lead Agency.

The District has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Exposition Park Branch Rail Transit Corridor Route proposed by the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission and finds that the proposed project may have net overall (cumulative) air quality benefits. There appear, however, to be some short- and long-term adverse air quality impacts from the project itself which have not been fully addressed in the Draft EIR.

The attached staff assessment presents a detailed discussion of the District's analysis of the Draft EIR, and Attachment 2 provides a list of mitigation measures. The District appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed Exposition Park Branch Rail Transit Route, and requests that a copy of the Lead Agency's response to our comments be sent to us prior to the adoption of the Final EIR. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Connie Day, Program Supervisor, at (714) 396-3055.

Sincerely,

Cindy S. Greenwald
Planning Manager
Office of Planning and Rules

CSG:CAD:PF
Attachments

**ATTACHMENT 1
SCAQMD'S ASSESSMENT
OF THE EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH
RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE:
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)**

Project Description

The Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC) proposes the construction of a 1.8 mile transit route (Route) along Flower Street, starting at the Blue Line station at Washington Boulevard, to the proposed terminus at Vermont Avenue, southeast of the University of Southern California campus. The proposed Route will serve the employment, residential and cultural centers in downtown Los Angeles and provide a link to the Exposition Park, University of Southern California Campus (USC), Sports Arena and Vermont business areas. Three stations will be built along the 1.8 mile route. Two additional stations at Figueroa and Washington Streets may be considered later. A bus/rail station at 23rd Street will enable the transfer of riders from the Interstate 110 (Harbor Freeway) bus transitway. The hours of operation and frequency of service on the new route will be similar to that of the existing Blue Line. The projected daily ridership of the Route is 15,000 at buildout.

Air Quality Setting

The Draft EIR characterizes the air quality setting relative to the proposed project using the 1990 air quality monitoring data from the District's Los Angeles air monitoring station. The 1991 air quality data should be used in the Final EIR. A copy of the most recent data is included as Attachment 3.

19

Air Quality Impacts

The District concurs with the Draft EIR that the project may have overall (cumulative) air quality benefits. There are, however, short- and long-terms project impacts which should be fully addressed in the Final EIR.

20

Impacts from Construction

The impacts from construction will result from grading, excavation and the relocation of storm drains, sewer mains and water lines. Trenching work along the route and the closure of street intersections may cause additional vehicular impacts. The Draft EIR does not provide an estimate of the construction related emissions which will occur during a scheduled eight-month construction period. The Final EIR must quantify all sources of construction emissions and propose mitigation measures to reduce those emissions. Impact mitigation and monitoring are areas that should be further addressed in the Final EIR. The eight-month construction period proposed in the Draft EIR will result in high daily emissions, which need to be monitored regularly. The Final EIR should ensure that the proposed mitigation monitoring plan discuss which mitigation measure will be implemented, by whom, and within what time frames. Such a strategy may help reduce the construction emissions to the level of insignificance.

21

Air Quality Impacts from Operation

The Draft EIR has estimated that the project will result in reduced vehicular miles traveled (VMT) in the project area. The Draft EIR anticipates a decrease of 120 pounds per day of carbon monoxide, 200 pounds per day of nitrogen oxides, 40 pounds per day of particulates, and 100 pounds per day of reactive organic gases due to the project.

Traffic delays will nevertheless occur at 14 major intersections along the route due to the rail preemption at rail crossings. Traffic will idle at these intersections as they wait for the train to pass. The Draft EIR has not analyzed the potential for carbon monoxide (CO) exceedences from this traffic congestion. CO exceedences due to increased peak hour congestion may be experienced at all major intersections even after the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR. (22)

Special events at the Coliseum, Sports Arena and the USC Campus will also result in traffic delays. The delays at the intersections at Adams and Flower Streets in particular, will be considerable according to the Draft EIR. Traffic delays may account for CO emissions that are higher than the anticipated net decrease of 120 pounds per day of CO due to the project. The Final EIR should clarify whether a net air quality benefit will occur as a result of project construction even if intersection delays due to rail crossings are likely. (23)

The Draft EIR states that if traffic delays cannot be avoided at the intersections, "consideration will be given to the feasibility of grade separation." The Draft EIR, however, does not provide a full assessment of traffic delays and the projected level of vehicular emissions. The Final EIR should analyze the extent of delays at rail crossings and at the special event centers, and recommend a grade separation construction schedule. The schedule should include grade separation at all intersections where the projected level of service (LOS) is E or worse. (24)

Studies have shown that intersections with LOS E and F may experience exceedences of CO levels. The Final EIR should propose additional mitigation measures to improve traffic flows at the major intersections, and thereby, improve the predicted LOS F to D at a minimum. (25)

Traffic Impacts at Rail Stations

The potential traffic impacts at the proposed rail stations have not been fully analyzed in the Draft EIR. The discussion of Transportation System Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) does not include all potential traffic reduction measures. Those programs should provide for improved transit plans, park-and-ride lots, and preferential parking for ridesharers. (26)

Improvements to traffic signalization and efficient management of parking at the rail stations should also be discussed in detail. Bicycle parking facilities, pedestrian walkways, and nonpeak-hour maintenance should be considered in the Final EIR. (27)

Energy Needs

The Final EIR should analyze direct and indirect energy-saving measures at the rail station sites, including efficient heating and cooling systems, passive solar design and (28)

increased thermal integrity of buildings. Additional mitigation measures are provided in Attachment 2 and should be included in the Final EIR where feasible.

Conclusion

The Draft EIR states that the project will result in beneficial air quality impacts due to the reduction of VMT in the area. All impacts from project operation, construction and delays at intersections due to rail crossings have not been fully addressed in the Draft EIR. The Final EIR should address those issues discussed in this document and implement all feasible mitigation measures to further reduce the impacts from this project. It should be clearly demonstrated that the project's net air quality benefits will outweigh the site specific impacts associated with traffic delays.

ATTACHMENT 2
MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE
EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE
RAIL TRANSIT ROUTE PROJECT

1. Minimize Construction Activity Emissions:

- o Employ construction activity management techniques, reduce the number of pieces of equipment used simultaneously; reduce or change the hours of construction; schedule activity during off-peak traffic hours; and require a phased-schedule for construction activities to even out emission peaks.
- o Suspend grading operations during second stage smog alerts.
- o Maintain construction equipment engines by keeping them tuned.
- o Use low-sulfur fuel for equipment.
- o Permanent sources of power should be used from the beginning of the project.
- o Reduce or eliminate odors due to construction activity.

2. Reduce Construction-Related Traffic Congestion:

- o Provide rideshare incentives, and transit incentives for construction personnel.
- o Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interferences.
- o Schedule operations affecting traffic during off-peak hours where feasible.

3. Limit Emissions From Vehicle Trips:

- o Provide local shuttle and regional transit systems, transit shelters, bicycle lanes, storage areas and amenities, and ensure efficient parking management.
- o Work with citizen groups and businesses in the region to implement TDM goals.
- o Coordinate TSM and TDM programs.
- o Provide grade separation at major intersections if traffic delays are anticipated.

4. Minimize Energy Requirements:

- o Implement energy conservation measures beyond state and local requirements.
- o Include energy costs in capital expenditure analyses.
- o Introduce glazed windows, wall insulation, and efficient ventilation methods; install window systems to reduce thermal gain and loss.
- o Incorporate appropriate passive solar design and solar heaters.
- o Replace incandescent indoor lighting with fluorescent lamps, and outdoor lighting with halogen lights.

5. Limit Emissions From Architectural Coatings and Asphalt Usage:

- o Use low-emission coating systems where possible.
- o Substitute reactive solvents with nonreactive solvents.
- o Use high-solid or water-based coatings.



ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS
TO THE COMMISSION
107 SOUTH BROADWAY, ROOM 5109
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
TELEPHONE: (213) 897-
8340

Public Utilities Commission

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

July 24, 1992

FILE NO.

183/19/84L/EIR

Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. de la Loza:

This refers to the Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route Draft Environmental Report, concerning the proposed Metro Blue Line Exposition Extension. The Commission's Safety Division Traffic Engineering staff has reviewed the information submitted and has the following comments:

1. Consideration should be given to keeping the number of at-grade crossings to a minimum, in order to reduce the possibility of train-vehicle conflicts. This would include closing as many driveways as possible along Flower Street and, if possible, reducing the number of streets which will cross the light rail tracks. (30)
2. Crossing warning devices for vehicular and pedestrian crossings should be consistent with the crossing warning devices used on the existing Blue Line. (31)
3. Staff is concerned about Alternative 1b, which would have the light rail vehicle (train) cross over from the east side of Flower Street to the west side, and then back again from the west side to the east side. It would be preferable not to cross Flower Street. (32)
4. What type of interconnection will the Exposition Extension have with the Harbor Freeway Transitway? (33)
5. What type of crossing warning devices would be used at the existing railroad crossings, west of Flower Street? (34)
6. Who will be responsible for maintaining crossing warning devices along Exposition Boulevard? (35)
7. We are especially concerned with any change in circulation patterns of vehicles which could affect railroad operations and safety considerations at railroad-highway at-grade crossings and grade separations. Review of further growth, estimated vehicular traffic, and probable land use may indicate necessary improvements to some of these at-grade crossings, closure of other crossings, and/or construction of grade separation structures at certain locations. All future Blue Line Extension studies and environmental documents should consider the above. (36)

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment on this matter. We appreciate your keeping us informed of all the above matters, with which the Commission staff is concerned. If you require further information, please contact me at the above address and telephone number.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jesus Escamilla". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Jesus Escamilla
Associate Transportation Engineer
Traffic Engineering Section
Safety Division

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



TOM BRADLEY
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
ROOM 1200, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
(213) 485-2265
FAX (213) 237-0960

July 27, 1992

Mr. Neil Peterson
Executive Director
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Attn: Jim de la Loza, Central Area Project Manager

COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR) FOR THE EXPOSITION PARK
BRANCH LINE RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE

The Department of Transportation has reviewed the May 1992 version of the above document. First general comments are provided and then additional comments that relate directly to specific text in the DEIR.

The general comments are organized to follow the alignment from north to south:

- o The DEIR should evaluate the widening of Flower Street from Washington Boulevard to Exposition Boulevard to 70 feet curb to curb for the at grade alternative. This will provide three southbound lanes plus parking on one side. (37)
- o Consideration should be given to shifting the alignment from the eastside to the westside at and south of 20th Street, and signaling the intersection of 20th Street and Flower Street. This would allow the transition to occur in a section of Flower Street that has only one-way traffic. The signal will allow pedestrians to cross at 20th Street (midway between Washington Boulevard and 23rd Street) in addition to controlling traffic approaching the rail crossing. Otherwise the only permitted pedestrian crossing in this 1400-foot long section of Flower Street would be at Washington Boulevard or at 23rd Street. This shift may require ROW (right-of-way) from 20th Street to 23rd Street to provide adequate lanes. (38)
- o At any location where vehicles are permitted to turn from parallel to across the tracks at an intersection there should be a dedicated turn lane. The impact of adding turning lanes, which will require removal of parking must be evaluated. The turns must also either be controlled by protected left or right turn signal phase or activated electric signs. Turn into driveways will also, require No left turn or No right turn electric signs. (39)

- o For the westside alignment at 23rd Street the station location should be considered south of the intersection. The westside alignment will likely require right-of-way to provide adequate roadway width for the northbound and southbound operation between Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street. (40)
- o North of Adams Boulevard there should be four southbound lanes and a northbound lane. One of the southbound lanes would be a dedicated turn lane (left or right depending on track alignment). (41)
- o With either eastside or westside alignment a traffic signal would be needed at 28th Street since the Harbor Freeway Transitway southbound on-ramp is just southerly of 28th Street. A four lane approach should be provided. With an eastside alignment the southbound left turn may need to be prohibited. (42)
- o At the 30th Street traffic signal provide a four lane approach. Three lanes for through traffic and a dedicated turn lane. (43)
- o Consideration should be given to ramping over Jefferson Boulevard to avoid congestion and visibility problems. Provide four southbound lanes; one for left turns and three for through traffic. (44)
- o If an at grade alignment is selected, then consideration should be given to moving the Jefferson Boulevard station northerly to allow for a southbound left turn pocket; the 33-foot roadway is not adequate to accommodate traffic flow. See above lane requirements. (45)
- o On either of the above Jefferson Boulevard Station alternatives shifting the alignment slightly to the east from north of Jefferson to south of Jefferson might facilitate provision of the necessary lanes utilizing Caltrans ROW. (46)
- o The at-grade alignment crossing Figueroa Street will not operate efficiently as the intersection is already congested and the City cannot allow priority. The alignment on Flower Street at the Exposition Boulevard off-ramp will be congested and dangerous due to the grade of the off-ramp. The ramp at-grade at Jefferson Boulevard is unworkable due to visibility problems for the westbound Jefferson Boulevard traffic. At-grade operation through this area does not appear desirable to the Department. The aerial or subway alternatives appear more acceptable. (47)
- o Sidewalk widths of 10 feet should be maintained if at all possible. (48)
- o Construction impact and mitigation measures should be evaluated for normal weekday operation and also for the frequent special events which severely impact traffic circulation in this area. During major sports, entertainment or other events staged at the adjacent activity centers, Flower Street becomes a critical alternate traffic route because of the limited or prohibited use of Figueras Street, and serves as an important inlet and outlet for event traffic. The severity of traffic congestion and circulation problems caused by (49)

the events has necessitated LADOT to direct traffic and provide special traffic controls to mitigate the impact on circulation. The DEIR should consider possible construction impact mitigation such as limiting the size of the project impact area during any one period of time, phasing and staging of work. Detailed Worksite Traffic Control Plans and Circulation Plans should be developed. LADOT and Caltrans will be extensively involved.

- o Where cross over operation is contemplated a positive control such as gates or pop-ups should be considered. (50)

The following comments relate to specific text in the DEIR and have been organized to directly correlate with the specific page:

- o p 1-7: 23rd Street Station maps show location between 22nd and 23rd Streets. The text indicates between 21st and 23rd Street. (51)
- o p 1-7: Exposition Park/Vermont Station. Is loading access for three trains or three cars-clarify. (52)
- o p 1-8: Vermont Station. Explain why this option limits operation on Branch Line to two-car trains. (53)
- o p 1-9 to 1-17: Table 1.4-1 - At beginning of Chapter 1 it is explained that there are two segments with alternatives under each. This is being done to clearly identify alternatives. The segments and alternatives are identified in the table as 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, and 2c. Unfortunately the text is not confined to just a single segment/alternative. Overlapping the discussion helps to confuse the issues associated with a specific segment/alternative. (54)
- o p 3-3: Alternative 1a - Indicates the HOV lane is to the southbound Harbor Freeway Transitway. The northbound off-ramp from the transitway feeds into the Adams Boulevard northbound off-ramp from the main line. This is described on p 4-6 in section 4.4. (55)
- o p 3-11: Clarify why this option limits trains to two-cars. (56)
- o p 4-6: In section 4.4 paragraph 3, Figueroa Street is identified as a one-way northbound street with two contra-flow lanes. Also, Flower Street is identified as a one-way southbound street with a northbound contra-flow lane between Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street. Please treat Figueroa Street as a two-way street with an off-center operation. Flower Street is a one-way southbound street except Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street. Within this segment it is a two-way street. (57)
- o p 5-6: Closing of the Trade Tech exit driveway on Flower Street and conversion of the entrance driveway on 23rd Street to two-way operation would seriously impact driveway operation. With the driveway being located adjacent to the signalized intersection of 23rd Street and Flower Street the westbound traffic at the signal would block the exiting move. It is also possible that the exiting traffic would be restricted to right turn only. (58)

- o p 5-8: Alternative 1b - The mid-block signal requires detailed analysis before it can be considered as a viable mitigation measure. Also, the McDonald driveway south of 28th Street operates as entry only. (59)
- o p 5-14: Alternative 2a - Proposed Exposition Park/Vermont Station is 1000 feet east of Vermont, not west of Vermont. (60)
- o p 5-20: Figueroa Street also has left-turn pockets and two-way left turn channelization. (61)
- o p 5-21: Fig. 5.2-1 - The intersection of Exposition Boulevard/Flower Street/I-110 Freeway should be deleted since it is shown on the next page. See attached Bureau of Engineering Standard Plan D-22549 for standard dedications and roadway widths. (62)
- o p 5-23: Flower Street: See attached Bureau of Engineering Standard Drawing D-22549. (63)
- o p 5-23: Adams Boulevard also has left-turn channelization, as does Jefferson Boulevard (64)
- o p 5-24: Exposition Boulevard has a 26-foot wide median, not a 30-foot wide median. (65)
- o 5-24: Vermont Avenue has two through lanes in each direction in addition to left-turn channelization. North of Exposition Boulevard and Vermont Avenue is striped for the third northbound lane and a southbound right-turn lane. (66)
- o p 5-24: Transit Service: The DASH Route C serves the area. It operates on Figueroa, Coliseum, Menlo, Exposition and then back onto Figueroa. (67)
- o p 5-27: Flower Street between Adams Boulevard and 23rd Street should be referred to as two-way operation. (68)
- o p 5-28: Figueroa Street - See earlier comments regarding two-way street operation. (69)
- o p 5-30: Fig. 5.3-3: Figueroa Street and Washington Boulevard for westbound show one right turn lane, three through lanes, and one left turn lane. (70)
- o p 5-30: Fig. 5.3-3: 23rd Street and Figueroa Street. For eastbound show on right turn lane, not two right turn lanes. (71)
- o p 5-30: Fig. 5.3-3: Adams Boulevard and Figueroa Street. For southbound show one right-turn lane, two through lanes, and one left-turn lane. For northbound show one left-turn lane, three through lanes and an optional through-right turn lane. (72)

- o p 5-30: Fig. 5.3-3: Flower Street and Washington Boulevard. For southbound show the left-turn lane as an optional left-turn through lane. For westbound show the optional left-turn through lane as a through lane; left-turns are prohibited. (73)
- o p 5-30: Fig. 5.3.3: 23rd Street and Flower Street for eastbound show the optional through-right lane as a right-turn lane. For northbound show a left-turn lane, in addition to a right turn lane. (74)
- o p 5-30: Fig. 5.3-3: Adams Boulevard and Flower Street. For southbound show two through lanes, not three. (75)
- o p 5-31: Fig. 5.3-4:
 - * Figueroa Street and Jefferson Boulevard: for northbound show a single left turn, not a double left turn. (76)
 - * 37th Street, Exposition Boulevard and Figueroa Street: For southbound show a right turn lane and an optional right turn/through and retain other lanes as shown. For westbound show 3 through lanes and a right turn only lane. (77)
 - * Flower Street and Exposition Boulevard: for southbound show a right turn lane, an optional right turn/through, three through lanes and a left turn lane. (78)
 - * Exposition Boulevard/Flower Street/I-110 ramps: For southbound show a right turn lane, an optional right turn through and four through lanes. (79)
- o p 5-36: Traffic impacts will be affected by the preceding lane changes on pages 5-30 and 5-31. Also some lane descriptions will need modification. (80)

Alternative 1a and 2a

- o p 5-36: It should be clarified that the eastbound double left turn lanes on Exposition Boulevard at Figueroa Street that will be eliminated do not currently exist and are a result of other future projects. Also, any signal phases added at this location will worsen the level of service (LOS). (81)
- o p 5-37: Left turns or right turns from a lane adjacent to the light rail should be from a dedicated left turn or right turn lane and only under a protected signalized turn phase. The optional lane operation is not acceptable. (82)
- o p 5-37: At Flower Street/Washington Boulevard left turns would not be made when southbound train movement is allowed. Southbound left turn also cannot go when pedestrian movement across the east leg of Washington Boulevard is permitted. (83)

- o p 5-38: The proposed lane configuration for Flower Street and 37th Street is identical to the lane configuration on page 5-31. The figure on page 5-38 should be deleted. (84)
- o p 5-38: The lane configuration for Figueroa Street, Exposition Boulevard and 37th Street is not clear. The arrows for eastbound Exposition Boulevard appear to go through to Exposition Boulevard, whereas on page 5-31 the arrows appear to go to 37th Street only. Correspondingly, it is not clear if Exposition Boulevard is one-way westbound between Figueroa Street and Flower Street. (85)
- o p 5-38: Adams Boulevard and Flower Street. For southbound show left turn lane. (86)
- o p 5-38: Flower Street and Jefferson Boulevard: For southbound show left turn lane. (87)
- o p 5-39: The intersection of 20th Street and Flower Street may be signalized if east to west alignment shift occurs in this area. (88)
- o p 5-39: Since the study proposes that the intersection of Flower Street and 28th Street be signalized, the adjacent intersection of Flower Street and 30th Street should be analyzed as well. (89)
- o p 5-40: 23rd Street and Flower Street: Separate left turn and right turn lanes are now combined into just one lane. (90)
- o p 5-40: Adams Boulevard and Flower Street. Show 4 southbound lanes and one northbound lane: One southbound left turn lane with left turn phase. Also, summary at beginning of DEIR called for left turn phase. (91)
- o p 5-41: Flower Street and Jefferson Boulevard. The optional lane for movement across tracks is not acceptable. Widen, shift station or realign into Caltrans ROW to obtain 4 southbound lanes. (92)
- o p 5-42: A more thorough definition of significant impact (for ICU analysis) should be given. For example, from Table 5.3-6, Flower Street at Exposition Boulevard changes from LOS C to LOS D with an increase in delay of 21.2 seconds. LADOT's definition of significant impact for a LOS C to LOS D transition is a change in v/c of .02. (93)

Alternative 1b and 2c

- o p 5-42: Alternative 1b requires that the LRT cross over to the west side of Flower Street in front of Orthopaedic Hospital and that the crossing be signalized. The Department recommends that the crossing be signalized for pedestrians crossing Flower Street and that the crosswalk remain in place. Contrary to the statement on page 5-50, removing the crosswalk will add approximately 625 feet to the distance walked between the hospital entrance and Lot G, not 250 feet. The Department recognizes that the addition of pedestrian (94)

actuation could impede traffic flow on Flower, as mentioned on page 5-52. However, the Department believes that safety will be improved by making the crossing into a more standard mid-block pedestrian crossing. Thus, pedestrian actuation should be factored into the analysis, and Flower Street and 23rd Street and Flower Street and Adams Boulevard should be adjusted accordingly.

- o Tables 5.3-7 and 5.3-8: The Orthopaedic Hospital mid-block signal should be included. (95)
- o Table 5.3-8: The table should show Flower at 28th Street being significant impacted due to the high delay created and the poor LOS. (96)

Alternative 2a

The discussion and conclusions in this section should follow the format of the previous sections i.e. either "Alternative 1a and 2a" and "Alternative 1b and 2a" or all segments should have been analyzed individually i.e. "1a", "1b", "2a"... By this reasoning, Alternative 2a would have a significant impact at Flower Street and 28th Street when combined with Alternative 1b, but no impact if combined with Alternative 1a. Similarly, the only peak hour impact from Alternative 2a on page 5-45 is at Figueroa Street and Exposition Street in the A.M. peak. The P.M. impacts are a result of Alternatives 1a or 1b, not 2a. (97)

- o p 5-45: The statement that double left turns would be allowed "from westbound Exposition Boulevard to Figueroa Street" should be changed to read eastbound. (98)
- o p 5-45: Impacts of the column placement should be evaluated in the EIR. The significant impact at Figueroa Street and Exposition Boulevard could possibly be mitigated with proper column spacing and maximum span. The intersection of Exposition Boulevard, Flower Street and I-110 ramp will have the same widening and lane configuration as shown in Figure 5.3-9. (99)

Alternative 2b

- o Both impacts listed on page 5-46 are attributable to Alternatives 1a and 1b. Alternative 2b therefore has no significant traffic impacts and is a highly desirable alternative. (100)

Weekend/Event Traffic

- o It is not clear that "implementation of the Branch Line would help alleviate some of the weekend traffic and parking impacts in the Exposition Park area associated with events." Based on current commuter behavior, it seems unlikely that patrons will commute in from CBD lots unless the current supply of parking is restricted or the rates adjusted to discourage use. (101)
- o p 5-47: Will arrangements be made with USC and Exposition Park/Vermont Avenue private lot and to make parking available during weekdays. (102)

- o p 5-48: Table 5.3-9 NPAT, NP 4-6 PM indicates No Parking Anytime, No Parking 4-6 PM. This type of restriction is usually Tow Away No Stopping Anytime, or Tow Away No Stopping 4-6 PM. (103)
- o p 5-49: Washington Boulevard and Flower Street. The pedestrian signal phase would not go concurrently with the southbound left turn phase. (104)
- o p 5-50: At the Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard/I-110 ramp intersection pedestrian crossings would only be prohibited across the north leg. Pedestrians would be allowed to cross the east leg. (105)
- o p 5-50: Second paragraph. The additional walking distance of 350 feet seem extremely low. Washington Boulevard to 23rd Street is approximately 1400 feet; 23rd Street to Adams Boulevard is approximately 1000 feet. (106)

Pedestrian Impacts

- o p 5-50: The statement that removing the mid-block crosswalk between Jefferson Bl. and Exposition Bl. increases the walking distance from the east side of Flower St. to the west side by 500 feet is incorrect. The correct distance is 1300 feet, a quarter of a mile, when both legs of the trip are considered. The Harbor Freeway undercrossing does not appear to be frequently utilized, and is only intended have limited use in the future. (107)
- o p 5-52: Sidewalk width reduction to 6 feet is unacceptable. The Department's minimum sidewalk width is 10 feet. Additional right of way should be considered for column placement. (108)

Mitigation Measures

Based on prior comments measures will need to be reevaluated/modified. (109)

Alternative 1a and 2c

- o In general, restriping in itself is not a mitigation measure without the widening. Restriping often redistributes capacity, rather than increasing it. In addition, restriping mitigation measures may already be claimed by other future projects. (110)
- o p 5-55, Item 1: How many additional lanes would be provided by widening the overcrossing? (111)
- o Items 3 & 6: It is not clear how the additional lane will be created: by widening or restriping? (112)

- o Item 4: The southbound Harbor Freeway off-ramp is currently striped for a shared through/right, one through and one exclusive left (with its own left turn phasing). To restripe for a shared through/left will decrease left turn capacity and change the signal phasing, thus decreasing intersection capacity. This should have been accounted for in Tables 5.3-10 and 5.3-11. See earlier comments on Future no project condition. (113)
- o Item 7: It is questionable to signalize this intersection. The only westbound movement possible on 37th Pl. is a right turn: a concrete median forces traffic northbound on Figueroa. Further, 37th Pl. is approximately 200 feet from Figueroa St. and Exposition Bl., which is too close for installing a new signal. (114)
- o Item 8: On page 5-41, the eastbound Exposition Bl. lane configuration of page 5-31 is changed to a shared through/left, 2 through and one shared through/right. Item 8 now eliminates the shared eastbound through/left, as shown in Figure 5.3-10. The elimination of all eastbound left turns at Exposition and Figueroa should be clearly stated. In addition, guide signs for eastbound Exposition Bl. motorists (to 37th St.) must be clearly posted to prevent confusion. (115)
- o p 5-56: Item 9. Shared lane operation is unacceptable. See earlier comments regarding lanes and phasing. (116)
- o p 5-57. Modify lane configurations. (117)

Alternative 1b and 2c

- o p 5-60, Item 1: Will the overcoming be widened as in the 1a case? (118)
- o Item 3: A southbound left-turn pocket should be created (if one doesn't already exist) on Figueroa at 27th St. to accommodate residents. (119)
- o Item 4: Did the previous LOS calculations (with project) reflect the 120 second cycle & its resultant delay? (120)

Alternative 2a

- o p 5-60: Mitigation measures such as column placement, span and additional right of way should be addressed. (121)
- o It is not clear where the eastbound Exposition Bl. cross section should be widened. (122)
- o It is not clear what 12 foot curb lanes will accomplish. (123)
- o p 5-61: "Along Washington Bl." should be changed to "Along Exposition Bl." (124)

Construction Traffic Impacts

- o p 5-91: Worksite Traffic Control Plans and Circulation Plans should be developed. LADOT and Caltrans will be involved. (125)

Design Comments

- o Any use of street light poles for catenary wire support will require the approval of the Bureau of Street Lighting.

126

S.E. Rowe

S.E. Rowe,
General Manager

JAK/MM:dp
a:expo

cc: Councilman Nate Holden
Linda Waade, Mayor's Office
Keith Comrie, City Administrative Officer
William McCarley, Chief Legislative Analyst
Con Howe, City Planning
Robert Horii, BOE



ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS
TO THE COMMISSION
107 SOUTH BROADWAY, ROOM 5109
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
TELEPHONE: (213) 897-

Public Utilities Commission

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILE NO.

July 24, 1992

Mr. Jim De La Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West 7th Street, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Subject: CPUC Staff Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact
Report for the Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit
Project.

Dear Mr. De La Loza:

Commission staff has completed its review of the subject document
and we have no safety concerns.

Please feel free to call Joey E. Bigornia at (213) 897-3012 if
you have any questions concerning this matter.

Very truly yours,

Joey E. Bigornia

for:

DONALD R. JOHNSON
Supervising Engineer
Rail Transit Safety Branch
Safety Division

DRJ/jeb
S-07321

Los Angeles Unified School District

WILLIAM R. ANTON
Superintendent of Schools

Business Services Division

DAVID W. KOCH
Division Administrator, Business Services

ROBERT BOOKER
Chief Business & Financial Officer

C. DOUGLAS BROWN
Deputy Administrator, Business Services

Environmental Review File
Metro Rail Blue Line
Exposition Extension

BOB NICCUM
*Director of Facilities Planning &
Real Estate*

July 28, 1992

Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West 7th Street
Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. de la Loza:

Re: Metro Blue Line Extension to Exposition Park

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR for the above-referenced project.

Five District schools have service boundaries which cross the proposed alignments for the Blue Line extension. The schools are: Norwood Street School, 32nd Street Magnet School, Adams Middle School, Manual Arts High School and Jefferson High School. Descriptions of the service boundaries for these schools are enclosed for your information. For the two elementary schools, safe pedestrian route maps are also provided.

The EIR should have contained an analysis of the project's effect on District student walk patterns. Unfortunately, the District was not included in the circulation of the Notice of Preparation for this project.

We ask that the impact on pedestrian routes used by District students who will have to cross the extended Blue Line be addressed for each of the proposed alignments in the Final EIR. Safe and convenient routes must be maintained to accommodate students walking to and from school. This may necessitate the inclusion of additional mitigation measures, such as the providing of crossing guards where the safety of District students is endangered.

In the discussion under Public Services, Schools, Section 5.8., mention is made of safety criteria which will be provided "to schools adjacent to the light rail project for distribution to students and teachers." That material should also be provided to the five District schools listed above. Also, District staff should be included in the list of "local community officials" with whom "construction sequencing will be coordinated to minimize conflicts with student walk routes, school buses and carpools."

Mr. de la Loza

2

July 28, 1992


Student pedestrian safety should be a consideration when the final alignments for the northern and western segment are selected. From the information provided in the EIR, it appears that Alternative 2A, Part Aerial, and Alternative 2B, Part Subway, provide the safest crossings for students at Flower/Exposition and Figueroa/Exposition.

The crossing at Figueroa/Exposition is particularly important because of the proposed Museum Space Saver School. While it is true that the exact location of that school has not been determined, the Armory is being considered as the preferred site. This site, as well as the alternatives to be considered, will draw students from the surrounding community, many of whom will walk to school.

For further information about student pedestrian travel and safety, please contact the District's Student Traffic and Safety Education Coordinator, Don Rector, at (213) 625-4933. We have enclosed, as Appendix I to this response, a list prepared by that office entitled "SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE LIGHT RAIL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY."

If this office can provide any additional information as you respond to our comments, please contact Joan Friedman at (213) 742-7581.

Very truly yours,



Elizabeth J. Harris
California Environmental Quality Act Officer
for the Los Angeles Unified School District

EJH:JF:del

Enclosures

c: (w/o attachments)

Mrs. Boudreaux
Mr. Slavkin
Dr. Anton
Dr. Booker
Mr. Isaacs
Mr. McAdoo
Ms. Franco
Mr. Leichty
Mr. Koch
Mr. Brown

Mr. Niccum
Mr. Tomiyama
Mr. Hall
Mr. Young
Mr. Rector
Principal, Norwood Street School
Principal, 32nd Street Magnet School
Principal, Adams Middle School
Principal, Manual Arts High School
Principal, Jefferson High School


APPENDIX ISAFETY CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE LIGHT RAIL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDYA LIST OF SAFETY FACTORS

1. Conflicts of right of way for pedestrians, and motorists
2. Security of right of way - fences, walls
3. Time schedules for operation - changes of routes and movements for school buses and motorists
4. Trespass attractions and security
5. Off street walking along routes (access versus isolation for the area)
6. Overhead security of power sources
7. Noise control
8. Station locations (security safety)
9. Station lighting
10. Station parking arrangements
11. Overhead bridges or separations
12. Construction - (equipment)
13. Construction (material storage security)
14. Construction (disruption of travel)
15. Construction (noise)
16. Construction (disruption of parking)
17. Vandalism security
18. Speed of Rail units
19. Warning signs and barriers
20. Interfacing with L.A. City Traffic Engineers
21. Effect on Pedestrian Route to School
22. Police activities
23. Emergency Services and access
24. Handicap access
25. Social attractions and strangers
26. Public telephones
27. Weather factors

APPENDIX ISAFETY CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE LIGHT RAIL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDYA LIST OF SAFETY FACTORS

1. Conflicts of right of way for pedestrians, and motorists
2. Security of right of way - fences, walls
3. Time schedules for operation - changes of routes and movements for school buses and motorists
4. Trespass attractions and security
5. Off street walking along routes (access versus isolation for the area)
6. Overhead security of power sources
7. Noise control
8. Station locations (security safety)
9. Station lighting
10. Station parking arrangements
11. Overhead bridges or separations
12. Construction - (equipment)
13. Construction (material storage security)
14. Construction (disruption of travel)
15. Construction (noise)
16. Construction (disruption of parking)
17. Vandalism security
18. Speed of Rail units
19. Warning signs and barriers
20. Interfacing with L.A. City Traffic Engineers
21. Effect on Pedestrian Route to School
22. Police activities
23. Emergency Services and access
24. Handicap access
25. Social attractions and strangers
26. Public telephones
27. Weather factors

To THIRTY-SECOND STREET SCHOOL



Legend (Leyenda)

Recommended Crossing... →
(Lugar de cruce recomendado)

Traffic Signal... ⊙
(Señal de Tráfico)

0 200 400 600
SCALE (FT)

Parents:

This map shows the recommended crossings to be used from each block in your school service area. Following the arrows, select the best route from your home to the school and mark it with a colored pencil or crayon. This is the route your child should take.

Instruct your child to use this route and to cross streets only at locations shown. You and your child should become familiar with the route by walking it together. Observe marked crosswalks, stop signs, traffic signals and other traffic controls. Crossing points have been located at these controls wherever possible, even though a longer walk may sometimes be necessary.

Padres de Familia:

Este mapa le indica la ruta más segura de cada cuadra o manzana en el área de su Escuela. Siguiendo las flechas en el mapa, seleccione la ruta más conveniente de su casa a la Escuela y márquela con una línea gruesa. Esta será la que sus niños deban seguir.

Instruya a sus niños a usar esta ruta siempre y a cruzar las calles solamente en los lugares indicados. Usted y sus niños deberán familiarizarse con esta ruta recorriéndola juntos. Observe las señales de calles marcadas con cruce para peatones. Estos cruces para peatones han sido instalados en aquellos lugares donde se ha determinado que son

City of Los Angeles

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

Donald R. Howary, Gen. Mgr.

COUNCIL DISTRICT NO. 9

178

PEDESTRIAN ROUTES


NORWOOD STREET SCHOOL

Padres de Familia:
Este mapa le indica la ruta más segura de cada cuadra o manzana en el área de su Escuela. Siguiendo las flechas en el mapa, seleccione la ruta más conveniente de su casa a la Escuela y márquela con una línea gruesa. Esta será la que sus niños deban seguir.

Instruya a sus niños a usar esta ruta siempre y a cruzar las calles solamente en los lugares indicados. Usted y sus niños deberán familiarizarse con esta ruta recorriéndola juntos. Observe las señales de calles marcadas con cruce para peatones. Estos cruces para peatones han sido instalados en aquellos lugares donde se ha determinado que son más necesarios. La ruta de su casa a la Escuela tal vez sea más larga, pero es la más segura.

LEGEND (LEYENDA)

-  Recommended Crossing
(Lugar de cruce recomendado)
-  Traffic Signal
(Señal de Tráfico)
-  Crossing Guard
(Lugar de guardia para cruzar)



Parents:

This map shows the recommended crossings to be used from each block in your school attendance area. Following the arrows, select the best route from your home to the school and mark it with a colored pencil or crayon. This is the route your child should take.

Instruct your child to use this route and to cross streets only at locations shown. You and your child should become familiar with the route by walking it together. Observe marked crosswalks, stop signs, traffic signals and other traffic controls. Crossing points have been located at these controls wherever possible, even though a longer walk may sometimes be necessary.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DONALD R. HOWERY, General Manager

LOS ANGELES CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL HOUSING BRANCH

Service Boundary Description

To The Principal:

The territory described below has been approved by the Superintendent as the district to be served by your school. The description starts at the most northwesterly corner and follows the streets in clockwise order. Unless noted otherwise, the center of the street is the official boundary.

This boundary becomes effective on June 13, 1980
and supersedes boundary description effective September 1, 1978

This is your OFFICIAL COPY and is to be retained in your files until it is superseded.

Signed

William V. Tascher
DIRECTOR, EDUCATIONAL HOUSING BRANCH

GRADES K-6

VENICE BOULEVARD * HILL STREET * TWENTY-THIRD STREET * FLOWER STREET * ADAMS
BOULEVARD * MAGNOLIA AVENUE AND EXTENSION * SANTA MONICA FREEWAY * HOOVER
STREET * WASHINGTON BOULEVARD * BURLINGTON AVENUE.

GRADES 1-6

ADAMS BOULEVARD * FLOWER STREET * 23RD STREET * HILL STREET * ADAMS BOULEVARD *
HARBOR FREEWAY * JEFFERSON BOULEVARD * HOOVER STREET.

OPTIONAL: NORWOOD STREET AND VERMONT AVENUE SCHOOLS (K-6)

SANTA MONICA FREEWAY * MAGNOLIA AVENUE AND EXTENSION * ADAMS BOULEVARD *
ELLENDALDE PLACE AND EXTENSION.

LOS ANGELES CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

EDUCATIONAL HOUSING BRANCH

Service Boundary Description

To The Principal:

The territory described below has been approved by the Superintendent as the district to be served by your school. The description starts at the most northwesterly corner and follows the streets in clockwise order. Unless noted otherwise, the center of the street is the official boundary.

This boundary becomes effective on July 1, 1981 (Clarified 1-15-83)
and supersedes boundary description effective September 1, 1979

This is your OFFICIAL COPY and is to be retained in your files until it is superseded.

Signed

William V. Tascher

DIRECTOR, EDUCATIONAL HOUSING BRANCH

(GRADES 7-9)

WASHINGTON BOULEVARD * BURLINGTON AVENUE * VENICE BOULEVARD * HILL STREET *
PICO BOULEVARD * MAIN STREET * SEVENTH STREET * STANFORD AVENUE * FOURTEENTH
STREET * GRIFFITH AVENUE * PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAILWAY (SANTA MONICA LINE) *
SAN PEDRO STREET * MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. BOULEVARD * TRINITY STREET *
FORTY-FIRST PLACE AND EXTENSION * HARBOR FREEWAY * THIRTY-NINTH STREET *
FIGUEROA STREET * HOOVER BOULEVARD * JEFFERSON BOULEVARD * VERMONT AVENUE.

LOS ANGELES CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL HOUSING BRANCH

Service Boundary Description

To The Principal:

The territory described below has been approved by the Superintendent as the district to be served by your school. The description starts at the most northwesterly corner and follows the streets in clockwise order. Unless noted otherwise, the center of the street is the official boundary.

This boundary becomes effective on June 13, 1980
and supersedes boundary description effective September 1, 1987 (Clarified 11-19-79)

This is your OFFICIAL COPY and is to be retained in your files until it is superseded.

Signed

William V. Tascher
DIRECTOR, EDUCATIONAL HOUSING BRANCH

K-ONLY

ADAMS BOULEVARD * FLOWER STREET * 23RD STREET * EXTENSION OF LOS ANGELES
STREET (THROUGH AND EXCLUDING 200 EAST 23RD STREET, 201 EAST JEFFERSON
BOULEVARD AND 200 AND 201 ON ALL STREETS BETWEEN 23RD STREET AND JEFFERSON
BOULEVARD) * JEFFERSON BOULEVARD * MAIN STREET * BROADWAY PLACE * 38TH STREET *
GRAND AVENUE * 39TH STREET * FIGUEROA STREET * NORTH COLISEUM DRIVE * VERMONT
AVENUE * 35TH STREET AND EXTENSION * CATALINA STREET * JEFFERSON BOULEVARD *
VERMONT AVENUE * 29TH STREET * ELLENDALE PLACE.

LOS ANGELES CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

EDUCATIONAL HOUSING BRANCH

Service Boundary Description

To The Principal:

The territory described below has been approved by the Superintendent as the district to be served by your school. The description starts at the most northwesterly corner and follows the streets in clockwise order. Unless noted otherwise, the center of the street is the official boundary.

This boundary becomes effective on October 22, 1979
and supersedes boundary description effective January 29, 1968

This is your OFFICIAL COPY and is to be retained in your files until it is superseded.

Signed William V. Tascher
DIRECTOR, EDUCATIONAL HOUSING BRANCH

ADAMS BOULEVARD * NORMANDIE AVENUE * WASHINGTON BOULEVARD * VERMONT AVENUE *
11TH STREET * WESTMORELAND AVENUE * 12TH STREET AND EXTENSION * MAGNOLIA AVENUE *
PICO BOULEVARD * BURLINGTON AVENUE * 14TH STREET * UNION AVENUE * VENICE BOULEVARD *
HARBOR FREEWAY * SLAUSON AVENUE * FIGUEROA STREET * 62ND STREET * DENKER AVENUE *
VERNON AVENUE * WESTERN AVENUE * 39TH STREET * GRAMERCY PLACE * EXPOSITION
BOULEVARD * ST. ANDREWS PLACE * 36TH PLACE * WESTERN AVENUE.

OPTIONAL: MANUAL ARTS, FREMONT AND WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOLS.

62ND STREET * VERMONT AVENUE * 76TH STREET * DENKER AVENUE.

OPTIONAL: MANUAL ARTS, CRENSHAW AND WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOLS.

62ND STREET * DENKER AVENUE * 76TH STREET * WESTERN AVENUE.

EDUCATIONAL HOUSING BRANCH

To The Principal:

Director, Educational Housing Branch

ALAMEDA STREET.



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President
Rep., Cities of San Bernardino
County
John Longville, Mayor
Rialto

First Vice President
Rep., Imperial County
Abe Seabolt, Supervisor

Second Vice President
Cities of Riverside County
Judy Nieburger, Councilmember
Moreno Valley

Past President
Rep., Ventura County
John Flynn, Supervisor

Los Angeles County
Mike Antonovich, Supervisor
Deane Dana, Supervisor

Orange County
Harriett Wieder, Supervisor

Riverside County
Norton Younglove, Supervisor

San Bernardino County
Jon Mikels, Supervisor

Cities of Los Angeles County
Robert Bartlett, Mayor
Monrovia

Cities of Imperial County
Stella Mendoza, Councilmember
Brawley

Cities of Orange County
Irwin Fried, Mayor
Yorba Linda

Cities of Ventura County
John Melton, Councilmember
Santa Paula

City of Los Angeles
Tom Bradley, Mayor
Mark Ridley-Thomas,
Councilmember
Hal Bernson, Councilmember

City of Long Beach
Clarence Smith, Councilmember

POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Hal Croys, Mayor Pro Tem
Lomita; Chair, Transportation
and Communications

Diann Ring, Mayor Pro Tem
Claremont; Chair, Energy
and Environment

Scott Garrett, Vice Mayor
Hemet; Chair, Community,
Economic, and Human
Development

AT-LARGE DELEGATES

Robert Lewis, Mayor
Thousand Oaks

Fred Aguiar, Mayor
Chino

Richard Kelly, Mayor
Palm Desert

ALTERNATES

Imperial County o **Sam Sharp, Supervisor** • Los Angeles County o **Ed Edelman, Supervisor** and **Kenneth Hahn, Supervisor** • Orange County o **Gaddi Vasquez, Supervisor** • Riverside County o **Melba Dunlap, Supervisor** • San Bernardino County o **Larry Walker, Supervisor** • Ventura County o **Vicky Howard, Supervisor** • Cities of Imperial County o **Victor Sanchez, Jr., Mayor Pro Tem** Westmorland • Cities of Los Angeles County o **Abbe Land, Councilmember** West Hollywood • Cities of Orange County o **Ruthelyn Plummer, Councilmember** Newport Beach • Cities of Riverside County o (Vacant) • Cities of San Bernardino County o **Elmer Digneo, Mayor Pro Tem** Loma Linda • Cities of Ventura County o **Judy Mikels, Councilmember** Simi Valley • City of Los Angeles o **Richard Alatorre, Councilmember** o **Rita Walters, Councilmember** o **Michael Woo, Councilmember** • Long Beach 2nd position o **Douglas Drummond, Councilmember** • At Large o **George Nakano, Councilmember** Torrance o **Candace Haggard, Councilmember** San Clemente o **Judy Wright, Councilmember** Claremont • Ex-Officio o **Judith Johnston-Weston**, Los Angeles; Chair, Regional Advisory Council

MEMORANDUM

HAND DELIVERED

DATE: July 28, 1992

TO: Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission

FROM: Rail/Transit Planning Staff

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Metro Blue Line
Extension to Exposition Park. SCAG No. LA-55769-MT

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Metro Blue Line Extension project in Los Angeles County. We appreciate the extension of time you provided SCAG to submit comments. If you have any questions about these comments, please contact Manuel Gurrola at (213) 236-1907.

Evaluation

Adequate attention has not been given to the fact that an Exposition urban rail line will be a regional light rail rapid transit facility, which will most probably eventually extend to Santa Monica and/or the Crenshaw District/Inglewood. Hence, efforts should be made to (a) increase the speed of the service and (b) reduce instances of delay at arterial highway grade crossings.

The Blue Line has been criticized for a long stretch of side-of-road and center reservation along Flower St. and Washington Blvd., running at highway speeds, i.e. 35 MPH, and with little in the way of signal preemption or transit priority at present. It is felt that future light rail facilities of this kind should take advantage of the excellent performance of modern LRVs to run at higher average speed, thus enhancing the quality of the service for commuters, and resulting in a higher mode split in favor of transit as a result.

132

133

Memo to Mr. Jim de la Loza
Metro Blue Line Extension to Exposition Park
Page 2

In the case of the Exposition Branch Line project, what is called for is a 35 MPH light rail operation, with a minimum of grade separations and no gated crossings. The distance between the recommended 23rd Street and Jefferson Blvd. stations is almost 0.7 miles, which is greater than the 0.6 mile critical distance to accelerate the Blue Line car from 0 to 55 MPH and brake to a stop again. Hence, it appears to be technically feasible to operate at a speed as high as 55 MPH along this segment. However, this would not be permitted because of the heavily congested Adams Blvd. grade crossing, which will require trains to stop en route between these two station stops.

Several possible solutions are suggested, as listed below:

- o Assuming a Flower St. alignment, one possible solution would be to gate the Adams crossing. However, Adams is a heavily congested street, with a major freeway off-ramp (and in the future an HOV-lane on-ramp); and the nearby Adams/Figueroa intersection is also heavily congested. This suggests a flyover instead. Location of such a flyover will be dictated by the need to avoid the future overhead Harbor Freeway transitway structure which will continue north of Adams along the existing freeway alignment between Flower and Figueroa.
- o Therefore, consideration should be given to shifting the LRT alignment south 23rd Street, to the southwest, crossing the freeway and passing under the future transitway structure, and then curving back towards Flower on to the west side of the freeway. The rail structure would ascend to an above-grade level in the space over the unused Figueroa freeway ramp, pass over Adams, and descend to grade level along the east side of Flower St. south of Adams. Continuing south, the alignment would be fenced, and a gated crossing installed at 30th, to permit the trains to run at a higher speed through this section. (This assumes that the 28th and 29th St. freeway crossings will be demolished as part of the transitway construction.)

This alternative would probably require taking the small, 4-story apartment building at 23rd and Flower, as well as a small structure on the northwest corner of Adams and Flower. (In the case of the apartment building, this dilapidated, isolated building is likely to be torn down anyway as part of the growth that will be induced near transit station in this location, and the residents relocated.)

Much has been made in the EIR (pp. 7-2 and 7-3) of desirability of maintaining a viewscape along Flower Street; however, this viewscape will be largely destroyed when the Harbor Freeway transitway (with a huge aerial structure) is constructed. Therefore, much less additional visual clutter will be created by an aerial transit facility at Adams, adjacent to the transitway structure, than would be created if the light rail project were to be installed on aerial structure here, without the transitway.

Memo to Mr. Jim de la Loza
Metro Blue Line Extension to Exposition Park
Page 3

- o Another Flower St. alignment option, less desirable from the viewpoint of speed--but which could reduce the delay at Adams, would be to relocate the 23rd St. station to Adams, probably placing it above the freeway, combined with an at-grade crossing of Adams. Signal preemption would therefore be used to speed the light rail trains through 23rd Street. While there would be some delay at Adams under this alternative, the stop at the grade crossing would coincide with a station stop, thus reducing overall delay. (139)
- o The report does not study in detail promising alignment alternatives along the east side of the Harbor Freeway, but instead (pp. 7-4 and 7-5) dismisses this concept with a very short discussion. (140)
- o An east side alignment using Flower Street north of Adams could easily be combined with an Adams Blvd. flyover. The latter could begin just south of 23rd (the chosen station site along this part of the line) from an alignment on the west side of Flower, crossing both Flower and Adams to transition to an alignment on the east side of the Harbor Freeway. It could begin to descend to the surface above the present northbound Adams freeway off-ramp, or continue if desired on an aerial alignment for some distance south of this point. South of Adams, the following would be used for right-of-way: (141)
 - A 30' wide, unused alley east of the freeway at 28th, and perhaps the edge of the adjacent County parking structure;
 - Parking lots of the H. Claude Hudson health center south of 28th and west of Hope;
 - Freeway embankment, and possibly a small 2-story commercial structure at 29th together with a row of storage garages thence to 30th and the corner of a small ticket factory south of 30th;
 - A 30' wide parking lot north of Hope St. at 31st, and Hope Street itself from 31st to 33rd--also about 30' wide (displacing if necessary a wide but little-used parking lot on the east side of Hope);
 - From 33rd to Jefferson, a combination of freeway embankment (40' wide) plus Hope St. (30') and a 45' parking lot just to the east of the street;
 - And south of Jefferson, a 75' wide freeway embankment (next to which Hope St. is about 40' wide).

It will be noted that if a surface line is used between Adams and Jefferson on the east side of the freeway, it would permit a gated crossing a 30th (and a high running speed), with the grade crossing rather distant from parallel Flower St. and Grand Avenue. (142)

Considering the congestion at the Figueroa/Exposition intersection, taken together with off- and on-ramps in conjunction with the freeway at Exposition, an underpass below the freeway and emerging on the Exposition Blvd. median right-of-way may be most workable for an east side alignment. Underpasses of this kind have been used with considerable success on the Calgary light rail system, in changing from one alignment to another.

However, if a surface alignment is being considered from the south end of Flower St. to Exposition, despite the traffic congestion in this area, it is just as reasonable to consider a surface line transitioning from the Hope St. alignment to the Exposition Blvd. railroad right-of-way, east of the freeway.

- o The EIR (pp. 7-4 and 7-5) states that disadvantages of using an east side alignment are: need to take right-of-way from the Orthopaedic Hospital; inability to satisfy community development objectives (on the west side of the freeway); and interference with the new USC parking structure and the DMV facility.

However, with an aerial alignment over Flower and Adams, there would be no need to take any surface property from the hospital; and adequate noise mitigations (sound panels, etc. on the aerial structure) can be provided on the structure where it approaches the southern end of the hospital building.

With respect to community development objectives, there will only be one station (Jefferson) along Flower St. serving USC and the redevelopment area west of the freeway. An east side alignment will be only 240' or so farther away from the redevelopment area than will a west side alignment; hence the only real contribution of the LRT line to the redevelopment will be a visual presence along Flower. The light rail line will be peripheral to the redevelopment area, and not an integral part of it.

With respect to possible impacts on the USC parking structure and the DMV, there will be none if an underpass is used south of Jefferson; with a surface connection there may be some minor impacts on the parking structure (which actually faces Grand) and probably very little impacts on the DMV, which is south of Exposition.

- o An alternative east side alignment which would allow the present Grand Avenue Blue Line station to be used would of course entail the use of Olive St. below Washington, quickly transitioning to an aerial structure over parking lots north of 21st, taking several light industrial properties to transition to the Grand Ave./23rd St. area and continuing southwest above the Orthopaedic Hospital parking lots to gain access to the east side alignment discussed above, at Adams. (However, this would be a slightly more circuitous route than a Flower St./east side alignment.)

Memo to Mr. Jim de la Loza
Metro Blue Line Extension to Exposition Park
Page 5

- o For a west side Flower Street alignment between Washington and Adams, consideration should be given to eliminating driveways crossing the LRT line by providing alternative access via side streets (20th to 22nd), which would be truncated at Flower Street. (Elimination of intersecting streets is an often-used method of reducing the number of at-grade crossings on LRT lines.) In contrast, there may be no alternative locations for driveways belonging to the LA Trade Tech or the Orthopaedic Hospital, on the east side of Flower St.
- o Based on urban environmental considerations mentioned at various places in the report, and especially p. 7-5, if an east side Harbor Freeway alignment were considered, combined with an underpass to connect the Hope St. alignment Jefferson station with the Exposition Blvd. alignment, it appears that this would be environmentally superior to any of the alternatives studied in the EIR, because:
 - It would grade separate the line at Adams;
 - It would not impose an aerial structure close to the historic church at Adams/Flower (even though the Harbor Freeway transitway project would do so);
 - It would provide grade separation of Exposition, Figueroa, and Flower, and nearby freeway ramps on the southeastern corner of the USC campus, without impacting the viewscape along Exposition between USC and Exposition Park.

150

151



April 27, 1992

Mr. James de la Loza
Project Manager, Central Area Team
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. de la Loza,

I understand from my discussions with Rich McCarthy, Executive Vice-President at Orthopaedic Hospital that the draft E.I.R. for the Blue Line Extension to Exposition Park will be released within the next several weeks. Although we have not seen the detailed Blue Line Route recommendations, we understand that two options are under final consideration.

- o Option one would place the light rail tracks on the east side of Flower from Washington to well below Adams Street. The Blue Line Cars would pass adjacent to the western entrance to Orthopaedic Hospital. Such an alignment would block practical usage of our front entrance. Also, under this plan, a transit stop and platform would be constructed next to Trade Tech on the north east corner of 23rd and Flower. 152

This proposed route is not acceptable to Orthopaedic Hospital. We have been working closely with the LACTC leadership including Nancy Michali, Ralph de la Cruz and you as well as representatives from Los Angeles City Department of Transportation and Cal Trans Officials in identifying a Blue Line route that would be situated on the west side of Flower thereby mitigating the impact on Orthopaedic Hospital. Therefore, the proposed east side configuration is somewhat puzzling to us. 153

- o As we understand it, the second option provides for development of a platform and stop in the same location adjacent to Trade Tech. However, immediately upon leaving the 23rd Street stop, the Blue Line would cross Flower on a diagonal to the west side of the street and proceed south bound from that point forward. 154

RECEIVED

Mr. James de la Loza
April 27, 1992
Page 2

While this option appears to eliminate some of the problems related to passage of the Blue Line cars in immediate proximity to the Hospital, it appears to create complex traffic flow and access problems for us. Again, we are concerned that this second option does not consider our earlier discussions in which the Blue line would cross Flower well north of 23rd Street.

155

Much of our earlier discussion focused on development of a transit station on the south west corner of 23rd and Flower. We are still interested in pursuing this option which we believe would provide many advantages to Blue Line passengers and minimize the disruption of services at Orthopaedic Hospital.

156

As you know, Orthopaedic Hospital is one of the areas leading providers of specialized Orthopaedic care to people from throughout Southern California. We are also one of the major providers of charity care to injured and crippled children and must assure full access to our services for all of our patients. The initial Blue Line route options as we currently understand them would seriously limit this access.

I suggest that we convene a meeting of LACTC leadership with hospital staff, key hospital board members and hospital counsel to more carefully review the initial Blue Line Route options and clarify Orthopaedic Hospital's position on this issue.

We continue to support the Exposition Park extension of the Blue Line but are vitally interested in assuring that the route selection does not seriously disrupt hospital operations. The two route options outlined above appear to be very disruptive to our operations and we strongly urge serious consideration of other alternatives as part of the E.I.R. process.

Sincerely yours,



Dennis Poulsen
Chairman of the Board

cc: Mr. Ray Remy
Mr. H. Randall Stoke
Mr. Jerrold A. Fadem

Memorandum

To: Mr. Randy Stoke
Latham & Watkins

From: Don Toy
Jon Ziegler

Subject: LACTC Exposition Park Branch Line
Draft EIR Review for Orthopaedic Hospital

Date: June 17, 1992

W.O. No. 90039-10

Pursuant to our review of the subject Draft EIR and our subsequent meeting with LACTC, et al, at Orthopaedic Hospital (OH) on June 15, 1992, we offer the following comments: (Please note that we have attempted to keep our comments brief, so if you need additional detail on any item, don't hesitate to ask.)

Although there are many inconsistencies in the document, we have compiled what we believe is the intended configuration of the alternatives, based on a combination of:

1. the Draft EIR
2. the Plan & Profile received at the meeting
3. discussions held at the meeting

EIR Project Alternative 1a:

This configuration, from 23rd Street to south of the OH, consists of (moving from east to west across Flower Street) a narrowed east sidewalk with all palm trees removed, a two-way light rail corridor, one northbound contraflow traffic lane, three southbound traffic lanes, and a narrowed west sidewalk with all palm trees removed.

This alternative fails to correctly reference the configuration of the Contraflow Lane concept previously agreed to between OH and Caltrans, which included not only a northbound traffic lane, but also a two-way left turn lane in front of OH and a northbound Flower to westbound 23rd St. left turn lane.

It is our opinion that this Alternative is not in the best interests of OH for the following reasons:

A. Significantly Reduced Traffic Safety:

1. As presented, Alt. 1a would force all traffic entering the OH drop-off area to cross the train tracks twice, upon entering and upon leaving, greatly increasing the chances of a potentially serious accident.
2. All left turns from southbound Flower into the drop-off area would additionally be forced to cross the contraflow lane and its opposing traffic, while waiting in a lane which allows both through and left-turn traffic.
3. Traffic leaving the Hospital and proceeding southbound would be required to cross both the train tracks and the contraflow lane, and to attempt to immediately enter a through traffic lane.

Memorandum

4. Traffic leaving the Hospital and wishing to proceed westerly on 23rd Street would be prohibited from doing so, since no left turn lane is provided from the contraflow lane to 23rd Street. Therefore these people would be forced to turn right at 23rd Street and go around to Adams Blvd., an extremely busy street as compared to 23rd Street, via Grand Ave.

B. Removal of Palm Trees:

1. Although the documents provided conflict with relation to the proposed sidewalks widths adjacent to OH, they are clear in the fact that all palm trees would be removed and the walk would be narrower. Similarly conflicting information is presented with respect to the need narrow the sidewalk on the opposite (west) side of Flower Street, but this appears to be necessary; therefore the trees on that side would be removed.

C. Increased Noise Due to Train Operations:

1. The relatively close proximity of the trains to the Hospital buildings would certainly increase noise levels within the adjacent buildings, as compared to current levels.

D. Increased Vibration Potential:

1. The relatively close proximity of the trains to the Hospital buildings have the potential to cause unacceptable vibration levels within the buildings; and it is our opinion that this issue has not been adequately addressed in the Draft EIR.

Project Alternative 1b:

This configuration consists of placing the tracks on the east side of Flower Street as in Alternative 1a until just south of 23rd Street, and then transitioning to the west side of the street in front the Hospital. [Note that on page 1-3 of the report it is stated that "alignment would traverse from the east side just south of Orthopaedic Hospital to the west side of Flower,"(bolding added), but that on drawings separately provided, but not referenced in the report, this transition is shown to take place along the north end of the Hospital. LACTC confirmed at the meeting that it was their intent, in this alternative, to transition as shown on the drawings.]

This alternative also fails to correctly reference the configuration of the Contraflow Lane concept previously agreed to between OH and Caltrans, which included not only a northbound traffic lane, but also a two-way left turn lane in front of OH and a northbound Flower to westbound 23rd St. left turn lane.

It is our opinion that this Alternative is not in the best interests of OH for most of the same reasons listed above, and with the additional condition of the need for stopping auto and train traffic directly in front of the Hospital to allow the trains to cross Flower. This additional condition further confuses the traffic situation for those entering and leaving the OH drop-off area and would add to the noise, as well as the vibration potential, with cars and trains stopping and starting, blowing horns and the like.

cc: Orthopaedic Hospital
Attn.: Mr. Rich McCarthy

FADEM & DOUGLAS

A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION
12424 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SUITE 900
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025
(310) 207-2727

MAILING ADDRESS
POST OFFICE BOX 250050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

TELECOPIER
(310) 442-6400

June 23, 1992

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West 7th Street
Los Angeles, Ca 90017

Attn: Jim de la Loza

Re: Draft EEIR
Exposition Park Rail Transit

Gentlepeople:

This letter is written on behalf of Orthopaedic Hospital ^{*/}, located on the East side of Flower Street between 23rd Street and Adams Boulevard.

Orthopaedic Hospital provides specialized orthopaedic care. The Hospital is one of the major providers of charity care to injured and crippled children and must have assured, easy, and full access for all of its patients.

Lamentably your draft EIR falls so far short of being the informational full disclosure document CEQA mandates that it cannot be effectively critiqued in a conventional way. Its short comings are in nearly every major requirement. It lacks:

impact disclosure, *King's Co. Farm Bureau v. Hanford* (1990) 162
221 CA3 692, 712; Guidelines §15126 (a) ^{**/}

alternatives, Guidelines §§ 15002 (a)(3), 15021 (a)(2) and 163
15126 (d)

^{*/} sometimes "Hospital" hereafter.

^{**/} Guidelines means CEQA Guidelines of the State office of Planning and Research.

mitigations, *Laurel Heights v. Regents* (1988) 47 C3 376, 407-422; 164
Kings Co., 221 CA3 727-728

technical presentation so that an expert can verify the conclusions, 165
Kings Co., 221 CA3 692

writing that can be understood by lay readers, 166
Kings Co., 221 CA3 692

and even legibility.

There is not even a single description of the project. Guidelines §§15124 and 167
15125

One would like to say cure it with an addendum, but the flaws are so many, so pervasive, and so fundamental, that only a new EIR can comply with CEQA.

The inadequacy is demonstrated by the scantness of the EIR. There is no way to do an adequate EIR for a 2 mile project through an urbanized area with only 105 pages of text, and many of those pages are partial pages.

The superficiality of the EIR is again evidenced by absence in the district description of the largest, and probably most important, land use, the 168
Orthopaedic Hospital. */ 4-2

When we requested copies of the EIR we were not furnished Alignment Plans and Profiles or Station Design Plans. p.ii. *Russian Hill v. Board* (1975) 169
44 CA3 168. Others report like experience. As there are major contradictions between these plans and the EIR, many commentators, would be misled and make inappropriate comments, or not make comments. Other potential commentators would not comment because of their unawareness of the plans contradictory of the EIR.

Unbelievably, the EIR concludes the increased noise, vibration, air pollution and access interference, "would likely not be significant." 7-5 That is an unsupported 170
conclusory statement, inadequate under CEQA. *People v. Kern Co.* (1974) 39 CA3 830, 841-842.

*/ Pages are cited by their number, i.e., page 4-2 is shown as 4-2.

PRESENTATION PROBLEMS

- Maps are of such a small scale that they cannot be read, even with a magnifying glass. Fig 3.3-2 171
- Impact descriptions are incomprehensible. Page 5-68 mixes noise scales without identifying whether a CNEL scale or the A scale is being used. 172
- The impacts that are disclosed are never related to the effects on people. One cannot learn from the EIR what effect the increased air pollution has on health, noise has on patients' ability to sleep, or vibrations on a micro surgery. Guidelines §15126 (a). 173
- The EIR is self contradictory. It says at one place that there are no significant impacts and others that there are impacts. e.g., Noise 5-69 and 5-71, vibration 5-80, traffic 5-123, Parking 5-48, and table 5.3-9, pedestrian safety 5-50 and 5-52, air quality 5-64, report impacts, while 7-5, without explanation dismisses them as likely "not significant." 174
- EIR 5-50 shows the Hospitals sidewalk eliminated under alternative 1a, but Drawing EP-2 contradicts this. 175
- Orthopaedic Hospital (Hospital) is the most sensitive land use on the entire route, and the EIR unabashedly confesses to not having investigated its operation. 5-81 Guidelines §15168 (b)(1). 176

ALTERNATIVES

- A viable, indeed preferable, alternative is not discussed. Guidelines §15126 (d) (3). 177
- An alignment entirely on the west side of Flower Street between 23d Street and Adams Blvd would protect Orthopaedic Hospital from the damaging impact on its humanitarian activities that alternatives 1a and 1b, would cause. A location on the West side of Flower Street would mitigate the noise with its disturbance of ill patients. Vibrations that would endanger hand micro surgeries would be absent at the Hospital. Air pollution which would be locally increased to a health-impairing level would be mitigated. Pedestrians crossing Flower Street to get from parking, and alighting from transportation would be safe rather than

June 23, 1992

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission

Page 4

endangered as they would be by the alternatives 1a and 1b with their need to walk across two train tracks.

The 2 alternatives presented each consider a different bridge to cross the freeway. A proper consideration of alternatives would consider joint bridge use and a separate bridge use with each of those 2 alternatives.

178

MITIGATION

Mitigation measure are absent for most impacts, e.g. impacts on the Hospital include noise, vibration, air pollution, traffic safety, access impairment for ambulances and private cars carrying injured persons. No mitigations are proposed for any of these impacts except promises of a future look at avoiding traffic and pedestrian disruption with its increased air pollution and noise. 5-15, 5-61, and 5-67. Guidelines §15126 (a). This absence may be understood when one notes the rather startling suggestion that mitigation can be accomplished by compensation. 5-11 and 1-9 That suggestion reveals a fundamental misunderstanding of the EIR function, to reveal impacts on the environment and ways to mitigate impact on the environment. Guidelines §15362. Paying money does not mitigate environmental impact.

179

Another insight to the reason for the absence of mitigation proposals is seen in the absence of description of impacts on people. As the EIR does not present information on how noise, vibration, and air pollution affect people, or how pedestrian safety, and auto safety are impaired, it is impossible to describe ways to mitigate those effects.

180

There has been a task force, which included an Orthopaedic Hospital representative, to point to environmental impacts and alternatives and mitigations. But the EIR seems to have been written without consideration of what was pointed to by the task force.

181

VIBRATION

The Blue Line trains cause vibrations that travel through the ground to nearby structures. The structures are vibrated by passage of a train. This is incompatible with use of sensitive instruments and the delicate micro surgeries done at Orthopaedic Hospital.	182
The vibration section encourages the reader to forget the Hospital when it omits hospitals from the headline telling vibration sensitive uses at the top of 5-76.	183
The vibration predictions assume trains will be moving at 35 mph. 3-1 Train operators with schedules to meet and trains capable of 55 mph are not going to keep trains at 35 mph 3-1, or 30 mph. 5-81	184
Vibrations consequently will exceed the predicted level.	185
In Table 1.4-1 it is said that Alternative 1b causes no vibration impacts on the hospital. This is contradicted at 5-77 and 1-11 where it is admitted that sensitive equipment and activities could be affected.	186
In an effort to avoid describing the vibration impact, the EIR with artfully chosen words seeks to imply that unnamed Hospital personnel said the Hospital does not use sensitive equipment by saying "discussions with hospital personnel during the scoping phase of this project did not indicate that there was sensitive equipment in use." 5-77 That does not say anyone asked, or that anyone said there was not sensitive equipment used. In fact, sensitive equipment is used, and the future of the hospital could be curtailed as more sensitive technology evolves.	187
The disingenuousness of the attempted implication of no sensitive equipment is revealed when the Oct 1, 1991 letter from the Hospital administrator is read. It says that vibration is an environmental issue during construction and during on going train operation. The letter is the unnumbered 8th page from the end of the EIR.	188
The motive for creating this inaccurate implication that are no vibration sensitive uses at the Hospital is found at 5-77 where the astounding admission is made that the vibration effects on the hospital have not been studied, but will be. That study of vibration is what the EIR was supposed to	189

do. Guidelines, §15126 (a) and §21000 (a), Kings Co., 221 CA3 712. Such a study was promised by the Commission's September 1991 check list. P 12 of Appendix A.

NOISE

The noise study is at best a mistake by an author who does not understand the affects of noise or how it is measured.

The problems with the noise impact description start with a failure to describe the methods of noise measurement. Kings Co., 221 CA3 712. There are probably 20 different methods. Two characteristics are shared by all. They are all logarithmic and all use the decibel as the unit of measure. */ The EIR does not give this information to the reader. Without understanding that 10 dB means a doubling of the noise, the uninitiated would believe that a one dB increase is minimal. But each dB increase is a 10% increase in noise.

There are few EIR readers who will know by name that the A scale is the noise measurement they are used to dealing with. When those whose awareness of decibels is related to the conventional A scale read dBs in the 70's they will think it is a modest noise. But a CNEL of 70 dB's is a continuous din of much higher A scale dB's. The A scale measures individual noise events.

But this EIR mentions only the CNEL scale. 5-68. That is an averaging method over a 24 hour period. The CNEL method, because it averages individual noise events, conceals more than it reveals. With a system like the Blue Line where the noise is bunched at peak hours **/, the averaging of heavy traffic with the hours when there are few or no trains, creates a misleading dB number as it does not tell the individual noise events the Hospital would have to endure at the early morning and late afternoon peak train times. These times are the favorites for surgery, as they permit the surgeons to keep office hours and still do lengthy surgeries.

*/ Noise Reduction, Leo Beranek, McGraw Hill, P46
**/ A train every 3 minutes. 5-37

The EIR makes no mention of the train horns. Until one has heard the Blue Line horn, one cannot understand how piercingly loud it is. Rightly so with the ever rising number of intersection fatalities on the Blue Line. The horn noise level on the A scale should be said. By horn non-mention it is clear that the CNEL levels reported do not count horn noise. 193

There is reason to believe that the EIR slips into use of the individual event A scale on page 5-69 where it says " ...the allowable noise from a light rail vehicle is specified to be 77 decibels at distance of 50 feet..." and at page 5-68, "At locations where there is a direct line of sight to the freeway, ambient noise levels may reach 72-73 decibels." But one cannot know as the noise measurement scale there is not said, only the decibels. 194

The noise effects on sick patients in the hospital and on communications during surgery, and sleep are never mentioned. This is an example of the EIR's consistent failure to describe effects on people. Guidelines §15126 (b) and 2100 (b). Indeed, the only mention of the Hospital in the noise section is on one line in Table 5.5-2 where it is erroneously said that impact will be minimal. No basis for this erroneous conclusion is given. Kern Co. 39 CA3, 841-842, Kings Co. 221 CA3 692. 195

Hospitals are recommended to have CNEL levels of 40 dB(A).^{*/} The Hospital currently has a noise problem. A 10% increase would be intolerable. The EIR admits a 20% increase is possible. 5-69 If a grade separation is used it would be a 30% increase. 7-3. The more severe an existing environmental problem is, the lower is the threshold of significance. Kings 221 CA3 718-721. 196

TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

The traffic analysis is deficient. The deficiency start with the absence of the most basic needed data, a description of Flower Street's present right of way. The reader is not told the right of way width, the paved road surface width, the sidewalk widths, or if there is some right of way which is not street or sidewalk. 5-23 Without this information one cannot properly understand the discussion that follows. 197

^{*/} Noise Reduction, Leo Beranek, Mc Graw Hill, P523.

Pedestrian access , circulation , and safety are near forgotten despite pp 2-1 and 2-2 mention that circulation and access are to be encouraged.

There is a mid block pedestrian crossing on Flower that is a heavily used access to the Hospital by patients and staff. It would be reckless to have those pedestrians, some crippled, have to cross tracks with a fast moving train passing every 3 minutes. To ask the crippled to have to walk to 23rd Street to cross Flower Street and evaluate that as not significant must have been written by a person who has never had a leg injury, or used crutches or a wheel chair. 5-50

198

A west side of Flower track location would mitigate the pedestrian/train hazard.

199

The hazard to autos is the same as for pedestrians. While there is confusion in the EIR as to where tracks in alternate 1b would cross Flower Street, Figure 3.3-2, wherever that crossing is in the Hospital's block, there would be continuous auto/train friction.

200

Use of the Hospitals driveways with alternative 1a would be a difficult maneuver for North bound entry, and dangerous for Northbound exit. For Southbound, entry would be dangerous, and exit a difficult maneuver.

201

Under 1a all left turns from southbound Flower into the patient drop-off area would cross the contraflow lane while waiting in a lane which allows both through and left-turn traffic under alternative 1a. 5-37

202

Traffic leaving the Hospital and proceeding southbound would cross both the train tracks and the contra lane, and have to attempt to immediately enter a through traffic lane.

203

These are unsafe proposals.

The Hospital driveways onto Flower Street would be unsafely impaired by Alternative 1a. Because of the uncertainty where Alternative 1b would move the tracks to the West side of Flower Street, the driveway impact cannot be determined. The consequences of driveway loss would not be over stated as catastrophic. 1-3, 3-3

204

- The EIR discusses "LOS" without describing what level of service means or the meaning of each level. 5-25 A lay reader would have trouble divining from the LOS code that there is going to be gridlock at Adams and at 23d Street. 5-29 and 5-44 205
- The project significantly threatens the Hospital access requirements which the years long transitway negotiations with Caltrans preserved. Elimination of the North bound contra lane is contemplated. 5-55 Left turns from Flower onto Adams are to be forbidden. 5-41 These would destroy needed easy access to the Hospital. 206
- Hidden in the Air Quality section is the admission that this grid lock is likely to be unacceptable, requiring an overpass. 5-67 Trains would pre empt the signals at Adams Boulevard. 5-67 Trains would occupy the intersection 1/2 minute out of every 3 minutes. 5-37 207
- The EIR confesses that it has not evaluated this situation and that it may require an overpass which is nowhere evaluated. People v. Kern Co. (1974) 39 CA3 830, 841-842. 5-67 It needs to be a discussed alternative. 208
- Alternative 1b proposes a mid block signal in front of the Hospital. 5-42 That would add to traffic congestion and raises the air pollution with the added stops and starts from 3 traffic signals in one block. 5-23 209
- Traffic leaving the Hospital Flower Street driveways could not proceed westerly on 23rd Street, since no left turn lane is provided from the contra lane to 23rd Street. Therefore this traffic would be forced to turn right at 23rd Street and go to Adams Blvd., an extremely busy street. That would add to traffic congestion. 210
- The Caltrans Transitway which physically overlaps the rail line is only passingly mentioned. 4-6 Absent is a description of how the 2 systems are to cohabit. The reader is left only with a promise that LACTC "will continue to work with Caltrans" */ 5-15 and 5-61. It is required that compatibility with 211

*/ CalTrans believes it should design the freeway crossing. DOT
October 10, 1991 letter.

other projects be discussed, not put off to the future. Guidelines, § 15125 (b).
Kings Co., 221 CA3 727-728.

AIR QUALITY

The local increased air pollution created by the project caused gridlock and added stops and starts for autos is discussed only for carbon monoxide. 5-64 and 5-65 212

Impacts from the increases of other auto-produced pollutants: lead, particulates, nitrogen dioxide, and ozone are not described or discussed. 5-62 Most of these already exceed standards. 4-7. The more severe existing problems are, the lower is the threshold of significance. Hanford 221 CA3 718-721. 213

That is unacceptable for a hospital with its population of ill persons.

PARKING

Parking admittedly will be decreased. Table 5.3-9. Then that decrease is characterized as not a significant impact 5-48, when it will be significant. No parking is proposed for the 23rd Street train station. 5-46 That will add to the parking deficit. 214

No mitigation is proposed.

THE SOLUTION


The solution is obvious. It is to put the tracks on the West side of Flower Street, opposite the Hospital. This may encroach onto the block on the West side of Flower. Tracks West of Flower would mitigate the Hospital's noise and vibration problems, it would provide a station location on 23d Street, and it would provide space for station parking. It would eliminate the pedestrian and auto safety problem. 5-61 It would provide a bus lay over area. 5-54 It would solve the shortage of Southbound Flower lanes. 1-11, 5-55, 5-36 and 5-40.

215

Equally desirable, it would also eliminate the substandard living conditions in the apartment on the West side of Flower Street at 23d Street. 5-19 The tenants could be provided proper housing. If replacement housing becomes needed it is an authorized project cost. Govt Code §7272.3 and 7264.5. Proper housing could be provided by the Community Redevelopment Agency which is trying to improve the residential quality in the neighborhood under the Hoover Redevelopment Plan. 2-1, 4-4 and 5-15. It is to be noted that the Community Plan shows the block west of the Hospital as publicly owned. Fig 5.1-7

216

Sincerely,



Jerrold A. Fadem
Fadem & Douglas

LATHAM & WATKINS

PAUL R. WATKINS (1899-1973)
DANA LATHAM (1898-1874)

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
633 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 4000
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071-2007

TELEPHONE (213) 485-1234

FAX (213) 891-8763

TLX 590773

ELN 62793268

CABLE ADDR FSS LATHWAT

June 22, 1992

CHICAGO OFFICE

SEARS TOWER, SUITE 5800
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60608
TELEPHONE (312) 876-7700
FAX (312) 993-9767

LONDON OFFICE

ONE ANGEL COURT
LONDON EC2R 7HJ ENGLAND
TELEPHONE 071-374 4444
FAX 071-374 4460

NEW YORK OFFICE

885 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1000
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-4802
TELEPHONE (212) 906-1200
FAX (212) 751-4864

ORANGE COUNTY OFFICE

650 TOWN CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 2000
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626-1925
TELEPHONE (714) 540-1235
FAX (714) 755-8290

SAN DIEGO OFFICE

701 "B" STREET, SUITE 2100
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-8197
TELEPHONE (619) 236-1234
FAX (619) 696-7419

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE

505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1900
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-2586
TELEPHONE (415) 391-0600
FAX (415) 395-8095

WASHINGTON, D.C. OFFICE

1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W., SUITE 1300
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2505
TELEPHONE (202) 637-2200
FAX (202) 637-2201

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Attention: Jim de la Loza

In re: Draft Environmental Impact Report
Exposition Park Branch line Rail
Transit Corridor Route.

Dear Commissioners:

This letter is written on behalf of our client Orthopaedic Hospital which is located on the East side of Flower Street between 23rd Street and Adams Boulevard. The purpose of this letter is to respond to the request of your Staff for comments on the above referenced draft EIR.

The Hospital has for the last few years been supportive of the extension of the Blue Line to Exposition Park. At all times and in all conversations between representatives of the Hospital and LACTC and its representatives it was understood by the Hospital that any such extension would occur on the West side of Flower Street in the area of Orthopaedic Hospital.

Orthopaedic Hospital provides specialized orthopaedic care to people throughout Southern California and in particular to those in the Metropolitan area. The Hospital is one of the major providers of charity care to injured and crippled children and must assure full access to its services for all of its patients.

Late last year the Hospital officials had some indication that the Staff of LACTC and its consultants were considering deviating from the understanding regarding the alignment for the Blue Line extension. Representatives of the

June 18, 1992
Page 2

Hospital wrote to Mr. de la Loza in October and April expressing great concern for any change in the alignment that they originally understood. (See copies of letters attached.)

The Hospital was disappointed to receive the DEIR which makes no reference to an alignment along the westerly side of Flower Street, even as an alternative. 1 A and 1 B as proposed make no sense at all and will do great damage to the hospital. It is inconceivable in this writer's mind that a DEIR could be prepared which ignores the westerly alignment and all that has transpired since the CalTrans EIS, which was also virtually ignored by the LACTC Staff and its consultants, which also heavily impacts Flower Street in direct conflict with the LACTC proposal.

The failure of the DEIR reporter to consider the westerly alignment makes this environmental process and the DEIR a waste of time for everyone involved. The Hospital did have the privilege of outlining specifically to Mr. de la Cruz at a meeting on June 15 its problems with what the Staff of LACTC and its consultants have proposed. Unfortunately all we have is this deficient DEIR as the only work product to which we are permitted to make comments.

The DEIR is flawed throughout. Section 1.5 concerning areas of controversies and issues to be resolved totally ignores the alignment that has been the subject of conversations between LACTC and the Hospital, the needs of the Hospital and the damages to the Hospital that the two alternatives would inflict.

Table 1.4-1, which is a summary of environmental impacts and mitigation measures, is totally irrelevant with respect to environmental categories, local area plans, population and housing, transportation and circulation, noise/vibration, geology/hydrology, construction, public services, esthetics and cultural resources because no consideration was given to westerly alignment of the extension along Flower Street, at least as a mitigation measure.

Chapter 2 is likewise deficient since the planning history makes no mention of either the CalTrans project and its traffic impacts on the Hospital or the communications between the Hospital and LACTC.

Chapter 3 is deficient in that it fails to consider a reasonable alternative which should have been the preferred westerly alignment for the extension.

217

218

219

220

June 18, 1992

Page 3

Chapter 3.4 is likewise deficient since the station should really be on the West side of Flower Street Northerly of 23rd Street which alternative is not even considered in the DEIR.

221

Chapter 4: The environmental setting does not describe the Hospital in terms of its value to the community, its inter-relationship to the project and the impact of the project on the Hospital.

222

The DEIR ignores the Final Environmental Assessment by CalTrans concerning the Northerly Terminus of the I-110 Transitway dated February 11, 1992. The DEIR treats the CalTrans project as some other regional project. Nothing could be further from the truth, as the Staff of LACTC and its consultants know. The CalTrans project will result in a north-bound contra lane on the easterly side of Flower Street in direct conflict with the DEIR proposal.

Each chapter of the DEIR is similarly flawed. The Hospital has provided to the Staff and consultants of LACTC drawings by the architectural firm of Albert C. Martin and Associates demonstrating the conflict between the proposals of the DEIR and what will result from the CalTrans construction. In addition, we attach notes of Albert C. Martin and Associates, dated June 17, 1992 reflecting some of the LACTC-Hospital discussion which occurred on June 15, 1992. What the Staff and consultants of LACTC do not seem to understand or appreciate is that the Hospital services are being provided to injured and crippled persons, people who have physical problems; and people who have problems associated with physical injuries. The Hospital hopes that the Commission will understand that the perception of the public is that the front doors and open arms of the Hospital to the public are on the West side of its facility and the Hospital must be able to accommodate those who need to use the hospital facilities.

223

The DEIR is internally inconsistent in its consideration of the noise, vibration and physical impacts on the Hospital which will be caused by either of the two proposals recommended by the Staff and consultants of LACTC. Attached is a brief statement outlining some of the problems which the Hospital will encounter.

224

The Hospital has devoted its time, its energy and its money to assist the LACTC in accomplishing the Blue Line extension. What the Staff and consultants of LACTC have proposed cannot, under any stretch of the imagination, from the Hospital or community standpoint, be accepted. We regret the necessity


June 18, 1992
Page 4

but we must respectfully suggest that this DEIR be scrapped. It is respectfully suggested that a new DEIR be prepared showing the alignment of the extension (with a transit station North and West of Flower and 23rd Streets) on the westerly side of Flower Street as the preferred alternative. The Hospital has at all times responded to its civic responsibilities and it has done so in this case. The Hospital hopes that the Commission will understand the hospital's problems and needs and will revise its project accordingly.

225

Respectfully submitted,

LATHAM & WATKINS

By 

H. Randall Stoke
Attorneys for Orthopaedic Hospital

Encls.

June 23, 1992

reid
6-23-92
© LA Trade Park
4.30
[signature]

My name is Eloise Helwig. I am executive vice president of the Los Angeles Orthopaedic Foundation, which provides funding to Orthopaedic Hospital for charity care, research and medical education.

I am here to speak on behalf of the hospital -- its employees, medical staff and hundreds of volunteers -- who devote thousands of hours of service to Orthopaedic Hospital. Most of all, I speak on behalf of the children and adults with orthopaedic difficulties who come to us for treatment and their families who care for them.

We are a community facility; a charity hospital. Since 1922, when Orthopaedic Hospital opened its doors -- thanks to the

vision of our founder, Dr. Charles LeRoy Lowman -- we have continuously provided world-class medical care to orthopaedically disabled and crippled children regardless of their ability to pay.

Last year, we treated over 20,000 children in our clinics. Forty percent of these children were Hispanic and thirty-three percent were Black; most of them coming from the South Central and Eastern part of our city.

We also provide a clinic in Calexico one weekend a month to serve children from Mexico. Our doctors and volunteers visit the clinic and see approximately 250 children. Approximately 13 children are brought here to Orthopaedic Hospital each month for more complicated surgeries. We see more than 1,000 children from Mexico during the course of the

year. Our doctors who volunteer at the clinic do not get paid for their services.

Additionally, we see children from all over the world. We have had children from Afghanistan, Korea, Russia and from Central and South America. Tomorrow, we will go to the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and meet a six-year old boy from Romania who will be with us for approximately six months while our doctors treat him for deformities of both feet at the metatarsal joints (bilateral fixed varus deformity of the forefeet).

Orthopaedic Hospital is a specialty care hospital, providing medical care to treat various orthopaedic specialities. We have the largest hospital for hemophilia patients in the country -- we currently have more than 300 patients with this bleeding disorder.

We have over 400 children with spina bifida, a genetic condition. A child is born with an opening or hole in its spine, resulting in a great variety of physical disabilities.

We also have more than 400 children with cerebral palsy, and, again, with a variety of physical disabilities.

Three years ago in May 1989, we signed an agreement with the County of Los Angeles to take children of the city who, because of their inability to pay, are sent to the overcrowded County hospitals to repair a broken arm, a broken leg or a fractured hip.

At times, these children must wait hours, or even days, to get the proper treatment due to the heavy caseload at County hospitals.

Orthopaedic Hospital accepts these children and treatment is provided by the finest of medical staff -- all of this, at no cost to the County or to the families of these children.

In 1958, we began accepting adults because of the incidence of greater orthopaedic conditions affecting adults. Today, fifty-five percent of our patient population is children; forty-five percent is adults. We have the largest joint replacement institute in the country serving adults, replacement of hips and knees, using state of art techniques.

Orthopaedic Hospital is a teaching hospital -- the largest teaching hospital in the West for orthopaedics. It also has a very intensive

research program -- the largest privately funded research institution in the country.

We have more than 400 attending physicians who come from all over Southern California. Our employees number 600; our volunteers number 576, providing more than 32,000 hours annually.


All of these people will be affected by the project now before the Commission. For the record, we are not opposing this process; we are concerned that you understand the full impact that this project, as currently designed, will have on our ability to serve the needs of our community:

- access to the hospital for patients and employees;

- inconvenience for our surgeons and medical staff;
- vibration and noise level issues which will have a detrimental impact on our very sensitive equipment and the well-being of our patients;
- dirt pollution which will have a serious impact on our heating and air conditioning system; and,
- our ability to continue to attract volunteers who are so important to our existence.

We ask for your understanding and support of our work here at Orthopaedic Hospital.

Thank you.





October 1, 1991

Mr. Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Jim,

Thank you for sending the Draft Environmental Impact Report to Orthopaedic Hospital for review and comment. I would like to outline the concerns that Orthopaedic Hospital has regarding any significant construction and/or increased traffic flow in proximity to the hospital. I am also enclosing a report developed by Hospital staff last year in response to the planned Cal Trans HOV project. Some of the issues raised in this study may be relevant to the EIR study and should be given consideration in both route planning and construction plans for the Blue Line Project.


We are primarily concerned with maintenance of good access to the Hospital including access from Flower Street and full access to the rear of the hospital from 23rd Street. We believe that access can best be maintained by placement of the light rail line along a right of way on the west side of Flower. Placement of the light rail line in the center of Flower or on the east side of the street would significantly reduce both northbound and southbound entry to the Hospital. We also want to be certain that the Light Rail project will not negatively impact the eastbound and westbound traffic flow on 23rd Street. Many of our patients access the hospital through the 23rd Street entrance.

228

Other environmental issues relate to noise levels and vibration levels during the light rail construction phases as well as any impact resulting from ongoing light rail operations. We also are interested in processes to mitigate ambient dust flow during construction. Concerns related to these issues are described in greater detail in the attached report.

We would be pleased to work with you and the EIR consultants to be certain that the above outlined issues are appropriately considered in the Environmental Assessment.

Best regards,


Richard McCarthy

EXBD
ROW

Antenna Research Company

3954 Edenhurst Avenue • Los Angeles, California 90039 • (213) 664-7351

MICROFILMED
JUL 11 1992

220234

July 7, 1992

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
218 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles California 90017

Attn: Mr. Jim De La Loza
Mrs. Nancy Mickely

After reviewing the DEIR documents for the Exposition Park Branch, I have prepared some comments that you might find useful.

While Alternative 2b (subway) offers an attractive solution to the surface traffic problems without precluding an easterly extension in the future, both Alternatives 1a (at-grade east side), and 1b (at-grade west side) appear to be very poor alignments.

The following concerns are related to Alternative 1a:

229

1. This alignment appears to be much too close to the Orthopaedic Hospital with possible long term negative impacts to the facility which could result in lengthy litigation.
2. Placing the tracks on the existing Flower Street bridge over the Harbor Freeway will result in a long stretch of relatively slow LRT operation (25 MPH vs 35-40 MPH for adjacent traffic). A realigned street would likely only marginally improve these speeds and would mandate a joint bridge with Caltrans resulting in a long and complex design phase and drastically increased costs for construction and property acquisition.
3. The alignment is open to potentially severe conflicts with regular Flower Street traffic, and both northbound and southbound HOV movements at Adams Boulevard which will likely have a long term adverse effect on LRT operations, traffic flow and overall safety.

The following concerns are related to Alternative 1b:

230

1. Perhaps even more so than Alternative 1a this alignment would seem to pose severe LRT operational and safety concerns, especially since it will have at-grade crossings with Adams Boulevard once and Flower Street twice as well as pass directly in

front of cars exiting a drive-thru Mc Donald's restaurant and cars entering and leaving Saint John's Episcopal Church and several other small businesses. The 35 MPH LRT speed shown in the DEIR would appear to be extremely optimistic. (One major lawsuit here might make the LACTC wish it had sought a different approach).

2. A separate LRT bridge over the Harbor Freeway just westerly of Flower Street would likely incur similar consequences as that described for the combined bridge in Alternative 1a since, due to the proximity of Flower Street to the LRT bridge, Caltrans would still have to design their own bridge. All this would seem to be a lot of investment with very little payback as the alignment would still be burdened with a slow and potentially unsafe LRT operation.

231

In summary, Alternative 1a and particularly Alternative 1b will no doubt slow down LRT service, exacerbate an already overloaded vehicular traffic system, and provide an exasperating entry into downtown Los Angeles for USC and Exposition Park riders as well as those from Santa Monica when the line is extended westerly. One need not be reminded that a regional LRT route must have an attractive service and fast running times to successfully compete with the private car.

I strongly urge the LACTC to reconsider an alignment east of the Harbor Freeway (see enclosure) or consider some other alternative that will effectively mitigate my concerns about crossing Adams Boulevard at grade, or even consider alignments along Grand Avenue or Hill Street but with direct access to the proposed Transitway station at 37th Street.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,



Alan Fisher

CC: Robert Biller
USC

Richard Mc Carthy
Orthopaedic Hospital

J.A. Gravich
LATT

Alan Havens
SCAG



SIERRA CLUB — ANGELES CHAPTER

3550 WEST SIXTH STREET, SUITE 321, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90020

(213) 387-4287

3104 Mount Curve Ave.
Altadena, CA 91001

July 20, 1992


Jim de la Loza, Project Manager
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. de la Loza:

Re: Exposition Park Branch Line DEIR

We wish to congratulate the Commission on the initiative and the creative energy which gave rise to this project. Our only comment is that we hope that the project will be given a very high priority; it is badly needed.

232

Sincerely,

Stanley Hart, Chairman
Transportation Committee



Automobile Club of Southern California

HEADQUARTERS: 2601 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007-3294
MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 2890 TERMINAL ANNEX • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90051-0890

DAVID D. GRAYSON
DIRECTOR
ENGINEERING & TECHNICAL SERVICES

June 23, 1992

Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich, Chair
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West 7th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Supervisor Antonovich:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Route Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). We note the purpose of the DEIR is to guide the LACTC as it considers the selection of a preferred project from the options currently under study. In order to provide a solid basis for this critical decision, we believe that the DEIR could be strengthened in several ways:

1. **Possible extensions should be discussed.** The DEIR is largely silent on possible extensions of the Exposition Park Branch Line, specifically the USC to Santa Monica candidate corridor. The DEIR should address the impact of such an extension on Branch Line patronage and train operations, especially as they affect traffic and circulation. 233
2. **Better coordination is needed with studies of the northerly terminus of the Harbor Freeway Transitway.** Caltrans' "Initial Study/Environmental Assessment" for the northerly terminus I-110 Transitway (dated April 26 and May 2, 1991) arrives at different conclusions about future traffic conditions. Caltrans forecasts future PM peak level of service F along Adams Avenue (with the transitway). The DEIR (with mitigation) forecasts a more optimistic level of service D. This location is critical to both community traffic circulation, and access to and from the transitway for buses and carpools. The differences should be explained and resolved. 234

Supervisor Michael Antonovich
June 23, 1992
Page 2

3. **More analysis is needed of the rail line crossovers on Flower Street in Alternative 1b.** The justification for the crossover from the east side of Flower Street to the west side, and return, is not clear. Although traffic signalization is discussed as a safety and control measure at these crossovers, the impact on traffic and circulation of trains weaving across Flower and back is not described. 235
4. **Analysis of traffic circulation at stations could be strengthened.** Although pedestrian circulation and parking in and around the Branch Line stations is discussed, there is no explicit analysis of traffic circulation adjacent to rail stations. Auto access, bus operations, park-and-ride and kiss-and-ride activity may be significant in the vicinity of the stations and we suggest an evaluation of these impacts be included in the DEIR. 236

Sincerely,



David D. Grayson

jm

pc: Neil Peterson, LACTC
LACTC Board Members
Jim de la Losa, LACTC ✓

DRAFT/CMNT

Re: 1

220279

OFFICERS
WILLIAM R. ROBERTSON
PRESIDENT

N. MATTHEW GROSSMAN
VICE PRESIDENT

MARGARET U. FARNUM
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER



SITE OF 1932 AND 1984
OLYMPICS ATHLETICS COMPETITION
OPENING & CLOSING CEREMONIES



SITE OF 1984 OLYMPICS
BOXING COMPETITION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
JESSE A. BREWER
JAMES F. DICKASON
N. MATTHEW GROSSMAN

ROGER KOZBERG
ALTERNATE

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
DEANE DANA
EDMUND D. EDELMAN

KENNETH HAHN
ALTERNATE

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
NATE HOLDEN
RICHARD J. RIORDAN
WILLIAM R. ROBERTSON

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
J. STANLEY SANDERS
ALTERNATES

LOS ANGELES MEMORIAL COLISEUM COMMISSION

COLISEUM, 3911 SO. FIGUEROA ST. • 747-7111 — SPORTS ARENA, 3939 S. FIGUEROA ST. • 748-6136
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90037

July 7, 1992

Mr. Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West 7th Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90017

Dear Jim:

Since I was on vacation last week, I could not attend the public hearing for the Metro Blue Line Extension to Exposition Park. I have read through the draft, and my comments are attached.

The Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission and Spectacor are supportive of two stations -- Vermont and Figueroa. The at-grade alternative appears to be the only proposal that plans for a station at Exposition and Figueroa. We would, therefore, favor Alternate 2c with the belief that outstanding technical and traffic engineers can devise a workable plan for the intersection at Figueroa/Exposition/37th Street.

The retention of a licensed landscape architect to assess how many of the existing trees to be removed can be retained and incorporated into the project landscaping plan is excellent. There should be an emphasis on greenery along the entire route, with special attention to Exposition Boulevard so it will blend into the Park and University settings, which are adjacent to the proposed project.

237

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Margaret Farnum
Chief Administrative Officer

gbl

Enclosure

cc: Bill Robertson, w/enclosure
Bob Biller, w/enclosure

UNCLASSIFIED
TOP SECRET

COMMENTS ON DRAFT EIR BLUE LINE

Page 1-8 - 2nd Paragraph - Vermont Station - last sentence 238

Would it be more cost effective to plan for the future with 3-car platforms?

Page 1-12

There may be a significant noise impact on USC, CMSI and the new school by Alternatives 2a and 2c. 239

Page 3-3 - Alternative 2a - Elevated segment would: 240

- a. Visually detract from beauty of Exposition Park and USC.
- b. Have a more far-reaching impact upon the surrounding community since the sound would penetrate a greater distance.
- c. Probably disrupt normal traffic the least along entire route.

Alternative 2b

- a. Would be best solution to present surface traffic congestion and problems at Exposition/Figueroa/37th Street intersection, but fencing needed at portal entry would interfere with pedestrian traffic between USC and the Park. 241
- b. Attention should be given to methods to guarantee that youngsters/gangs/transients do not enter underground tunnel for play/mischief/protection from elements. This is probably addressed in similar projects. 242

Alternative 2c

- a. At-grade will challenge traffic planners to design traffic patterns to handle the congested area at Figueroa/Exposition/37th Street intersection. 243
- b. This appears to be the only alternative that plans for a station at Figueroa and Exposition.

Pages 2-1 and 3-11

"Tail" tracks should be "rail" tracks. 244

Page 3-11 - Vermont Station

- a. How long will it take to expand each station to 3-car platforms? 245

b. Does expansion disrupt service?	
c. What is cost differential between a 3-car platform now and expanding to 3-car later?	246
<u>Page 4-1 - 4.1.1 - 3rd line</u>	247
Landforms or "landfills"?	
<u>Page 4-2 - (Last line of 1st Paragraph)</u>	
What would be the depth of subway portion?	248
<u>Page 4-2 - Park/Vermont Square</u>	
Wouldn't it be proper to include "Los Angeles Swimming Pool" and "Community Center"? I believe "northeast" is more educational and commercial.	249
<u>Page 4-4 - 4th Paragraph, 4th Line</u>	
Uses should include "sports facilities".	250
<u>Page 4-7 - Exposition Park Projects</u>	
Is 6,368 parking spaces a <u>net gain over what is already available in Park?</u>	251
Should renovation of Coliseum be noted? There is no increase in capacity, but the process will have an impact. Would we be criticized for not acknowledging this project?	252
<u>Page 5-11 - 6th Paragraph, second line</u>	
Is it true that Exposition Park is zoned "Residential"?	253
<u>Page 5-47 - Exposition Park/Vermont Street, Paragraph 1, 4th Line</u>	
Should not <u>Menlo Avenue</u> be substituted for <u>Hoover Street</u> ? Hoover Street dead-ends at Jefferson on the north and resumes at Martin Luther King on the south.	254
<u>Page 5-47 - Paragraph 2 - Lines 3 and 4</u>	255
Should it be noted that these lots also serve the Museums and some USC students?	
<u>Page 5-89 - Traffic Impacts -- Alternatives 2a and 2b</u>	256
It would be my hope that the construction time frame would take into consideration our heavy event schedule from July/August through April, especially September through January at the Coliseum. If the closing of streets could be coordinated with DOT/LAMCC on heavily-trafficked events, there would be less impact on the community, the facilities, and air quality.	

Page 5-97 - First Paragraph

CMSI also has its own security force within Exposition Park. 257

Page 5-105

Are there places within the project area that could be enhanced by the transplanting of the trees that could be saved -- church, school, apartment complexes, parking lot perimeters or nearby residential -- if they cannot be used along the streets? 258

Page 5-106 - Setting -- 3rd Paragraph & Page 5-109 -- Last Paragraph

Since this is not an EIR for the extension to Santa Monica -- just to Exposition Park -- why would the La Cienega oil field be included when it is 5 miles west of our project? 259

Page 5-106 - 4th Paragraph

I believe the ARCO station at Exposition and Vermont is at the southwest corner rather than the southeast corner. 260

Page 5-121

Is the Rose Garden also a Historical Landmark? The Community Center on Menlo near the swimming pool is a Historical-Cultural Monument. 261

Page 6-3 - Last Paragraph

It is very timely to go forward with this light rail during the Rebuild L.A. project. It would bring employment to a high-unemployed area, update the transportation system to a disadvantaged community, and open new areas of employment and entertainment to South Central Los Angeles. 262

The Blue Line extension to Exposition Park would provide park and ride lots to assist City and County of Los Angeles in plans to lessen auto traffic in inner city.

LOS ANGELES CONSERVANCY

Roosevelt Building • 727 West Seventh Street • Suite 955 • Los Angeles, California 90017 • 213 /623-CITY

VIA TELECOPIER AND U.S. MAIL

July 10, 1992

Mr. James de la Loza
Project Manager
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90017

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report
Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transportation Corridor Route

Dear Mr. de la Loza:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for the Exposition Park Branch Line. Our comments will address the Cultural Resources section, 5.13.

We are particularly concerned about the removal of the historic street lights along Flower Street between Washington Boulevard and Exposition Boulevard discussed at Section 5, page 121 of the report. These fixtures are important historical resources that contribute to the character of the streetscape. In communities throughout the city, residents and property owners have been working with the Bureau of Street Lighting to preserve and refurbish historic street lights as a means of retaining the historic ambience of their neighborhoods.

263

The DEIR identified the removal of the historic 1932 street lights as an impact however it failed to analyze feasible ways of mitigating that impact including reusing them. The DEIR Mitigation Measures, at page 5-124, merely state that the LACTC "should work with the Bureau of Street Lighting . . . regarding the design of the proposed replacement street lights. At that time the potential of reusing and updating the lights should be considered as an alternative to removal and replacement with new lights." CEQA requires that this analysis be undertaken at the earliest possible time in a project so the decision maker will have complete information.

Mr. James de la Loza
DEIR: Exposition Park Branch Line
July 10, 1992
Page 2

Therefore, the final EIR must analyze the feasibility of reusing the historic street lights. This analysis should include incorporating them into a dual lighting system if increased illumination is required to meet current lighting standards.

The technology exists to refurbish the historic street lights which subsequently cost less to maintain and last longer. In some areas of the city, dual street lighting systems are being installed that preserve the historic lights and add new davit poles to increase lighting levels to meet current standards. An example of this dual system exists in a current project along Spring Street, in the redevelopment area, where vintage lights are being retained and refurbished and additional modern street lights will be installed.

Retaining the 1932 street lights along Flower Street will preserve a highly visible element of the city's history. Thank you for considering our comments.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Barbara Hoff".

Barbara Hoff
Director of Preservation Issues

PD 410

COX, CASTLE & NICHOLSON

A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

LAWYERS

2049 CENTURY PARK EAST

TWENTY-EIGHTH FLOOR

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067-3284

TELEPHONE (310) 277-4222

FACSIMILE (310) 277-7889

221424

July 13, 1992

PHILLIP R. NICHOLSON
LAWRENCE TEPLIN
RONALD I. SILVERMAN
STEPHEN G. SHAPIRO
MARIO CAMARA
GEORGE D. CALKINS, II
JOHN H. KUHLMAN
PHILLIP E. HIMELSTEIN
ARTHUR O. SPAULDING, JR.
JEFFREY LAPOTA
DAVID A. LEIPZIGER
JOHN S. MILLER, JR.
KENNETH B. BLEY
IRA J. WALDMAN
JOHN F. NICHOLSON
CHARLES E. NONEMAN
WILLIAM KAMER
MARLENE D. GOODFRIED
EVERITT G. BEERS
BARRY P. JABLON
JEFFREY D. MASTERS
ROBERT D. INFELISE
EDWARD G. SHIRLEY
BRADLEY D. FRAZIER
TAMAR C. STEIN
EDYTHE L. BRONSTON
CAROL M. LIFLAND
DOUGLAS P. SNYDER
JOHN R. CAUBLE, JR.
GARY A. GLICK
LORA LEE MOORE
LEWIS G. FELDMAN
P. JEROLD WALSH
MARK P. McCLANATHAN
JOHN A. KINCANNON
STANLEY W. LAMPORT
RANDALL W. BLACK
W. McLIN LINES
PERRY D. MOCCIARO

JESS R. BRESSI
GREGORY J. KARNS
D. SCOTT TURNER
SAMUEL H. GRUENBAUM
SANDRA C. STEWART
HERBERT J. KLEIN
DONNA J. CHRISTENSEN
STEVEN A. JUNG
JILL L. JASPER
KENNETH WILLIAMS
SUSAN J. JACKSON
KATHRYN M. LYDDAN
CARLISLE G. PACKARD
DAVID S. ROSENBERG
CARLA K. RYHAL
MICHAEL L. TIDUS
MATHEW A. WYMAN
LESLIE M. BAKER
AMY W. BRAMMER
PHILIP J. COLLIAS
H. MARK MERSEL
LISA A. STERES
DIANE E. TIBEREND
SCOTT D. BROOKS
SHARON L. TAMIYA
AMY H. WELLS
ROBERT L. BENUN
MITCHELL I. BURGER
ADRIENNE TYMON KENTOR
MARK A. REZAC
SHERRY M. DUPONT
JACKIE K. MILLER
PAUL J. TITCHER
KERRY V. WILKINSON
STUART J. EINBINDER
CAMELLIA KUO
TINA R. LIBENSON
ROBERT A. LURIE
MARY A. MINETTE

OF COUNSEL
GEORGE M. COX
RICHARD N. CASTLE
LAWRENCE J. TRACY
JAMES E. BARNETT
HOWARD GOLDSTEIN
EDWARD C. DYGERT
KEITH C. EYRICH
KEITH B. BARDELLINI

ORANGE COUNTY OFFICE
19800 MACARTHUR BOULEVARD
SUITE 600
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92715-2435
(714) 476-2111
(310) 284-2187

OUR FILE NO:

21974

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

310/284-2290

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90017
Attention: Mr. Jim de la Loza

Re: Draft EIR for the Exposition Park Branch Line Rail
Transit Corridor Route

Dear Commissioners:

This letter is written on behalf of our client, Esperanza Community Housing Corporation ("Esperanza"), a public interest corporation that works to provide and preserve low cost housing in the South Central Los Angeles area. Esperanza operates from St. Vincent's Church located at 621 W. Adams Boulevard and is run by Sister Diane Donoghue. Esperanza is extremely interested in the impact of the Exposition Park Branch Line (also referred to as the "Blue Line" or the "Blue Line extension") on the tenants of the apartment building located at 2315 S. Flower Street, between 23rd Street and Adams Boulevard.

Representatives of Esperanza and LACTC have met on many occasions over the last year, both privately and publicly, to discuss the Blue Line's impacts on those residents. It had always been Esperanza's understanding based on these meetings that there were three options being considered for the route of the line between Washington and 29th Street: one that traveled down the eastern side of Flower Street, one that crossed Flower Street directly in front of the apartment building, and one that traveled down the western side of Flower Street directly in front

of the apartment building. Esperanza also has understood that Orthopaedic Hospital, located directly across the street from the apartment building, has worked with LACTC for the past year to ensure that the western alignment is chosen because of the extreme adverse impacts that the other two alignments would have on the hospital.

Needless to say, we were quite surprised and dismayed to discover that the Draft EIR prepared by LACTC's consultant did not even describe the western alignment, either as a part of the project or as an alternative! The deficiencies of the Draft EIR are legion; but this complete omission of the only feasible route for the northern segment of the rail renders the Draft EIR beyond repair. Therefore, Esperanza regretfully must request that the Draft EIR be scrapped, and that a new Draft EIR that considers the western alignment and that corrects the other deficiencies set forth, infra, be prepared and recirculated.

264

The Draft EIR's consideration of the Blue Line's impacts on the residents of the apartment building is conclusionary, unsupported by any studies or analysis, and utterly contrary to common sense. Much of the Draft EIR ignores the existence of the apartment building altogether.

265

For example, page 4-4 of the Draft EIR describes the land uses along the Blue Line's route, completely omitting the apartment building. While chapter 5.1 (Land Use) mentions the apartment building at page 5-1, and even includes a picture of it in figure 5.1-3, there is absolutely no discussion on the Blue Line's significant impact on the apartment building in the "Impacts" discussion on pages 5-6 and 5-8.

266

The land use mitigation measures cryptically state that "LACTC would work with affected property owners, once the design alternative has been selected, to develop plans for compensating property acquisitions" (Page 5-11.) It is patently insufficient for the EIR to leave the analysis of the impact of the project on adjacent land uses for a later date. Citizens for Quality Growth v. City of Mount Shasta, 198 Cal.App.3d 433 (1988) The EIR should specifically identify those properties that will be acquired, and in the case of the apartment building, must specify that a program of owner compensation, renter relocation, and replacement housing provision will be undertaken. As will be discussed in more detail, infra, if and when the LACTC condemns the property on which the apartment building is located, it must provide replacement housing for the tenants because comparable replacement housing in the area is unavailable. Government Code § 7264.5.

267

The Draft EIR's discussion of the Blue Line's impacts on population and housing is simply astounding. After noting that the apartment building houses up to 221 persons, the Draft EIR concludes, with absolutely no analysis, that no unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated on the apartment building and that no mitigation measures are proposed. First, the sheer lack of any reasoned analysis makes this conclusionary Draft EIR's statements utterly useless to the LACTC when it attempts to make an informed decision on the Blue Line project. Second, the Draft EIR completely fails to consider the westerly alignment on Flower by which the rail would either run directly in front of the apartment building, or more likely, the apartment building would be condemned and acquired. Obviously, either one of these impacts would be extremely significant on population and housing, and merits analysis and mitigation. The Draft EIR is altogether inadequate in this regard.

Page 5-25's discussion of pedestrian activity wholly omits analysis of the pedestrian activity of the apartment building's residents. Any of the proposed (and ignored) rail alignments would pass directly in front of the apartment building and cause grave danger to the residents, especially the children, who live there. The Draft EIR contains no analysis of the significant impact the Blue Line would have on their safety, nor are any adequate mitigation measures included.

268

The Draft EIR's discussion of air quality impacts shows that carbon monoxide will increase at the apartment building due to the project (pages 5-65 to 5-66), yet no mitigation is proposed. Furthermore, the Draft EIR contains absolutely no analysis of the construction-related air quality impacts on the apartment building. Neither is there any analysis of the obviously greater air quality impacts that the westerly alignment on Flower would create.

269

The Draft EIR's dismissal of the significance of the Blue Line's noise impacts on the apartment building is both unexplained and unexplainable. No noise study is included in the EIR, and while representatives of the LACTC promised to send the noise study to Esperanza as we requested at a meeting on June 22, 1992, no such study has been sent or received. There is no basis for concluding, as the Draft EIR does, that the Blue Line's increase in the CNEL at the apartment building is "minimal." And the impact of a westerly alignment would, obviously, be that much more significant.

270

Industry standards prescribe a maximum CNEL of 65 for residential uses. According to the unsupported data in the Draft

271

EIR, the CNEL at the apartment building is already 69. (Page 5-71.) The claim that any addition to the noise levels is insignificant, when they are already well above the acceptable limit, is ludicrous. The residents in the apartment building are sure to suffer from the increased noise levels and appropriate mitigation measures must be established and enforced for their protection. Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford, 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 717-718 (1990).

The vibration "analysis" at pages 5-75 through 5-81 does not even consider existing or cumulative vibration impacts on surrounding uses. The vibration numbers (for which no explanation is given) purport to show the impact of the Blue Line trains alone on the surrounding uses. No consideration whatsoever is given to vibrations caused by existing and proposed traffic on Flower Street, not to mention vibrations from the freeway below. The vibration analysis contained in the Draft EIR is not based upon reality.

At page 7-4, the Draft EIR dismisses in four sentences the westerly alignment alternative that best addresses the significant environmental impacts of the two other alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR for the Washington to 29th Street segment of the Blue Line. Esperanza agrees with the assessment of Orthopaedic Hospital that the westerly alignment is the only alternative capable of mitigating the significant impacts that the Blue Line project will have on the hospital and other permanent, highly sensitive uses on Flower Street. Therefore, Esperanza cannot support either of the alternatives proposed in the Draft EIR for this segment, and regretfully requests that a new Draft EIR be prepared and recirculated that fully analyzes the impacts and mitigation measures relevant to the westerly alignment.

Those impacts will necessarily include the acquisition of the apartment building. Esperanza hereby requests that LACTC immediately undertake an accelerated comprehensive relocation plan to determine the needs of the apartment building's tenants and to verify the lack of availability of replacement housing. As you know, the residents of the apartment building are entitled, upon condemnation, not only to relocation assistance, but also to replacement housing:

"If a program or project undertaken by the public entity cannot proceed on a timely basis because comparable replacement housing is not available and the public entity determines that comparable replacement

272

273

274


housing cannot otherwise be made available, the public entity shall take any action necessary or appropriate to provide the dwellings by use of funds authorized for the project. . . . [¶]No person shall be required to move from his or her dwelling because of its acquisition by a public entity, unless comparable replacement housing is available to the person." Cal. Govt. Code § 7264.5.

Compensation to the owner and relocation assistance to the tenants will accompany the condemnation of the apartment building. But further mitigation is required. It is well known that there is a severe shortage of safe, decent and clean low-cost rental housing in the vicinity of Flower and 23d Street. Therefore, a necessary mitigation measure to be included in the revised Draft EIR is the provision of replacement housing for the displaced tenants of the apartment building, pursuant to Govt. Code § 7264.5.

275

Esperanza continues to be more than willing to work closely with LACTC to provide appropriate replacement housing. Esperanza looks forward to doing so, and to having the opportunity to comment again on a more thorough Draft EIR that is well-supported by appropriate scientific studies and analysis.

Very truly yours,


Lisa A. Weinberg

LAW/ks
[52019]

cc: Sister Diane Donoghue

PDS13
EX341

1992 JUL 18 10 14 AM

221221

July 9, 1992

Mr. Jim de la Losa
LACTC
818 West 7th Street
Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90017

Dear Jim:

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Blue Line Extension to Exposition Park at the meeting June 23rd. I am enclosing a hard copy of my remarks and also a letter from Doss Mabe, of Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Partnership, reflecting a more technical point of view on our behalf.

You should also have received comments from Margaret Farnum for the Coliseum Commission and either Bob Biller or someone else on behalf of USC.

We will be distributing copies of our draft master Plan shortly and I hope you will take some time to look thoroughly at that and let us know what you think.

Sincerely,



Suzanne L. Glad
Deputy Director for External Affairs

Enc.

Pete Wilson
Governor
State of California

Board of Directors

Fred L. Riedman
President

James Dickason
Vice President

Michael D. Bagdasarian

Jesse A. Brewer

N. Matthew Grossman

Alexander Haagen

Roger A. Kozberg

Christy Campbell Walters

Jeffrey N. Rudolph
Executive Director



CMSI COMMENTS ON
DRAFT EIR FOR METRO BLUE LINE EXTENSION TO EXPOSITION PARK

Public Hearing - June 23, 1992
Los Angeles Trade Tech College

CMSI welcomes the EIR report regarding the Blue Line Extension to Exposition Park as a timely adjunct to the Park Master Plan. The extension offers exciting options for increasing Park and Museum visitorship, traffic mitigation for major events and Park and Ride facilities of mutual benefit to downtown LA and park institutions.

We feel that the following points are our major concerns and objectives:

276

1. A single station located near Menlo will not serve the best interests of the majority of the park venues - e.g. Sports Arena, Afro-American Museum or CMSI.

We feel strongly that two stations should be built along Exposition - one near Figueroa and one near (or across) Vermont. Two stations will serve the Park, the University and the local community best.

2. Both the aerial (2a) and the subway (2b) alternatives preclude service at two stations. Of the two, we feel that the aerial choice (2a) is least acceptable because of the strong visual impact and the fact that the long grade necessary to bring the cars to grade level at the station would absolutely divide the University from the Park. The subway choice (2b) would have the same effect. There is considerable need to maintain the Exposition Boulevard crossing patterns for both special events at the Coliseum/Sports Arena and to preserve the visual connection between the two institutions.

277

3. For any choice, we feel that urban design issues are of paramount importance. In view of improvements planned for Exposition Park and the ongoing efforts of the University to beautify its campus, we urge the Commission to use maximum effort in planning an urban setting which will enhance our efforts and create a parkway which will be aesthetically pleasing to all students, park visitors, tourists, and community users.

278

ZIMMER·GUNSUL·FRASCA PARTNERSHIP

4675 MacArthur Court Suite 300 Newport Beach, CA 92660

714/752-1873 Fax: 714/752-2240

8 July 1992

MICROFILMED
COPY IN RMC

Ms. Suzanne L. Glad
Deputy Director for External Affairs
California Museum of Science & Industry
700 State Drive
Los Angeles, California 90037

Dear Sue:

Following are Zimmer Gunsul Frasca's comments and questions regarding the Draft EIR for the Metro Exposition Park Branch Line, dated May 1992.

1. Page 1-7: Would the Exposition Park/Vermont Station be designed to accommodate three car trains and not "three trains" as stated? As the Draft EIR acknowledges, this station location is not compatible with the Exposition Park Master Plan. The proposed location does not link directly with the proposed sites for the new CMSI, Science Museum School, Science Education Resource Center, and proposed alternative sites below CMSI (south of Rose Garden) or east of the Coliseum for parking structures, nor does it link directly with the Sports Arena. 279

If the Subway Alternative 2b is selected, the Exposition Park station should be located at the Rose Garden and USC Trousdale parkway axis to better serve the whole Park (and USC Campus), although we admit that such a location may not be feasible due to tunnel depth and maximum slope requirements for the subway. While the Exposition Park/Vermont Station location may be marginally better for the Park and USC than a "no project" alternative, one might reasonably expect patronage to suffer due to poor linkages to the Park. The promise of the Metro Blue Line to significantly decrease auto traffic during major events in the park, as well as the promise of weekday intercept parking for downtown, would be seriously curtailed if not lost due to the remoteness of this station location from major venues in the Park and at USC. 280

2. Pages 1-8, 2-1, and 3-11: The Exposition Park Master Plan proposes to vacate Menlo Avenue as a city street, and reconfigure Menlo as a limited access drive from Exposition Boulevard (right in and right out) for service and staff parking at the County Museum of Natural History and for major event parking only. Hence, the optional Vermont Station Platform could be 270 feet long, to accommodate three-car trains, and still accommodate left turns into a reconfigured Hoover auto entrance to the USC Campus if required. If left turn access is not required, this platform could be lengthened to a double station. 281

Members American Institute of Architects

Partners: Brooks R. W. Gunsul FAIA Robert J. Frasca FAIA Gregory S. Baldwin FAIA Daniel J. Huberty AIA
Robert G. Packard III Associate AIA Larry S. Braton AIA R. Doss Mabe AIA Evett J. Ruttcorn AIA

Norman C. Zimmer, FAIA, Emeritus

Associate Partners: Debra Joan Barbour John P. Blumthal AIA Joseph A. Collins AIA Jack Cornwall AIA Kelly D. Davis AIA Dennis W. Destefano AIA Paul J. Engels AIA
Noel Fagerlund AIA Janice E. Finney Nancy M. Fishman Brainard Jey Gannett AIA Ernest L. Grigsby Ronald P. Gronowski AIA Lee F. Kilbourn AIA FCSI Don C. Miles FAIA
Craig S. Norman AIA IBD Karl R. Sonnenberg AIA Patrick C. Tillet RIBA MRTPI AICP AIA Stanley G. Zintel AIA

Associates: Gregory S. Clamp Ted A. Hyman AIA

Portland

Seattle

Newport Beach

Ms. Sue Glad
8 July 1992
Page 2

3. Pages 1-8, 2-1, and 3-8: The optional Figueroa Station could likewise be lengthened to a double station, which would best serve the Park venues listed in Item 1 above. The Armory Drive and Kinsey Drive entrances to Exposition Park would be closed under the Park Master Plan. 282
4. Pages 1-10 and 5-49: Of the existing 96 curb-side parking spaces along Exposition Boulevard, 76 would be eliminated by Alternative 2c (at grade), but there is no mention in the Draft EIR of spaces to be eliminated by Alternative 2b as indicated in Gannett-Fleming's engineering drawings. In either case these spaces could possibly be replaced through the Park Master Plan. 283
5. Page 4-7: Related Exposition Park projects would add 376,000 square feet of museum/elementary school/science education resource center/community center space and *no additional parking spaces*. 284
6. Pages 4-12 and 4-13: 285
 - Item 21: The Park Master Plan does not propose adding additional parking spaces to the current inventory in the Park, only relocating 2,100 spaces into a parking structure, and reconfiguring certain other surface spaces.
 - Item 22: The Park Master Plan allocates a site for 54,000 square feet of community center facilities, either in a renovated and enlarged swim stadium facility or a new facility.
 - Item 23: The Park Master Plan designates two alternative sites for a parking structure; the preferred site beneath new CMSI facilities south of the Rose Garden and an alternative site below grade east of the Coliseum. Either structure would replace surface parking spaces elsewhere in the Park without increasing the total number of spaces.
 - Item 24A: In addition to the Science Museum School (pre K-5) a 54,000 square foot Science Education Resource Center is proposed for a site connecting the school with CMSI.
 - Item 26: The Park Master Plan does not propose additional parking spaces in a vacated Menlo Avenue.

Subtotal Exposition Park Projects: 376,000 square feet of museum/elementary school/science education resource center/community center space, and no additional parking spaces.
7. Page 5-25: Pedestrian Activity 286

The USC Campus also may be entered between Hoffman Hall and the Musick Law Center, and therefore the Park Master Plan proposes a pedestrian crosswalk to link this USC Campus entrance with the optional Figueroa Station platform and a major pedestrian corridor to replace Kinsey Drive and lead directly south to the north entrance of the Sports Arena.
8. Pages 5-50 and 5-51: The Park Master Plan envisions five signalized pedestrian crosswalks on Exposition Boulevard, at each end of the optional Vermont and optional Figueroa Blue Line Stations and between the Rose Garden and USC Trousdale Parkway. The latter would operate only during major events, while the former four would operate at all times. Although the Draft EIR suggests that a Rose Garden/Trousdale Parkway crosswalk could be accommodated under the Subway Alternative 2b, we are concerned about the feasibility of this crossing which is not indicated on the Benito Sinclair Associates Plan and Profile Drawing EP-11. Neither is this crossing indicated on the Aerial Alternative 2a (Plan and Profile Drawing EP-9), and no pedestrian crossings are indicated for the At-Grade Alternative 2c (Plan and Profile Drawings EP-4 and EP-5). 287

Ms. Sue Glad
8 July 1992
Page 3

9. Page 5-60: With reference to Traffic Modification No. 14, as noted above in Item 2, Menlo Avenue would be vacated and closed to through traffic under the Park Master Plan, and the Watt Way entrance to USC could be redesigned to accommodate a 270 foot (three-car) platform for an optional Vermont Station, and a left turn movement across Exposition Boulevard if desirable. 288
10. Page 5-61: With reference to Parking Mitigation Measures, as noted above in Item 6, the Park Master Plan proposes structured parking for 2,100 cars in two alternative locations, either of which would work well with the optional Figueroa Station, while the Plan proposes to replace parking with open space in the western sector of the Park adjacent to neighborhoods. A parking structure south of the Rose Garden would be as accessible to an Exposition Park/Vermont Station as to the optional Figueroa Station, but the alternative location for a parking structure east of the Coliseum would not be readily accessible to an Exposition Park/Vermont Station. 289
11. Pages 5-93 and 5-94: The Master Plan proposes to locate the new Science Museum School in the northeast quadrant of the Park between the Rose Garden and Figueroa Street. 290
12. We suggest that catenary strain poles be located along the platform center line at stations in the Exposition Boulevard Median, and designed to integrate with station canopies, in order to avoid spanning the street with support wires. (See Gannet-Fleming drawings ST2 and ST4 and Benito Sinclair drawings EP-25 Typical Section O and EP-26 Typical Section P.) The same approach could also eliminate catenary supports spanning Flower Street at several locations, while Benito Sinclair Typical Sections E and M could be similar to other "side-supported" catenaries. 291

We trust these comments will be helpful, and please do not hesitate to call if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

ZIMMER GUNSUL FRASCA PARTNERSHIP



R. Doss Mabe, AIA
Partner

RDM:kat

cc: Jeff Rudolph/CMSI
Master File N4045.06/2.1
Routing

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90089-1122

VICE PRESIDENT
BUSINESS AFFAIRS

L.A.C.I.O.
1992 JUL (213) 740-4540
FAX: (213) 740-8240

221428

July 13, 1992

Mr. James de la Loza
Program Manager
Los Angeles County Transportation
Commission
818 West 7th Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Jim:

I and my staff have carefully reviewed The Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route and, since I was ill and unable to attend the June 23rd. hearing, wanted to make sure you received our comments in a timely fashion.

As you already know, the University is very excited about the extension of the Blue Line to Exposition Park and the USC campus. Our interactions with the Commission staff, the consultants and yourself have been exemplary and we look forward to their continuation as this project proceeds toward realization.

In our review of the Draft Report we have concluded that the alternative which is at grade and includes stations at both Figueroa and Vermont on Exposition would best serve the needs of the University community as well as visitors to Exposition Park and its museums and entertainment venues. We understandably are concerned about the resolution of the intersections at Flower and Exposition and Figueroa, Exposition and 37th Street. The great majority of the visitors to the USC campus exit from the Harbor Freeway and negotiate these intersections which serve as the gateway to the campus and the Park. We also believe there is great merit in considering a one way pair of streets with Flower Street serving south bound traffic and Grand Avenue serving northbound traffic on either side of the Freeway. This will alleviate some of the congestion at the Exposition intersections and improve traffic flow.

292

Both Exposition Park, especially with the implementation of the Master Plan, and University Park are as their names imply, lovely park like areas of the city. This line running between them along Exposition must be landscaped with great sensitivity to avoid detracting from the setting. Likewise the design of the station and the catenary line supports is critical to the success of the project.

293

Mr. James del la Loza
Page Two

If you would like me to provide further elaboration on any of these points or if I can be of any other help don't hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

Thomas H. Moran

cc: Robert Biller
Jeffrey Rudolph
Margaret Farnum
Peter Luukko

EXPO Greenbelt Bicycle Trail Committee
4354 Coolidge Ave
Los Angeles, Calif 90066

310-398-6098

July 17, 1992

Jim de la Loza
LACTC
818 West Seventh Street
LA CA 90014

Dear Sir

I understand that there is still time for the public to comment on the proposed Blue Line Extension to the Exposition Park Area. Here are my comments:

294

Mass transit on the surface is short sighted and will only continue the congestion and mobility problems. In a city of 15 MILLION people, large numbers of whom come into the downtown and Westside areas daily a small train scheduled to carry 15-30,000 stopping at Red Lights is not adequate to carry the ridership.

We need to have a large capacity subway under the Wilshire corridor first. A second subway under the downtown streets extending to Exposition Park is an excellent idea. It should be continued West under Exposition and then Southwest under Venice. Please see a copy of my letter to Neil Peterson for a full delineation of where the subways should go and how to pay for them.

It is time that Los Angeles try to become a beautiful World Class city. If Exposition could be used as a Bicycle corridor and park with security and landscaping, it would do an enormous amount toward making Los Angeles a beautiful city where one could relax and walk or ride on a 12.2 mile corridor free of strip centers and cars. Think of acquiring the land where you proposed your extension, turning it into a landscaped walking corridor from USC into the downtown with bicycle trails and security. People would be able to bicycle commute to and from work in the downtown area. South Coast Air Quality Management wants people to ride bicycles to work. Realistically with the number of cars on the road an abandoned rail corridor is the only hope for safety.

I understand that CALTRANS is proposing a second layer of freeway over the Santa Monica Freeway. The cost must be enormous. Unfortunately due to laws that were written in the 1950's and that do not serve us today in 1992, Gasoline Tax money must be used for cement and not mass transit. I think that money should be used for a highspeed train over the freeway starting in the downtown area, stopping once at the 405 and once in Santa Monica. Obviously it will be difficult and expensive to do things like change old legislation from the 1950's and to dig subways underground. To me there is no choice. The city is dying of congestion and smog. The best and the brightest will leave rather than sit in traffic jams. Big companies will leave because their employees can't get from affordable housing to jobs.

Don't take the easy way out and build the quick and cheap light rail that will not solve the mobility problem.

Let's come out of denial about how bad the traffic problem really is and then solve it. By building the right subways in the right locations, and considering peoples needs to walk, relax, ride bicycles, the City can become liveable.

Sincerely

Johanna Rosenthal

Johanna Rosenthal

Chairman Expo Greenbelt Bicycle Trail Cimmittee

JOHANNA ROSENTHAL
Expo Greenbelt Bicycle Trail Committee
4354 Coolidge Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90066
310-398-6098

June 12, 1992

Neil Peterson
Executive Director
Los Angeles County
Transportation Commission
8181 7th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. Peterson:

Our committee started in order to develop the Exposition Right of Way as a Greenbelt Bicycle Trail and Park "Only" for activities such as bicycling, jogging, walking or rollerskating. These are activities that become less and less feasible on neighborhood streets as the city becomes more and more congested with traffic.

We realized that displacing the proposed Light Rail from Exposition to create the bicycle trail would affect mobility. We began to wonder why the Light Rail was planned in such a low density population area when there were other more suitable corridors such as Wilshire Boulevard for mass transit. Our committee began to study the 30 year plan for mass transit. Having studied the LA Country Transportation Commissions (LACTCS) 30 year plan, we find that too much is being spent on highway improvement and the development of high occupancy vehicle lanes and not enough on alternatives to the gasoline powered engine such as subways and rails. Our committee respectfully suggests modifications in funding allocations as well as novel ideas for funding of subways.

A bicycle trail and park on the Exposition Right of Way must come onto a substructure of excellent transportation and mobility in the Los Angeles "Westside." Rather than a Light Rail which only carries 30,000 a day (compared to 450,000 a day on the Santa Monica Freeway), I would suggest three subway additions to the 30 year plan. The first changes are in the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) to Palmdale line. My understanding of the 30 year plan is that there is at the moment no funding for a North South Rail paralleling the 405 in the 30 year plan when that route is one of the most heavily congested freeways in Los Angeles. The proposed line is for a high speed rail from airport to airport without any stops. I would suggest a North South Subway under Sepulveda from the Simi Valley Freeway with stops at the East West thoroughfares in the San Fernando Valley, for example. Reseda, Nordoff, Sherman Way, Victory Blvd., Encino, continuing to Mulholland, Sunset Blvd., UCLA, Wilshire Blvd. at the Federal Building, Santa Monica, Olympic, Pico, National, Venice, Washington Blvd., Culver, Fox Hills Mall, Century Airport, Imperial Highway, El Segundo, Rosecranz.

The second suggestion would be for changes in the proposed Orange line. Santa Monica residents have been ardent supporters of a Light Rail on Exposition Blvd. in order to travel downtown rapidly. I think that many of the trips from Santa Monica are not all the way downtown, but rather along parts of the heavily congested Wilshire corridor. The Orange line is proposed from downtown to Pico and San Vicente. I think that Pico and San Vicente is "off the track" so to speak and that the Orange Line should be moved back to Wilshire, the "Backbone" of Los Angeles.

Wilshire has the highest density of residential, commercial and cultural centers and will have more ridership.

I was also startled to find that the planned Orange Line was to extend only to the 405 freeway. Compare the route from the 405 freeway west to the Santa Monica Beach along Wilshire Blvd. to the route west along Exposition and it is obvious where the ridership will be, along Wilshire with the tall commercial office buildings and hi-density condominiums and apartments, let alone the large Veterans Administration Hospital. Suggested stops from West to East would be for example (all along Wilshire Blvd.) Ocean Ave., Third Street Promenade, 7th St, Lincoln, Cloverfield, 26th St, Bundy, Barrington, VA Hospital, Federal Building, Westwood Blvd., Theaters, the Wilshire and Santa Monica Intersection in Beverly Hills, Rodeo Drive (with extra Security) Beverly or Canon, Doheny, Robertson, La Cienga, Fairfax (consider the May Company building for a station) the LA County Museum of Art, the La Brea Tar pits, the Wilshire Financial District, Hancock Park (with additional security) and on downtown joining the Red Line.

There has been much discussion of the Methane Gas problems and Wilshire Blvd. In fact construction in Los Angeles commonly has to take Methane Gas into account. Tunneling can slow down while probes are used to detect the gas. The gas frequently has to be vented on a permanent basis and I have heard of elementary schools in Los Angeles which still have such venting systems in place. Methane Gas collects in metal pipes from old wells that have been sealed off. Metal detectors and other techniques exist such that there is no reason for workers to be exposed to unexpected hazards. The problems can be identified and dealt

with. The city is digging a sewer under the Ladera Heights District which goes under many old and new wells. In the past five years expertise in tunneling despite Methane Gas complications has been developed.

The third suggestion would be a subway serving Culver City, Marina del Rey, Palms and Venice. I would place a subway under Exposition Blvd. starting at USC, with stops along the big North South intersections, i.e. Vermont, Normandie, Western, Crenshaw, La Brea, Fairfax and La Cienga. At Robertson, the subway should change direction and travel Southwest under Venice Blvd., with a station near at Motor, near MGM Studios, to Sepulveda (to connect to the North South Line under Sepulveda) Sawtelle, Centinela, and then to Lincoln. At Lincoln the subway should turn North and South. Open air buses should shuttle people to the beach. During the summer people from all the Valleys, San Bernadino, San Fernando, Santa Clarita flock to the beach. The beach is a major tourist attraction. It should be preserved as single family, low density, pedestrian area with open air buses like the Westwood shuttle. The High Density commercial offices, the tall buildings, and high density apartment complexes should be zoned away from the beach, onto Lincoln Blvd. and East of Lincoln. The subway should run north to Santa Monica and South to Marina del Rey and also to the Summa Development of 33,000 projected population, obviously at each stop there would have to be bus service into the "subregional areas."

I anticipate the question - "But subways cost \$300 million dollars per mile, if these three subways are added to the 30 year plan it will cost approximately 24 billion dollars" - What is the

source for this funding? The 33 year plan budget of 33 billion for highway improvements and HOV lanes is an egregious error. High Occupancy Vehicle lanes (HOV) still limit people to use of gasoline powered engine. 70% of the air pollution comes from the gasoline powered engines. Once one gets off the freeway system, surface streets are still heavily congested and almost impossible to drive.

To prove that 33 billion to be spent in LA Basin alone for HOV lanes is excessive, please check the November 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act ISTEA. The total FEDERAL BUDGET for a six year period, for both New Rail Starts and Old Rail Modernization, in the whole United States is 12 billion dollars. This is considered sufficient for nine new rail starts and improvement and modernization of old rails in more than seven cities and is far less than 33 billion.

To prove that there are several sources for funding of rail, here is a second source of monies for the three subways proposed above. Caltrans is planning to put a second layer of freeway over the Santa Monica Freeway within 20 years. The cost of the second layer will be inordinate. There is no reason not to divert that funding to a mass Transit System.

A third option for freeway funding exists. I grew up in Seattle Washington where people were not horrified to find that transportation is expensive. In fact the people calmly paid a toll for 20 years for a floating concrete bridge of more than a mile across Lake Washington. The people than calmly paid for a second bridge.

Drive in to Los Angeles from Pomona some morning at 8:15 on

either the "10" or "60" freeway. Each of these freeways should have a dollar toll per ride. After one year (guessing) more than 500,000 trips per day, 180 million would be generated. One uses the first years income to float a bond issue. The first years income would build the first four miles of subways along the "10" or the "60". The second year's income floats the next four miles of subway and in ten years, the ridership will start paying off the bonds.

Freeways are actually a misnomer, they should be called **EXPENSIVE WAYS**. The true cost of a drive to work has to include costs of highway construction and maintenance. Dollar for dollar, countries such as Japan use much less of their GNP on transportation, because the cost of going to work on a train is much less per person when the unseen (capital construction costs paid through taxes) are taken into account.*

Los Angeles needs balanced growth. The transportation is the lifeblood of the city. Rather than cars through every corner of the city it is time to isolate the transportation, commercial buildings and cultural centers into corridors. We need to leave a more relaxed atmosphere in low density single family areas with **A BIKEWAY AND PARK ONLY** on the Exposition Right of Way.

Sincerely,



Johanna Rosenthal
Expo Greenbelt Bicycle Trail Comm.

*Personal Communication, Stanley Hart, Chairman, Sierra Club Transportation Committee.

Commissioner de la ZOLA:

I can tell you that new land use development is easier along the Flower/Figueroa Street corridor with the streets as a one-way couplet with the extension inclusion of the blue rail along Flower Street to Exposition to Vermont. Then it is along Grand Avenue corridor between 18th Street and 37th Street if blue line was routed overhead along this portion of Grand Avenue to Exposition now! At grade routing along Flower Street is possible. And less expensive for blue line with crossing gate signals south from Washington Boulevard along Flower Street to Exposition and Vermont now! The signals with crossing gates for the train car vehicles to have the travel right of way preference

is imperative these days while some
others want to sell more motor vehicles
to stifle travel LA etc! Now the
\$70,000,000 price should be in effect
with wider station platform
area And not a big controversy!

Would you use the Exposition
property between Flower And
Grand Avenue as a turnout
or storage track for emergency
or extra trains to enter in
service operation??

JIM, the number of
at grade surface crossings
must be minimized south from
Washington Boulevard along
Flower Street + And Along
Exposition right of way!!

Only 23rd, Adams, 30th, Jefferson
Exposition And Figueroa are needed!!

Crossing gates must be the ~~length~~^{length}
th At the width of the subjected
street is if not also including
the width of the sidewalks also!!

Jim AND L.A.C.T.C. / R.C.C. you
do not need Exposition Boulevard
between Flower And Figueroa
which can now be eliminated
for A traffic mitigation now!

Drivers can use 37th Street
to Hope Street to 110 north
on ramp AND Flower Street
to Either 37th, 39th or Figueroa
Streets from 110 south bound off

Ramp now which is workable ~~that~~ ^{that} short section of Exposition Boulevard is obsolete.
L.S.C. Can have OVERHEAD pedestrian
ramps at grade crossings which
Can be eliminated!

The 23rd Street station is a
proper location! The Jefferson
Boulevard station is a proper
location too! This will more so
pedestrianize the vicinity! Buses
Can be rerouted to better offer
transfer of mobility for patrons
at 23rd Street station, Jefferson
Boulevard station, Vermont Avenue
station! 37th Street Can be made
one-way eastbound only now!
39th Street Can be made one-way
westbound now LACTC!! Grand Ave
Can be made one-way only!

beyond 18th Street to 39th Street now!

Figuerot Street Can be made one-way
north only from 39th / Flower Streets
to Olympic Boulevard now!

Blue line trains only require
a few seconds to approach
and pass through the closest
crossing point at grade!

Fencing can be placed along
blue line property along
Flower Street and along

Exposition Boulevard now! (etc!)
It is better than Washington Boulevard
because you include crossing gate signals
for travel expedition Needed!
The 110 busway will

have to be reworked at Adams/Flower/etc.
thereby letting the bus users exit without
being held up At Adams BOULEVARD! There
should have been An off ramp or mit
made to descend connecting to either
Grand Avenue, Hill Street, Broadway
or Hope Street Appropriately if not
otherwise Each of them Appropriately Now!

This is for the northbound ~~Exiting~~ between
Martin Luther King JR. Boulevard And 35th
Street at most, LA etc, which is easier
than northbound on the 110 busway to Santa

Monica Freeway only for the first phase!
This 10/110 would only work for the
10 westbound to 110 south bound And
10 East bound to 110 south bound

now because the Exposition line
rail must be built! When it is
being built concurrently the 110
busway ramp connections can be
made to connect 110 to 10 East
AND 110 to 10 West! You have been
consulted to extend the busway
beyond Adams to 101-110!

23rd Street can be mitigated
at Figuerola Street so the 110 traffic
from the busway can not stop at a
traffic light. Otherwise the off ramp
can descend from 110 to Figuerola Street
Northbound north from the intersection
there to connect to Figuerola Street on its
Westbound SIDE two or three lanes!
There must not be any non emergency
vehicle PARKING along Figuerola

Street between Adams And Olympic

Boulevards then! ^{Adams Boulevard should}
^{overpass: 110, FIGUER STREET}
^{AND FIGUEROA STREET now!}

23rd Street Can also be closed
between FIGUEROA And Flower Street
to vehicular traffic now! This way
you do not require A crossing gate
posted train signal there! AETC!

This allows enough for traveling
impacts on the north bound end of the 110

busway And simultaneously the best
surface level mobility for blue line II

If blue line does not have right of way preference At Adams
I cannot attend meetings! ^{let it overpass}
If blue line does not have right of way At Flower ^{OR let}
^{be an}
^{overpass}

Thank you Mr de la Zola!

The train should go faster than 35 miles an hour.

137th, ^{FIGUEROA}
^{let}
it overpass
Steph Amred

Please eliminate the sidewalk area and
35th Street pedestrian undercrossing east side
Flower Street corridor between 28th Street
and 37th Street now, LACTC and RCC! People
can use the two existing underpasses or
three of them: Jefferson, Exposition, 37th Street
to reach the blue line / U.S.C. / Exposition
Park area! The extra Cal Trans right
of way is your Advantage between 30th
Street and Exposition right of way! It is
plainly your Advantage for rail rights of
way space and Flower Street widening
for traffic mitigation now! Parking is
possible yet best situated multi level
for blue line and bus patronage! Whether
Washington, Jefferson, Figueroa or Vermont
or Adams Boulevard yet all would well fit now!
It is better Adams Boulevard be made
An overpass because of the 116 busway
blue line presence. (before and after)

project, one-way couplet treatment with
Flower/Figueroa, Ambulance or emergency
service vehicles whether from orthopaedic
hospital area, police station, other emergency
People who want to reach Flower or Figueroa
Can use the street parallel to the South from
Adams or 30th or 23rd May, LACTC! 23rd Can be
westbound only between Grand and Flower and
get double as the new entrance to orthopaedic
HOSPITAL even with its expansion!

AERIAL or subway is an exception of
action and not the mandate rule for Figueroa
and Flower streets at Expansion Right of way!

The train rail speed is not linked
by Law to Motor vehicle street and highway speed!
You can use some rubber as a noise buffer
between Washington and Adams along Flower
street such as an eighteen inch to twenty six
inch rubber plating or matting with or without
mesh, LACTC! This is best for land use removal
and correction as somewhat written the best
value for the blue line, pedestrians and
drivers! it is not the entire vision

The optional "Washington" station as between
"18th And Washington" taking seven
businesses away from "Flower Street" &
allow consolidating 23rd, Grand, Washington
better yet is expedient! Rather than 23rd
Street, relocation of Grand Station onto Flower
Street And relocating 23rd Street to Washington
Merely is preferable And honorable, L.A. TC And
REC! Relocate Grand Station Now!

No Subway is needed from the branch line
segment to Belmont Avenue! The Fifth Street
Station is needed rather than the An option!
It is expedient! Phases one And two for Vermont
Station should be combined now! Storage tracks
Can be placed between Hope And Flower Streets
in the old right of way with elimination of the
On ramp underpassing I-10 to Northbound connected
there! Eliminating it will offer additional track
space there! You don't need any tail tracks
beyond Vermont for storage! L.A. TC.

Vermont Avenue should overpass Exposition!

Normandie Avenue should overpass Exposition!

Western Avenue should overpass Exposition!

It is not necessary that Figueroa and
Flower to overpass Exposition! People can
use other streets to meet Exposition from:
Vermont, Normandie, Western Avenues, L.A. etc!

Washington News should be built into an
overpass above Flower and Figueroa Streets!!!

LA 1010
1992 JUN 13 10 41



217382

1864 EAST KRAMER DRIVE
DOMINLO HILLS, CALIF. 90746
JUNE 13, 1992

Mr. Jim DE LA LOZA

LACTC

SUITE 1100

818 W. 7TH STREET

LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90017

DEAR MR. LOZA:

I HAVE BEEN A RIDER ON PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FOR
MANY YEARS GOING BACK TO MY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL YEARS
IN CHICAGO. I HAVE RODE ON PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IN
NEW YORK, WASHINGTON, D.C., NEW ORLEANS, AND SAN FRANCISCO.

297

I AM WRITING AT THIS TIME BECAUSE I HAVE NEVER
FAVORED THE BLUE LINE BECAUSE THE LINE DOES NOT SEEM
TO BE WELL THOUGHT OUT. IT OPERATES ON A STREET CAR
MODE ALONG WASHINGTON BOULEVARD AND WHEN IT REACHES
LONG BEACH, AND ON A TRAIN MODE BETWEEN ITS WASHINGTON
AND LONG BEACH POINTS. IN MY ESTIMATION STREET CARS
SHOULD BE PLACED IN THE BLUE LINE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR
FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. STREET CARS ARE REGULATED BY TRAFFIC SIGNALS.
2. THE LOUD HORN ON THE TRAINS WILL BE ELIMINATED WHEN
TRAVELING THROUGH THE BUSINESS AND RESIDENTIAL
SECTIONS OF THE CORRIDOR.

3. TRAIN SIGNALS AND GUARD POST WILL NOT BE NEEDED FOR STREET CARS.

4. STREET CARS MAKE MORE CONVENIENT STOPS THAN THE WIDE EXPANSE OF STOPS THAT ARE NOW REPRESENTED ONCE THE NORTH BOUND TRAIN REACHES WASHINGTON BOULEVARD.

THEREFORE, SINCE THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION IS NOW CONSIDERING EXTENSION OF THIS LINE TO EXPOSITION PARK, I DO FEEL THAT STREET CARS NEED TO BE PLACED IN THIS CORRIDOR AND REMOVE THE TRAINS AND REPLACE THEM WITH STREET CARS IN THE LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH CORRIDOR.

NOW REGARDING MY THIRD POINT WHEN I REFER TO TRAIN SIGNALS AND GUARD POST. STREET CARS WILL TRAVEL MORE FREQUENTLY THAN THE TRAINS IN THE MIDDLE PORTION OF THE ROUTE. THEREFORE I AM NOT ESPOUSING REMOVAL OF THE NEEDED SIGNALS WHEN FREIGHT TRAINS DO PAST THROUGH. OVER THE YEARS, THE HORN ON FREIGHT TRAINS HAVE PROVEN TO BE MELODIOUS AND MORE ACCOMMODATING TO THE EAR.

PERHAPS THE COMMISSION MAY WANT TO CONSULT WITH THE REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY IN NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA REGARDING ITS ST. CHARLES AVENUE STREET CAR LINE.

ESTABLISHING A SIMILAR LINE IN LOS ANGELES WILL PROVIDE WORK IN MANUFACTURING STREET CARS WITHOUT AIR CONDITIONING ON THE CARS. AND MANY YEARS OF WORK AND PLEASURABLE RIDING FOR RIDERS WHO ENJOY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND STREET CAR LINES.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

—SINCERELY—

MRS. LOIS E. THOMPSON

EX341

Dayton Associates
Ron Fechter, Principal
ééééé

MICROFILMED
COPY IN RMC

mail to: 990 Valley View Av. #37
Pasadena, Ca. 91107

L.A.C.T.O.

1992 JUN -4 PM 1:41

Mr. Jim De Le Rosa
Los Angeles Transportation Commission
818 West 7th St.
Los Angeles 90017
06/15/92

216387

Dear Mr. De La Roza:

I believe the expected patronage of Exposition Bl. LRT is 35% to 55% of the patronage Los Angeles to Long Beach LRT. I do not believe it is necessary to build a loop in downtown Santa Monica. LRT trains should be able to stop at the end point (identical to the original San Diego configuration) and reverse direction to continue back to USC.

298

2. I wrote Ms. Valdez and Ms. Rosales that the Exposition Bl. proposed minimal operating segment should reach from 5th St. (or 4th or 3rd) in Santa Monica to Figueroa and Exposition Bl. in Los Angeles. **THIS PROJECT MAY HAVE POTENTIAL AS A RAIL FACILITY FROM SANTA MONICA TO DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES BECAUSE THE RAIL FACILITY IS AT GRADE AND OF MINIMAL COST.*¹** (The furthest West Santa Monica Station should be walking distance to the Santa Monica Mall and Pacific Ocean)

Sincerely:



Ron Fechter
990 Valley View Ave. #37
pasadena, CA

*¹ This project may not work at all. The proposed LRT does not move in the perfect direction Santa Monica to Los Angeles downtown. Populations travelling from the west side are not exactly moving to most of their desired locations. I favor building the mid-town corridor alternative; which is Expo. Bl. to Venice Bl. to meet the Crenshaw Bl. METRORAIL (Heavy Rail) station.

EX 341

221418

Jim de la Loza
818 W. 7th St.
Ste 1100
L.A., Ca. 90017

As an owner of
An Apt. building
2315 S. Flower St.
I object to placing
a signal in the Block
of Flower St. 23 to
Adams. Trucks and
cars stopping will
create pollution, noise
and accident prone
situations. Since the
Block contains only
a hospital and
a residential bldg.
noise is extremely
important.

Sincerely
Robert Gluckstein
213-937-5252

299



In addition removing
street parking is a
sincere hardship for
my low income
tenants.



PUBLIC HEARING

π
case put
same on
Mailing
list

Wish to
give ~~private~~
Public Comment

NAME AND ADDRESS:

- * 1. T.A. Nelson, 2563 Dearborn Dr., Hollywood, CA 90068
 * 2. Michael Madison, 7506 Romaine St. #9 LA 90046
 * 3. Patsy H. Carter 657 W. 23rd St LA CA 90071
 * 4. Michael Meyer 900 Wilshire Blvd #1014 LA CA 90017
 * 5. Bob Saunders Auto Club So Calif Editor - 1078 PO Box 2890 LA 90051
 * 6. Allen V. Boone CSR (Court Reporter)
 * 7. Jami Handy 17350 Sunset Bl #204 Pac Pal 90272 (410-454-2111)
 * 8. BRIAN RICKERSON 1201 S. Figueroa L.A. 90015
 * 9. Eloise Helwig 2400 S. Flamingo LA 90007
 * 10. KENNEDY STUKE 633 W 5th ST LA 90071
 * 11. FRANK R. DiBENEDICTO 1415 ONYX KNOLL SOUTH PASADENA, CA 91030
 * 12. LISA A. WEINBERG 2409 CENTURY PARK EAST #2800 LA CA 90067
 * 13. Bill Graves, Southern Calif Co., Box 3249 Los Angeles 90051
 * 14. MIRTHA OCANA 3550 Wilshire Blvd #1200, LA CA 90010
 * 15. Deeptha Reddy City Hall Rm 260 - CD 9
 * 16. Terri Rotras Trade-Tech 400 W Washington Blvd 90015
 * 17. JIM GRIVICH Trade-Tech 400 W Washington Blvd 90015
 * 18. FRED YOUNG P.O. Box 3212 GARDENA 90247-1442
 * 19. AL BOWSER A.C.S.C., 2601 S. FIGUEROA, LOS ANGELES, CA 90007
 * 20. ELSON TRINIDAD 1128 N HELOTROPE DR LA CA 90029-2610
 * 21. Jesus Escamilla CPUC 107 S. Broadway, Rm 5109 LA, CA 90012
 * 22. Robert H. RICHMOND 2980 E. Villa St. PASADENA 91107
 * 23. T. R. R. 426 Beverly 902 LA 90048
 * 24. J. J. Thompson, 1839 S. PRITCHARD WAY HARTLAND HTS. CA. 91745
 * 25. T. J. HAYES 409 MARLTON L.A. CA 90007
 * 26. SR. DIANE DONOVAN 621 S. Figueroa (A9107-748-7285)
 * 27. BILL HUNTER - 819 TOWNE - LA 90021
 * 28. CHARLES P. HOBBS 10938 PALMS #2 LA 90034
 * 29. ALICE SALINAS HOUSING CORPORATION (213) 748-7245
 * 30. GUY GAD CANSI EXPOSITION PARK
 * 31. Frank Kawan 1188 Innes Ave 10 LA 90026
 * 32. JAMES WASHINGTON 1439 MYRLES AVE LONG BEACH, CALIF 90813
 * 33. PAT MOSER P.O. Box 41198, L.A. 90041-0198
 * 34.

Craig Thompson

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM
EXPOSITION BRANCH LINE
RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Need @ LA Trade Tech

Name: T. A. Nelson
Address: 2563 Dearborn Dr.
Hollywood, CA 90068

6-23-92

All relevant comments received during the 45-day comment period will be answered in the Final Environmental Impact Report due September 1992. The 45-day review period begins May 28 and ends July 13, 1992.

Comments should be addressed to:

Mr. James de la Loza, Project Manager
Central Area Team
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West 7th Street
Los Angeles, Ca 90017

There should be two stations on Exposition Blvd.
regardless of which vertical alignment option is chosen; one
as close to Vermont as possible for convenient transfers to
and from the busy Vermont Ave. bus route, the other as
close as practicable to Figueroa for the best access to the
combination of USC, sports, and museum destinations.

Although not included in the DEIS as an option (perhaps
due to high costs), the alignment east of the freeway between
Adams and Exposition, as proposed by the Exposition Rail
Committee in Appendix B, would provide the best service.

The present Grand Station should not be eliminated.

295

IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

IN RE: METRO RAIL BLUE LINE)
EXTENSION TO EXPOSITION PARK)
_____)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

TAKEN ON

TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 1992

REPORTED BY: EILEEN V. BANE

CSR NO. 9009

1
2 PUBLIC HEARING, TAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE LOS
3 ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AT 400 WEST
4 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD, GRAND THEATRE, LOS ANGELES,
5 CALIFORNIA, 90017, ON TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 1992, AT
6 4:45 P.M., BEFORE EILEEN V. BANE, CSR NO. 9009.
7
8

9 APPEARANCES:

10
11 FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION:

12 JAMES DE LA LOZA
13 818 WEST SEVENTH STREET
14 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90010

15 CONSULTANTS FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION
16 COMMISSION:

17 JOHN STUTZ (VICTOR GRUEN AND ASSOCIATES)
18 TERRY HAYES (TERRY HAYES AND ASSOCIATES)
19 PETER ZIMMERMAN (BENITO, SINCLAIR)
20 MICHAEL MEYER (MEYER, MAHADDES)

21 ALSO PRESENT:

22 ROBERT NEHER-ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
23 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
24 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
25

I N D E X

SPEAKERS IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE:	PAGE
1- MICHAEL MADISON	7
2- PATSY CARTER	8
3- JAIMI HANDY	11
4- ELOLSE HELWIG	13
5- H. RANDALL STOKES	17
6- MIRTA OCANA	22, 49
7- ELSON TRINIDAD	23
8- CRAIG THOMPSON	27
9- TUT HAYES	28
10- SISTER DIANE DONOGHUE	33
11- BILL HUNTER	36
12- CHARLES HOBBS	43
13- JAMES WASHINGTON	45
14- PAT MOSER	46
15- ROBERT RICHMOND	50
16- SUE GLAD	55

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 1992

2 4:45 P.M.

3
4
5 P U B L I C H E A R I N G
6
7

8 JUDGE NEHER: THIS IS THE TIME AND PLACE SET
9 FOR A HEARING IN THE MATTER OF THE LOS ANGELES
10 COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION'S CONSIDERATION OF
11 A 1.9 MILE, THREE-STATION BRANCH EXTENSION OF THE
12 METRO BLUE LINE FROM WASHINGTON BOULEVARD TO THE
13 EXPOSITION PARK AREA.

14 I'M ROBERT NEHER. I'M AN
15 ADMINISTRATOR LAW JUDGE OF THE OFFICE OF
16 ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
17 AND I'VE BEEN ASKED TO PRESIDE AT THE HEARING FOR
18 PURPOSES OF GETTING THE PUBLIC COMMENT.

19 SO THAT YOU'LL KNOW WHO THE PEOPLE
20 ARE UP HERE AT THE BENCH, TO MY FAR RIGHT IS JAMES
21 DE LA LOZA; HE'S PROJECT MANAGER OF THE LOS ANGELES
22 COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION; TO HIS LEFT IS
23 PETER ZIMMERMAN, WHO IS A CONSULTANT WITH BENITO
24 SINCLAIR AND ASSOCIATES; TO HIS LEFT AND MY
25 IMMEDIATE RIGHT IS JOHN STUTZMAN, WHO IS A

1 CONSULTANT WITH VICTOR GRUEN AND ASSOCIATES; TO MY
2 IMMEDIATE LEFT IS TERRY HAYES, WHO IS A CONSULTANT
3 OF TERRY HAYES ASSOCIATES; AND TO HIS LEFT IS
4 MICHAEL MEYER, WHO IS A CONSULTANT.

5 THE MATTER SET FOR TODAY IS FOR
6 COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL
7 IMPACT REPORT, WHICH HAS BEEN RELEASED FOR PUBLIC
8 REVIEW AND COMMENTS.

9 THE 45-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD IS
10 OPEN UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 13TH, 1992, FOR RECEIPT OF
11 WRITTEN COMMENTS, FOR THOSE OF YOU THAT DON'T WISH
12 TO MAKE COMMENTS TODAY, AND THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY
13 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ADDRESS FOR SENDING THOSE
14 IS IN CARE OF MR. DE LA LOZA, AT 818 WEST 7TH
15 STREET, SUITE 1100, LOS ANGELES, 90017. THERE IS
16 ALSO A METRO HOT LINE WHICH YOU CAN CONTACT, WHICH
17 IS AREA CODE 213, 244-6915.

18 THE WAY WE'RE GOING TO COMMENCE TODAY
19 IS I'M GOING TO HAVE MR. DE LA LOZA GIVE YOU A SHORT
20 PERSPECTIVE ON WHERE WE'RE AT, AT LEAST
21 HISTORICALLY, WITH RESPECT TO THIS PROJECT, AND THEN
22 WE'LL TAKE THE PUBLIC COMMENTS. JIM.

23 MR. DE LA LOZA: WELCOME. I GUESS,
24 BASICALLY, I JUST WANTED TO WELCOME EVERYONE AND SAY
25 THAT WE ARE CURRENTLY IN THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL

1 IMPACT PHASE OF THIS PROJECT. ABOUT APPROXIMATELY A
2 YEAR AND A HALF AGO, WE HAD DONE A PRELIMINARY STUDY
3 THAT IDENTIFIED THIS POTENTIAL LINE. IT WAS A
4 SERVICE THAT WOULD LINK THE METRO BLUE LINE TO THE
5 EXPOSITION PARK/USC AREA. WE'VE BEEN WORKING OVER
6 THE LAST YEAR WITH A TASK FORCE, MADE UP OF
7 REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE EXPOSITION PARK MUSEUMS,
8 ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL, L.A. TRADE TECH AND THE ISLAMIC
9 CENTER ON VERMONT, AND A NUMBER OF OTHER INTERESTED
10 PARTIES ALONG THE LINE. THEY HAVE BEEN CONTRIBUTING
11 MEMBERS OR PARTICIPANTS IN THIS PROCESS.

12 AGAIN, WE ARE CURRENTLY IN THE DRAFT
13 E.I.R. STAGE RIGHT NOW. AND AS THE JUDGE SAID, JULY
14 THE 13TH IS THE CLOSING DATE FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS.
15 WE ANTICIPATE TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC COMMENTS DURING
16 AUGUST AND, HOPEFULLY, IF THINGS GO ON SCHEDULE,
17 WE'LL HAVE THE FINAL E.I.R. SOMETIME IN SEPTEMBER.

18 AGAIN, THIS IS THE DRAFT E.I.R.
19 WE'RE HERE TO LISTEN TO WHAT YOUR COMMENTS ARE.

20 WE HAVE BEEN WORKING WITH A NUMBER OF
21 GROUPS OVER THE LAST YEAR, HEARING THEIR CONCERNS,
22 AND WILL BE PRESENTING WHAT WE FEEL ADDRESSES MOST
23 OF THOSE CONCERNS. WE KNOW WE'RE STILL NOT THERE,
24 WHERE WE WANT TO BE, BUT WE'RE HERE TO LISTEN TO
25 WHAT YOUR COMMENTS ARE AT THIS TIME. THANK YOU.

1 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU, JIM. NOW, WITH
2 RESPECT TO THE PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION OF THE
3 HEARING, I BELIEVE THAT THERE IS A SIGN-UP SHEET
4 THAT PEOPLE HAVE SIGNED UP. OKAY. MAY HAVE THAT,
5 PLEASE? HOPEFULLY, I CAN READ YOUR NAMES.

6 OKAY. AND WHAT I'M GOING TO ASK YOU
7 TO DO IS WHEN I CALL YOUR NAME, IF YOU'LL RESTATE IT
8 WHEN YOU GET TO THE PODIUM, AND SPELL YOUR LAST
9 NAME. IF YOU REPRESENT SOMEONE OTHER THAN YOURSELF,
10 IF YOU'LL TELL US WHO YOU REPRESENT, AND WE'LL GO
11 FROM THERE; OKAY?

12 THE FIRST NAME ON THE LIST
13 APPEARS TO BE MICHAEL MADISON. MR. MADISON, COME ON
14 UP.

15 MR. MADISON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I'D LIKE
16 TO PREFACE -- AGAIN, MY NAME IS MICHAEL, LAST NAME
17 IS MADISON. LAST NAME, M-A-D-I-S-O-N.

18 I'D LIKE TO PREFACE BY SAYING THAT I
19 AM FIRST AND FOREMOST AN ENTHUSIASTIC SUPPORTER OF
20 THIS PROJECT EVER SINCE I FIRST HEARD ABOUT IT. AS
21 A STUDENT AND A STAFF MEMBER AT USC, I THINK IT'S AN
22 IMPORTANT LINK BETWEEN DOWNTOWN AND THE EXPOSITION
23 PARK AREA. BUT JUST TWO QUICK QUESTIONS:

24 UNDER OPTION 2-C OF THE WESTERN
25 SEGMENT, SINCE IT'S ALL THAT WAY, WHAT KIND OF

1 NEGATIVE EFFECTS WOULD THERE BE TO THE ACCESS LINK 300
2 PROPOSED TO USC PLAZA ALONG FLOWER STREET? AND
3 ALSO, WHAT KIND OF EFFECTS WOULD THERE BE TO THE 301
4 ACCESS BETWEEN THE ROSE GARDEN AND USC DURING LARGE
5 CULTURAL AND ATHLETIC EVENTS?

6 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WHAT
7 WE'RE GOING TO DO WITH RESPECT TO QUESTIONS LIKE
8 THAT IS I'M GOING TO ASK THE STAFF AND THE
9 CONSULTANTS JUST TO MAKE A NOTE OF THE QUESTIONS AND
10 THEN, WHEN WE GET THE COMMENTS IN, TO RESPOND TO THE
11 BEST OF THEIR ABILITY WITH RESPECT TO THOSE
12 QUESTIONS. I THINK THAT'S A LITTLE EASIER WAY TO
13 GO.

14 THE NEXT SPEAKER IS PATSY CARTER. IS
15 THAT RIGHT? OKAY.

16 MS. CARTER: YOUR HONOR, GENTLEMEN, LADIES
17 AND GENTLEMEN IN THE AUDIENCE, MY NAME IS PATSY,
18 P-A-T-S-Y, CARTER, C-A-R-T-E-R.

19 I'M CHAIRWOMAN OF A NEIGHBORHOOD 302
20 GROUP CALLED THE 23RD STREET NEIGHBORS. OUR AREA OF
21 CONCERN IS FROM HOOVER TO FIGUEROA, WASHINGTON TO
22 ADAMS. AS I HEARD YOU LISTING THE NAMES OF
23 INSTITUTIONS YOU HAD CONSULTED WITH, I WAS SORRY
24 THAT I DIDN'T RECOGNIZE ANY THAT I FEEL REPRESENT
25 THE PEOPLE WHO WILL BE MOST IMPACTED BY THIS

1 PROJECT. I'VE BEEN TOLD THAT YOU HAVE NOT
2 CONSIDERED THE TRAFFIC IMPACTS ON 23RD STREET.

3 AS A LAWYER WHO HAS LITIGATED THE
4 ADEQUACY OF E.I.R.'S MANY TIMES, I FEEL THAT ITS
5 POSSIBLE FAILURE TO CONSIDER THE TRAFFIC, AND
6 FAILURE TO OFFER LITIGATION WOULD BE A SERIOUS
7 DEFECT IN THE FINAL E.I.R.

8 SO I URGE YOU, FROM A LEGAL
9 STANDPOINT, BUT ALSO FROM A MORAL STANDPOINT, TO
10 CONSIDER THE TRAFFIC, TO CONSULT WITH ME OR OTHER
11 NEIGHBORS WHO ALREADY KNOW THE CURRENT TRAFFIC
12 IMPACTS ON 23RD STREET, AS AN ARTERY THAT IS
13 OVERUSED ALREADY AND OVERBURDONED, AND TO OFFER
14 ISSUES AND WORK FOR SOLUTIONS, ALL OF WHICH EXIST AT
15 A NOMINAL COST, CONSIDERING THE LENGTH AND THE
16 DURATION THAT THIS PROJECT WILL BE SERVICING PEOPLE
17 FROM ALL OVER SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, AND LET US FIND
18 SOME OF THOSE MITIGATION MEASURES SO THAT THE
19 NEIGHBORHOOD, LIVABLE AS IT IS NOW -- ALTHOUGH, I
20 KNOW TO MANY PEOPLE WHO LOOK AT IT, IT DOESN'T LOOK
21 LIVABLE. MANY PEOPLE WOULD NOT CONSIDER LIVING IN
22 THE NEIGHBORHOOD -- I ASSURE YOU, IT'S AN IMMENSELY
23 LIVABLE NEIGHBORHOOD AND LET'S LEAVE IT THAT WAY,
24 AND PROTECT THE FRAGILE BALANCE THAT NOW EXISTS
25 BETWEEN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD BEING A VIABLE PLACE FOR

1 PEOPLE WHO CHOOSE TO LIVE THERE AND A PLACE WHERE
2 NOBODY WILL LIVE THERE, EXCEPT THOSE WHO ABSOLUTELY
3 MUST. THANK YOU.

4 I OFFER MY SERVICES AT ANY TIME TO
5 MEET WITH ANY OF YOU AND PROPOSE A FEW MODEST
6 MITIGATION PROCEDURES THAT I THINK WOULD HELP
7 IMMENSELY WITH THE TRAFFIC.

8 MR. HAYES: EXCUSE ME. WHAT SECTION OF 23RD
9 STREET ARE YOU REFERRING TO?

10 MS. CARTER: I'M REFERRING TO FIGUEROA TO
11 HOOVER. NOW, I'M NOT SAYING IT'S NOT GOING TO
12 IMPACT THE VERMONT TO HOOVER SECTION. I REALLY
13 THINK IT WILL IMPACT THAT AREA. I THINK THAT
14 WHEREVER YOU HAVE AN OFF RAMP COMING OFF THE SANTA
15 MONICA FREEWAY TO EITHER VERMONT -- AND PEOPLE WILL
16 ZAP THROUGH FROM THAT OFF RAMP TO PARK IN OUR
17 NEIGHBORHOOD FOR ALL DAY, PROBABLY, AS THEY CATCH
18 THIS TO GO WHEREVER THEY WANT TO GO FOR RECREATION
19 OR WORK, OR ESPECIALLY AS THE ADDITIONAL LINE IS
20 ADDED, AS WELL IT SHOULD BE ADDED. BUT I DO HAVE A
21 RATHER NARROW FOCUS BECAUSE I'M ELECTED TO REPRESENT
22 THE PEOPLE FROM HOOVER TO FIGUEROA.

23 SO THAT'S MY MAIN AREA OF FOCUS, AND
24 IT WILL BE THE AREA I THINK MOST HEAVILY IMPACTED.

25 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

1 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU, MS. CARTER. THE
2 NEXT SPEAKER, IS THAT TOM HANDY?

3 MR. HANDY: HANDY, H-A-N-D-Y. PATSY'S
4 TESTIMONY ENVOKES A LITTLE NOSTALGIA BECAUSE DURING
5 WORLD WAR II, I USED TO WORK OUT OF A PREDECESOR OF
6 RTD, DIVISION 5, WHICH IS STILL CALLED DIVISION 5,
7 AND I DROVE A CAR, WHICH WAS, AT THAT TIME, CALLED
8 THE U-CAR LINE, WHICH WENT AROUND SOME POINT
9 STREETS.

10 HOWEVER, THAT ASIDE, AT A LATER TIME,
11 WHEN I WORKED DOWNTOWN, I USED TO RIDE WHAT WAS
12 CALLED THE SANTA MONICA AIRLINE, JOKINGLY CALLED
13 "THE SECRET COMMUTER RUN." AND SOMETIMES WHEN THE
14 CAR WAS A LITTLE LATE BECAUSE OF SOME MOTORS
15 STRIKING THE TRACKS OR SOMETHING, A LOT OF PEOPLE
16 WOULD GET OFF AND RIDE THE FIGUEROA BUS THE REST OF
17 THE WAY DOWNTOWN, RATHER THAN FOLLOWING THE LONG
18 PAINFUL ROUTE INTO THE DOWNTOWN TERMINAL, WHICH I
19 BELIEVE WAS AT 6TH AND MAIN.

20 HOWEVER, A GREAT MANY PEOPLE WHO TAKE
21 THE FIGUEROA BUS, BECAUSE IF THEY WORKED IN THE --
22 WHAT AT THAT TIME WAS CALLED THE ROBERTSON AND --
23 WELL, THE FIGUEROA AND 7TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD, OF
24 COURSE, THEY COULD LEAVE ABOUT 15 MINUTES LATER, AND
25 THIS PROVIDED THE FASTEST ROUTE BACK TO CHEVIOT

1 HILLS AND WESTWOOD, WHERE MOST OF THE PEOPLE WHO
2 KNEW THE SECRET LIVED BECAUSE IT WAS ABOUT A HALF AN
3 HOUR FASTER THAN ANY OTHER PUBLIC ROUTE AND 15
4 MINUTES FASTER THAN DRIVING. SO, OF COURSE, IF WE
5 HAD A RAIL ROUTE IT WOULD BE IDEAL FOR THAT PURPOSE.

6 I HAVE TWO LETTERS IN MY FILE FROM
7 THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. THE FIRST
8 LETTER FOCUSED JUST ON PEOPLE WHO LIVED WEST BECAUSE
9 ONE OF THEIR STUDENTS IS CAROL ALDRIGE. WHEN THE
10 CITY BOARD OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES DID NOT GIVE
11 PERMISSION FOR ABANDONMENT, BUT THE CALIFORNIA
12 PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION CHANGED THE PERMISSIVE
13 ORDER TO A MANDATORY ORDER TO ABANDON, SO, OF
14 COURSE, DURING THIS PERIOD, THEY RAN A USELESS
15 SERVICE FROM 11TH AVENUE AND, OF COURSE -- SO
16 CAROL ALDRIGE'S FAMILY, AFTER SPENDING ABOUT AN HOUR
17 AND A HALF TO GET TO USC, NOW TOOK TWO BUS TRANSFERS
18 AND IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE. SO HER FOLKS BOUGHT -- GAVE
19 HER THE FAMILY CAR AND ACQUIRED ANOTHER ONE. SO NOW
20 I'M GLAD WE'RE REVERSING THE PROCESS OF DIVERTING
21 PEOPLE THAT CHOICE, FOR PEOPLE IN AUTOMOBILES, BACK
22 TO PUBLIC RIDES.

23 AND CERTAINLY, FOR THE SECOND LETTER,
24 THOUGH, FROM USC, WHICH I HAVE ON FILE -- I DON'T
25 HAVE THE DATES. I DIDN'T BRING IT. I DIDN'T

1 ANTICIPATE THIS. BUT FOR HISTORY, IF YOU WANT IT
2 FOR YOUR FILES, I WOULD GET IT -- IT SUDDENLY
3 DISCOVERED THAT THEY HAD GREAT NUMBERS OF PEOPLE 303
4 COMING FROM LONG BEACH TO USC. WELL, THIS IS
5 PERFECT BECAUSE THEY COULD TRANSFER AT THE PICO
6 STATION AND TAKE THE SHUTTLE DOWN HERE. SO I THINK
7 IT'S A BLESSING.

8 IF YOU WANT THOSE LETTERS, LET ME
9 KNOW.

10 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
11 MR. HANDY. ELOISE HELWIG?

12 MS. HELWIG: YOUR HONOR, GENTLEMEN, MEMBERS
13 OF THE AUDIENCE --

14 JUDGE NEHER: MS. HELWIG, YOU'VE GOT A RATHER
15 SOFT VOICE AND YOU'RE AWAY FROM THE MIKE.

16 MS. HELWIG: MY NAME IS ELOISE HELWIG, THAT'S
17 H-E-L-W-I-G.

18 I'M THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF 304
19 THE LOS ANGELES ORTHOPEDIC FOUNDATION, WHICH
20 PROVIDES FUNDING FOR THE ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL AND
21 ALSO RESEARCH AND MEDICAL EDUCATION.

22 I'M HERE TODAY TO SPEAK TO YOU ON
23 BEHALF OF THE HOSPITAL, IT'S EMPLOYEES, THE STAFF,
24 AND HUNDREDS OF VOLUNTEERS WHO HAVE DEVOTED
25 THOUSANDS OF HOURS OF SERVICE TO THE ORTHOPEDIC

1 HOSPITAL. MOST OF ALL, I SPEAK ON BEHALF OF THE
2 CHILDREN AND ADULTS WHO HAVE ORTHOPEDIC DISABILITIES
3 WHO COME TO US FOR TREATMENT, AND FOR THEIR FAMILIES
4 WHO CARE FOR THEM.

5 WE ARE A COMMUNITY FACILITY; A
6 CHARITY HOSPITAL. SINCE 1922, WHEN ORTHOPEDIC
7 HOSPITAL OPENED ITS DOORS, THANKS TO THE VISION OF
8 OUR FOUNDER, DR. CHARLES LOWMAN, WE HAVE
9 CONTINUOUSLY PROVIDED WORLD CLASS MEDICAL CARE FOR
10 ORTHOPEDICALLY DISABLED AND CRIPPLED CHILDREN,
11 REGARDLESS OF THEIR ABILITY TO PAY.

12 LAST YEAR WE TREATED OVER 20,000
13 CHILDREN IN OUR CLINIC; 40 PERCENT OF THESE CHILDREN
14 WERE HISPANIC, 36 PERCENT WERE BLACK, MOST OF THE
15 THEM COMING FROM THE SOUTH CENTRAL PARTS OF OUR
16 CITY. WE ALSO PROVIDED A CLINIC IN MEXICO TO SERVE
17 CHILDREN FROM MEXICO.

18 OUR DOCTORS AND VOLUNTEERS VISIT THE
19 CLINIC AND CAN SEE APPROXIMATELY 250 CHILDREN. 13
20 TO 15 OF THESE CHILDREN ARE BROUGHT TO OUR HOSPITAL
21 EVERY MONTH FOR MORE COMPLICATED SURGERY. WE SEE
22 MORE THAN 1,000 CHILDREN FROM MEXICO DURING THE
23 COURSE OF A YEAR. OUR DOCTORS WHO VOLUNTEER AT THE
24 CLINIC DO NOT GET PAID FOR THEIR SERVICES.

25 ADDITIONALLY, WE SEE CHILDREN FROM

1 ALL OVER THE WORLD. WE HAVE CHILDREN FROM
2 AFGHANISTAN, KOREA, RUSSIA AND SOUTH AMERICAN.

3 TOMORROW WE WILL GO TO LAX AND MEET A
4 SIX-YEAR-OLD BOY FROM ROMANIA WHO WILL BE WITH US
5 FOR APPROXIMATELY SIX MONTHS WHILE OUR DOCTORS TREAT
6 HIM FOR DEFORMITIES OF BOTH FEET AND THE METACARPAL
7 JOINTS.

8 THE ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL IS A SPECIAL
9 CARE FACILITY PROVIDING MEDICAL CARE FOR SERIOUS
10 DISABILITIES. WE HAVE THE LARGEST HOSPITAL FOR
11 ORTHOPEDICS IN THE COUNTRY. WE CURRENTLY HAVE MORE
12 THAN 600 PATIENTS WITH SERIOUS DISORDERS. WE HAVE
13 OVER 400 CHILDREN WITH SPINABIFIDA, WHICH IS A
14 GENETIC CONDITION. THESE CHILDREN ARE BORN WITH A
15 HOLE IN THEIR SPINE, WHICH RESULTS IN A GREAT
16 VARIETY OF PHYSICAL DISABILITIES. WE ALSO HAVE MORE
17 THAN 400 CHILDREN WITH CEREBRAL PALSY, AGAIN WITH A
18 VARIETY OF DISABILITIES.

19 THREE YEARS AGO, IN MAY, WE ASKED THE
20 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES TO TAKE CARE OF THE CHILDREN
21 OF THE CITY. BECAUSE OF THEIR INABILITY TO PAY,
22 THEY'RE SENT TO THE ORTHOPEDIC COUNTY HOSPITAL TO
23 REPAIR A BROKEN ARM, A BROKEN LEG OR A FRACTURED
24 HIP. AT TIMES, THESE CHILDREN MUST WAIT HOURS OR
25 EVEN DAYS TO GET THE PROPER TREATMENT, DUE TO THE

1 HEAVY CASE LOAD AT THE HOSPITAL. THIS HOSPITAL
2 ACCEPTS CHILDREN AND TREATS THEM WITH THE FINEST
3 MEDICAL STAFF, ALL OF THIS AT NO COST TO THE COUNTY
4 OR THE FAMILIES OF THESE CHILDREN.

5 IN 1968 WE BEGAN ACCEPTING ADULTS
6 BECAUSE OF THE INCIDENTS OF GREATER ORTHOPEDIC
7 CONDITIONS AFFECTING ADULTS. TODAY, 50 PERCENT OF
8 OUR -- 45 PERCENT IS ADULTS -- EXCUSE ME. 55 ARE
9 CHILDREN, 45 ARE ADULTS.

10 WE HAVE THE LARGEST JOINT REPLACEMENT
11 INSTITUTION IN THE COUNTY SERVING ADULTS,
12 REPLACEMENT OF HIPS AND KNEES, USING STATE OF THE
13 ART TECHNIQUES. ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL IS ALSO A
14 TEACHING HOSPITAL. IT'S THE LARGEST TEACHING
15 HOSPITAL ON THE WEST COAST. IT ALSO HAS A VERY
16 INTENSE RESEARCH PROGRAM, AND IS ONE OF THE LARGEST
17 RESEARCH FUNDING INSTITUTES IN THE COUNTRY.

18 WE HAVE MORE THAN 400 ATTENDING
19 PHYSICIANS WHO COME FROM ALL OVER SOUTHERN
20 CALIFORNIA. OUR EMPLOYEES NUMBER 600, OUR
21 VOLUNTEERS NUMBER 576, PROVIDING MORE THAN 32,000
22 HOURS OF SERVICE. ALL OF THESE PEOPLE WILL BE
23 AFFECTED BY THE PROJECT NOW BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE.

24 FOR THE RECORD, WE ARE NOT OPPOSED TO
25 THIS PROCESS. WE ARE CONCERNED. WE UNDERSTAND THE

1 FULL IMPACT THAT THIS PROJECT, AS CURRENTLY
2 DESIGNED, WILL HAVE ON OUR FACILITY.

3 ONE: ACCESS TO THE HOSPITAL FOR
4 PATIENTS AND EMPLOYEES.

5 TWO: INCONVENIENCE TO SURGICAL AND
6 MEDICAL STAFF.

7 THREE: VIBRATION AND NOISE LEVEL
8 ISSUES, WHICH WILL HAVE A DEFINATE IMPACT ON OUR
9 VERY SENSITVE EQUIPMENT AND THE WELL BEING OF OUR
10 PATIENTS.

11 FOUR: DIRT POLLUTION WILL HAVE A
12 VERY SERIOUS IMPACT ON OUR HEATING AND AIR
13 CONDITIONING SYSTEM, AND ON OUR ABILITY TO ATTRACT
14 THE VOLUNTEERS WHICH ARE SO IMPORTANT TO US.

15 WE ASK FOR UNDERSTANDING AND SUPPORT
16 ON BEHALF OF OUR ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL. THANK YOU,
17 VERY MUCH.

18 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
19 H. RANDALL STROKE.

20 MR. STROKE: MR. CHAIRMAN, CONSULTANTS, MY
21 NAME IS H.R. STROKE. THE ADDRESS IS 633 SOUTH FLOWER
22 STREET.

23 I'M AN ATTORNEY REPRESENTING
24 ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL. ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL JOINED
25 HANDS WITH THE LACTC TO ENCOURAGE THE IDEA OF THE

305

1 EXTENSION OF THE BLUE LINE. I'M ADVISED THAT THE
2 ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL EVEN CONTRIBUTED TO THE DRAFT
3 ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT WHICH WE ARE DISCUSSING TODAY.

4 I CAN'T BELIEVE THE SHOCK AND DISMAY
5 THAT THE HOSPITAL EXECUTIVES SUFFERED WHEN THEY READ
6 A REPORT THAT TOTALLY DISREGARDED THE MATTERS OF
7 DISCUSSION BETWEEN THE HOSPITAL AND THE LACTC
8 REPRESENTATIVES WITH WHOM THEY DISCUSSED THESE
9 MATTERS.

10 AT ALL TIMES, THE HOSPITAL WAS
11 LOOKING FORWARD TO AN ALIGNMENT FOR THE BLUE LINE
12 ALONG THE WEST SIDE OF FLOWER. SURPRISINGLY, THE
13 STAFF AND CONSULTANTS OF LACTC DECIDED THE HOSPITAL
14 SHOULD BE ON THE EAST SIDE, EVEN THOUGH THESE
15 GENTLEMEN WERE PRIVY TO THE E.I.S. PREPARED BY
16 CAL TRANS. ALL THE LETTERS AND DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN
17 CAL TRANS AND THE HOSPITAL SHOWS AN OFF RAMP ONTO
18 ADAMS, A TURN TO THE RIGHT ON FLOWER, A CONTRA LINE
19 ON THE EAST SIDE FOR ALL THE TRAFFIC WE'RE GOING TO
20 GET FROM THE FREEWAY. NEVERTHELESS, IN DIRECT
21 OPPOSITION TO THAT COUNTER-FLOW AND THE CAL TRANS
22 PROJECT, THE LACTC STAFF AND CONSULTANTS PROPOSED TO
23 PUT THE BLUE LINE RIGHT DOWN THE SAME PATH.

24 WE HAVE PRESENTED TO YOU A LETTER,
25 NOT ONLY FROM MYSELF, BUT ANOTHER ONE FROM JERRY

1 FAYDAM (PHONETIC), ANOTHER ONE FROM A.C. MARTIN, AND
2 WE'LL SUBMIT TO YOU ADDITIONAL DRAWINGS WHICH WILL
3 SHOW WHERE, IN OUR JUDGMENT, THE BLUE LINE WAS TO BE
4 CONSTRUCTED, NAMELY ALONG THE WESTERLY SIDE. IF YOU
5 PUT IT ALONG THE EAST SIDE -- AND I UNDERSTAND THAT
6 I ONLY HAVE THREE MINUTES, SO I CAN'T GO INTO
7 THIS -- BUT YOU WILL HAVE AN INCREDIBLE IMPACT WITH
8 THE ACCESS TO THE HOSPITAL.

9 THE INJURIES AND THE PEOPLE WITH
10 DEFORMITIES YOU'VE HEARD OF, LOOK TO THE ENTRANCE TO
11 THE HOSPITAL AND THE OPEN ARMS OF THE HOSPITAL ON
12 THE WEST SIDE OF THE HOSPITAL, WHICH IS THE EAST
13 SIDE OF FLOWER STREET. HOW THEY'RE SUPPOSED TO GET
14 IN THERE, THROUGH WHAT WILL BE CREATED ON THE PLANS
15 SUBMITTED BY LACTC, IS A MYSTERY.

16 WE'RE ALSO MYSTIFIED BY ALL OF THE
17 SUMMARIES OF ALL OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS THAT
18 YOU SHOW ON TABLE 1.4, INCLUDING, FOR EXAMPLE, THE
19 MATTER OF ASTHETICS, WHICH ARE SO NICELY AND EASILY
20 TAKEN CARE OF, AND WHICH WILL CERTAINLY BE
21 MITIGATED. BUT WHAT THEY'RE GOING TO DO TO MITIGATE
22 IT IS TO TAKE DOWN ALL THE PALM TREES.

23 NOW, THE DRAWINGS THAT YOU'VE BROUGHT
24 TO US TODAY SHOW US WHAT A SUPER PLACE THIS IS GOING
25 TO BE, BUT YOU SHOW PALM TREES. THOSE PALM TREES

1 ARE NOT GOING TO BE IN THERE. IN YOUR ENVIRONMENTAL
2 REPORT, YOU'RE ELIMINATING THOSE PALM TREES.

3 WE CANNOT REALLY RESPOND TO THIS
4 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT BECAUSE IT DOESN'T MAKE
5 ANY SENSE, BECAUSE IT DOESN'T CONSIDER THE
6 MITIGATION AND ALTERNATIVES WHICH SHOULD BE A PART
7 OF YOUR PROGRAM.

8 FOR THE PREPARER OF THE E.I.R. TO
9 SIMPLY SAY IT WON'T BE A PROBLEM, HE DOESN'T TELL
10 ANYBODY THAT THERE COULD BE AN ALTERNATIVE OF THE
11 WEST SIDE OF THE STREET.

12 AND IN VIEW OF THE TIME, I CAN ONLY
13 SAY THAT NOBODY CAN RESPOND TO THIS E.I.R. IN A
14 MEANINGFUL WAY UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THOSE WHO PREPARED
15 THE E.I.R. SHOW THE MITIGATIONS THAT ARE POSSIBLE,
16 SHOW THE ALTERNATIVES THAT ARE POSSIBLE, AND THEN
17 EXPLAIN WHAT THOSE VARIOUS IMPACTS ARE GOING TO BE.

18 THE DOCUMENT ITSELF IS ETERNALLY IN
19 CONFLICT WITH RESPECT TO VIBRATION AND OTHER
20 MATTERS. WHAT THEY ADMIT IN THE E.I.R. IS THEY
21 REALLY HAVEN'T STUDIED WHAT THE EFFECT IS ON THE
22 HOSPITAL. WE HAVE VERY SENSITIVE EQUIPMENT THERE.
23 WE HAVE SURGEONS, OPERATIONS, ALL OF THOSE MATTERS
24 ARE GOING TO GO ON, HOPEFULLY, WHETHER WE HAVE A
25 BLUE LINE OR NOT. WE HOPE WE HAVE A BLUE LINE. BUT

1 HOW MUCH BETTER IS IT TO MOVE THE BLUE LINE OVER TO
2 LESSEN THE IMPACT OF VIBRATIONS THEN IT IS TO SHOVE
3 IT RIGHT NEXT TO THE HOSPITAL AND HAVE NOT ONLY
4 THOSE VIBRATIONS, BUT ALL THE CONFUSION THAT GOES
5 ALONG WITH THE PATIENTS AND THE PEOPLE WHO NEED TO
6 USE IT AND NEED TO SERVICE THOSE PATIENTS?

7 THERE WILL BE SOME ENCROACHMENT ON
8 THE WEST SIDE, IN ADDITION TO THE RIGHT-OF-WAY. AND
9 IF YOU PLAN IT SAFELY, IT SEEMS ALMOST UNAVOIDABLE.
10 BUT THOSE ARE THE KIND OF THINGS THAT THE PEOPLE WHO
11 ARE SO TALENTED AS CONSULTANTS AND HAVE BEEN HIRED
12 HERE BY THE LACTC OUGHT TO BE ABLE TO FIGURE OUT.

13 UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, BECAUSE WE
14 ONLY HAVE THIS DOCUMENT TO WORK WITH, I'M AFRAID
15 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO ASK RESPECTFULLY THAT WE
16 SCRAP IT, AND THEN DO IT OVER AND THINK OF THESE
17 ALTERNATIVES WHICH HAVE BEEN IN THE MINDS OF
18 EVERYBODY WHO HAS CONSIDERED THIS MATTER, BUT HAVE
19 NEVER BEEN REPORTED ON BY THE CONSULTANTS OR THE
20 STAFF OF LACTC. THEN, HOPEFULLY, WE CAN ALL WORK
21 TOGETHER.

22 AND I HOPE YOU'LL MEET WITH PATSY
23 CARTER, BECAUSE SHE'S HAD SOME WONDERFUL IDEAS FOR
24 THIS AREA AND THE IMPACTS, AND COME UP WITH A
25 PROGRAM THAT MEETS THE OBJECTIVES OF THE LACTC, AND

1 ALSO THE MAJOR RESIDENTS, INCLUDING THE HOSPITAL,
2 ALONG THIS ROUTE.

3 AND I HOPE THAT NEXT TIME AROUND, THE
4 HOSPITAL WILL NOT BE ASKED TO PAY FOR THIS
5 DOCUMENT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

6 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU, MR. STOKE. I THINK
7 THE NEXT SPEAKER'S NAME IS MINDY OCANA. IS MINDY
8 CORRECT? I BLEW IT ON ELOISE -- IT WAS ELOLSE.

9 MS. OCANA: MY NAME IS MIRTA, M-I-R-T-A, LAST
10 NAME IS OCANA, O-C-A-N-A.

11 I WORK FOR THE LAW FIRM OF 306
12 (UNINTELLIGIBLE) AND WE REPRESENT -- MY LAW FIRM
13 REPRESENTS TENANTS WHO LIVE AT 363 SOUTH FLOWER.
14 THIS IS A BUILDING LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF
15 FLOWER STREET, AND IT HOLDS APPROXIMATELY 60 UNITS,
16 AND IT'S FULLY OCCUPIED BY LOW-INCOME TENANTS.

17 MY OFFICE IS VERY CONCERNED ABOUT
18 THREE ISSUES, AND I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE SOME RESPONSE
19 AT THE END OF THE SESSION ON THESE THREE QUESTIONS.

20 QUESTION NUMBER 1 IS THE ISSUE OF
21 RELOCATION FOR THE TENANTS, ALTERNATIVE LOW-INCOME
22 HOUSING FOR THE TENANTS IN THE BUILDING. AS YOU
23 KNOW, LOW-INCOME HOUSING IN LOS ANGELES IS BECOMING
24 SORT OF AN ENDANGERED SPECIES. SO WE'RE VERY
25 CONCERNED ABOUT THAT.

1 NUMBER 2 IS THE ISSUE OF RELOCATION
2 ASSISTANCE FOR THE TENANTS.

3 AND NUMBER 3 IS THE ISSUE OF THE
4 PRESERVATION OF THE EVIDENCE. WE WOULD LIKE TO BE
5 ABLE TO KNOW AHEAD OF TIME BEFORE ANY DEMOLITION
6 GOES FORWARD SO THAT WE CAN PRESERVE THE EVIDENCE.

7 WE REPRESENT THE TENANTS AGAINST THE
8 OWNER OF THE BUILDING, ABOUT MAINTAINING THE
9 BUILDING IN A SUBSTANDARD CONDITION. THIS IS
10 CONSIDERED A SLUM BUILDING.

11 THOSE THREE ISSUES I AM VERY
12 CONCERNED ABOUT. I WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO WHOEVER OF
13 YOU IS IN CHARGE OF THIS ABOUT THESE THREE THINGS.
14 THANK YOU.

15 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AND THE
16 NEXT SPEAKER -- IS THAT ELSON TRINIDAD?

17 MR. TRINIDAD: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, MY NAME 307
18 IS ELSON, E-L-S-O-N, TRINIDAD, T-R-I-N-I-D-A-D.

19 I WOULD LIKE TO START OFF BY SAYING
20 I'M WHOLEHEARTEDLY IN SUPPORT OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF
21 THIS SEGMENT, THE BENEFITS, INCLUDING THE EXPANSION
22 OF THE ALREADY SUCCESSFUL BLUE LINE, AND INCREASED
23 MOBILITY AND QUALITY OF THE LINE TO EXPOSITION PARK
24 AND THE SOUTH CENTRAL AREA.

25 THE REASON WHY THIS EXTENSION HAS

1 SOME SIGNIFICANCE TO ME IS THAT I'M A USC STUDENT
2 AND I TAKE THE BUS TO SCHOOL AND SOMETIMES I DRIVE
3 TO CAMPUS. THE BUSES ARE USUALLY CROWDED AND VERY
4 UNCOMFORTABLE, AND ALSO PARKING IS A PROBLEM AND
5 IT'S ALSO VERY EXPENSIVE.

6 I HOPE THIS SEGMENT WILL BE COMPLETED
7 BY THE TIME -- BEFORE I GRADUATE.

8 I HAVE READ THE DRAFT E.I.R. AND --
9 I'VE READ THE DRAFT E.I.R. WITH MUCH INTEREST AND I
10 HAVE SEVERAL COMMENTS, ESPECIALLY ON THE DESIGN OF
11 THE RIGHT-OF-WAY.

12 FIRST, I FEEL THAT CONSTRUCTION
13 SHOULD BE AS QUICK AND AS EFFICIENT AS POSSIBLE.
14 THE LINE'S ONLY TWO MILES LONG, AND CONSTRUCTION
15 SHOULD ONLY TAKE MAYBE ABOUT ONE YEAR. AND I THINK
16 THE ENTIRE LINE SHOULD BE BUILT SIMULTANEOUSLY
17 BECAUSE, IN THE LONG RUN, IT WOULD CREATE LESS
18 TRAFFIC AND LESS NOISE IN A SHORTER AMOUNT OF TIME.

19 SECOND, I SUPPORT THE IDEA OF A
20 SHARED BRIDGE OPTION OVER THE 110 FREEWAY. BUILDING
21 A SEPERATE BRIDGE WOULD ADD TO THE COST AND LENGTH
22 OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT. AND, ALSO, THE
23 SHARED BRIDGE IS MUCH SAFER TO MOTORISTS, AS IT
24 DOESN'T WEAVE ALONG CLARA STREET, AND IT STAYS ON
25 THE EAST SIDE OF THE STREET.

1 ALSO, WHERE IT CURVES WESTWARD, I'M
2 IN SUPPORT OF A SUBWAY OPTION UNDER FIGUEROA AND
3 FLOWER. IT MIGHT ADD TO THE COST AND THE LENGTH OF
4 CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT, BUT I THINK -- I MEAN
5 LIKE THAT, THE LINE WILL NOT INTERFERE WITH THE
6 MOTORISTS EXISTING THE HARBER FREEWAY OFF RAMP AND
7 THE LINE OPERATIONS WILL NOT INTERFERE WITH THE L.A.
8 MARATHON. ALSO, BY BUILDING A SUBWAY PORTION
9 THROUGH THERE, IT WILL BE INCREASED TRAVEL TIME.
10 AND THEN THERE WILL BE NO STOP LIGHTS, NO NEED FOR
11 STOP LIGHTS THROUGH THAT ROUTE.

12 ALSO, I'M IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTIONAL
13 STATION, WHICH I WOULD CALL THE USC/EXPOSITION PARK
14 STATION. IT WOULD BE ADJACENT -- DIRECTLY ADJACENT
15 TO TRUSEDAL (PHONETIC) WALKWAY, WHICH IS THE MAIN
16 NORTH/SOUTH WALKWAY OF THE USC CAMPUS AND, ALSO,
17 ADJACENT TO THE ROSE GARDEN, MUSEUMS, AND IT'S MUCH
18 CLOSER TO THE COLISEUM; IT WOULD HAVE BETTER SERVICE
19 TO THOSE PLACES.

20 I THINK THE STATION SHOULD BE BUILT
21 DESPITE THE SUBWAY OPTION. ALL THAT NEEDS TO BE
22 DONE IS TO PUSH THE TUNNEL A LITTLE MORE EASTWARD.
23 AND ALTHOUGH THE STATION WOULD BE CLOSED TO THE
24 VERMONT AVENUE STOP, ALL WE HAVE TO DO -- I MEAN,
25 LOOK AT LONG BEACH WHERE THE FIRST STREET AND THE

1 TRANSIT MALL STATION IS; THEY'RE PRETTY CLOSE
2 TOGETHER. AND SO THERE'S ALSO A GOOD REASON TO HAVE
3 TWO STATIONS PLACED CLOSE TOGETHER IN THAT AREA.

4 ALSO, I'M NOT IN FAVOR OF RELOCATING
5 THE GRAND STATION. I THINK DOING SO WOULD ADD MORE
6 TO THE COST AND IT WOULD ALSO CONFUSE RIDERS WHO
7 CURRENTLY PATRONIZE GRAND STATION, SINCE IT'S VERY
8 ACCESSIBLE TO L.A. TRADE TECH, AND NUMEROUS BUS
9 LINES. I THINK RIDERS WHO COME FROM THE SOUTH WHO
10 WISH TO GO TO THE EXPOSITION EXTENSION SHOULD JUST
11 TRANSFER OFF OF PICO STATION; IT'S ONLY LIKE A
12 TWO-MINUTE WASTE OF TIME -- I MEAN IT WOULD ONLY
13 TAKE UP TWO MINUTES.

14 AND SIXTH, MOST OF ALL, I THINK THE
15 LACTC SHOULD COMMIT TO EXTENDING THE LINE TO SANTA
16 MONICA. I THINK THAT -- I FEEL THAT THIS BRANCH AND
17 THE SANTA MONICA LINE SHOULD BE BUILT CONCURRENTLY,
18 AND I THINK THIS EXTENSION -- THIS TWO-MILE
19 EXTENSION WOULD BE A WASTE TO BUILD WITHOUT ACCESS
20 TO THE WEST.

21 MOST OF ALL -- WELL, BASICALLY I LOOK
22 FORWARD TO THE COMPLETION OF THIS PROJECT, AND I
23 LOOK FORWARD TO THE POSITIVE BENEFITS THAT WILL
24 SERVE THE AREA. THANK YOU.

25 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,

1 MR. TRINIDAD. CRAIG THOMPSON.

2 MR. THOMPSON: LADIES AND GENTLEMENT, MY NAME
3 IS CRAIG THOMPSON, C-R-A-I-G, T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N.

4 AND LIKE MY COLLEAGUE, MR. TRINIDAD, 308
5 I AM IN FULL SUPPORT OF THIS PROJECT. AND I WOULD
6 ALSO LIKE TO STATE THAT I CAN UNDERSTAND PERFECTLY
7 THE GENTLEMEN WHO WAS SPEAKING ON THE PROBLEMS
8 CAUSED BY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE LINE IN
9 FRONT OF HIS HOSPITAL, ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL. I
10 UNDERSTAND IT PERFECTLY, EXCEPT FOR ONE THING: IF
11 WE DID WHAT HE WANTED, IT WOULD CAUSE MORE ACCIDENTS
12 BETWEEN AUTOMOBILES AND THE TRAINS, IF WE PUT IT ON
13 THE LEFT-HAND SIDE OF THE STREET, ON THE
14 ALIGNMENT -- ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE STREET. EXCUSE
15 ME.

16 MY SUGGESTION FOR THAT WOULD BE, TO
17 SOLVE HIS PROBLEM AND TO SPEED UP SCHEDULES ON THIS
18 LINE, WOULD BE TO BUILD A PORT OF ENTRY AT 20TH
19 STREET, RUN IT IN TUNNEL ALL THE WAY TO JEFFERSON
20 STATION, WHICH WOULD ALSO BE UNDERGROUND, AND AROUND
21 THE CURVE TO EXPOSITION PARK. NOW, THERE WOULD BE
22 ANOTHER PORTAL AT UNIVERSITY AVENUE.

23 NOW, I UNDERSTAND THIS MIGHT BE AN
24 EXTENSIVE PROPOSITION, BUT THEN AGAIN, DUE TO THE
25 INCREASE IN SCHEDULES AND THE LEVEL OF SERVICE BEING

1 INCREASED, BECAUSE IT WOULD TAKE THE TRAINS OFF OF
2 THE STREET AND, IN EFFECT, PUTTING THEM ON THEIR OWN
3 RIGHT-OF-WAY, THIS WOULD INCREASE PATRONAGE ALONG
4 THAT SECTION.

5 NOW, MY BELIEF ON THIS IS THAT THIS
6 WOULD MAKE PRACTICALLY ALL THE PEOPLE IN THE AREA
7 PLEASED BECAUSE THERE WOULD BE NO VISUAL IMPACTS
8 ALONG THE LINE, PLUS THE CAPACITY OF THE LINE WOULD
9 BE INCREASED DUE TO THE FACT THAT IT WOULD BE IN
10 TUNNEL.

11 FURTHERMORE, THERE WOULD BE A LEVEL
12 OF SAFETY INCREASED ALONG THE STREET BECAUSE THERE
13 WOULD BE HARDLY ANY CHANCE FOR LIKE, WHAT I'D LIKE
14 TO TERM "SHOTGUN MARRIAGES" BETWEEN TRAINS AND
15 AUTOMOBILES ON THE STREET. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

16 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU, MR. THOMPSON. TUT
17 HAYES.

18 MR. HAYES: GOOD AFTERNOON. LET ME TAKE YOU 309
19 BACK TO A MOTION PICTURE. IT'S ABOUT AN ANCHORMAN,
20 NOT UNLIKE A JERRY DUMPHREY OR A CONCRITE IMAGE, WHO
21 HAD, FOR SO MANY YEARS, GIVEN THE NEWS ABOUT
22 CORRUPTION, SCANDEL, DESTRUCTION AND WAR. HE
23 FINALLY WENT ON THE AIR AND SAID, "I'M MAD AS HELL
24 AND I'M NOT GOING TO TAKE IT ANYMORE." WELL, THAT'S
25 WHAT I FEEL ALSO. I'M MAD AS HELL AND I'M NOT GOING

1 TO TAKE IT ANY LONGER.

2 YOU'RE UTILIZING PRIMITIVE CONCEPTS
3 FOR RAIL LINES. YOU'RE USING PRIMITIVE EQUIPMENT
4 TO CARRY PEOPLE.

5 WHEN YOU LOOK AT YOUR BLUE LINE, YOU
6 RECOGNIZE THAT ULTIMATELY YOU WILL HAVE TO ELEVATE
7 THE BLUE LINE, NOT ONLY BECAUSE OF THE ACCIDENTS
8 IT'S CAUSING AT CROSSINGS, BUT BECAUSE OF THE NOISE.
9 NOT ONLY IS THE NOISE ASSAILED UPON THE COMMUNITY AS
10 THAT TRAIN GOES THROUGH, BUT IT ALSO ASSAILS ON THE
11 PASSENGERS. MOST PASSENGERS LIKE TO RIDE IN PEACE;
12 THAT IS TO TAKE THE CARS, IF YOU WERE LEFT IN PEACE,
13 WHERE THE SOUND OF THE HORN DOES NOT GO OFF
14 CONSTANTLY.

15 IT'S NOT A SWIFT LINE BECAUSE IT HAS
16 TO SLOW UP AND CAUTION FOR PEOPLE WHO WILL RUN
17 THROUGH THE GATES. THIS LINE HAS TO BE ELEVATED FOR
18 SAFETY PURPOSES.

19 WE HAVE NOT INDICATED IN THE
20 DRAWINGS -- AND I MUST INDICATE TO YOU THAT I'VE
21 ONLY BEEN ABLE TO PERUSE IT FOR THE FIRST TIME
22 TODAY -- ALL OF THE STREETS ARE GOING TO CLOSE
23 OFF. IF THOSE STREETS ARE NOT GOING TO CLOSE OFF,
24 YOU ARE GOING TO PUT ARMS IN AND THE TRAIN WILL BE
25 REQUIRED TO SOUND THE HORN THREE TIMES OR FOUR TIMES

1 EACH TIME IT COMES TO A CROSSING.

2 WE NEED SOME TECHNOLOGY IN THIS
3 CITY. WE UNDERSTAND THAT THE TROLLY BUSES, ELECTRIC
4 BUSES, MADE IT POSSIBLE TO BE BUILT IN ALONG THERE.
5 WELL, IF INDEED THEY ARE BUILT HERE, SO SHOULD THE
6 BLUE LINE TROLLYS BE BUILT HERE. WE NEED TECHNOLOGY
7 IN THESE TRAINS, TO TAKE SOME OF THE PRIMITIVE
8 TECHNOLOGY THAT'S BEING UTILIZED AND IMPORT MAYBE
9 FROM CANADA AND VARIOUS OTHER PLACES AND BRING IT UP
10 TO SPEED.

11 I THINK THAT THE LINE SHOULD
12 TERMINATE IN EXPOSITION PARK, PERHAPS ON STATE
13 DRIVE. LET THE USC STUDENTS TAKE THEIR TRAMS, TAKE
14 THEIR BRIDGES, TAKE THEIR PEOPLEMOVERS AND GET TO
15 THE CAMPUS. I THINK IT'S TOTALLY UNFAIR TO LOOK AT
16 THE FACT THAT FOLKS THAT TRAVEL TO SPORTING EVENTS,
17 PERHAPS OVER 110,000 PEOPLE EVERY DAY, BUT THEY HAVE
18 TO HIKE ALL THE WAY THROUGH TO THE PARK TO GET TO
19 THE SPORTS ARENA AND THE COLISEUM. I THINK THAT'S
20 UNFAIR. IT'S OBVIOUSLY PLAYING INTO USC'S HANDS,
21 THE IMPACT ON THE STUDENTS. THEY RIDE IT EVERY DAY
22 AND, OF COURSE, THE SPORTING EVENTS WON'T HAPPEN
23 VERY OFTEN.

24 ONE OF THE GENERAL REASONS FOR HAVING
25 A STATION IN EXPOSITION PARK BETWEEN THE MUSEUMS AND

1 THE COLISEUM, SPORTS ARENA IS BECAUSE, AS YOU KNOW,
2 WE LOST THE L.A. RAMS WHO LEFT THE COLISEUM BECAUSE
3 IT WAS NOT SATISFACTORY. WE UNDERSTAND THAT OTHER
4 TEAMS ARE PERHAPS EAGER TO LEAVE THE COLISEUM ALSO.
5 AND ANOTHER EVENT WHICH COULD PERHAPS BE BOOKED INTO
6 THE COLISEUM WAS NOT BOOKED IN THERE NOT ONLY
7 BECAUSE OF THE TRAFFIC, BUT BECAUSE OF OTHER THINGS.

8 BUT IF YOU PAY MORE ATTENTION TO THE
9 FACT THAT THE PEOPLE ARE WHO IT IS SUPPOSED TO BE
10 SERVING, NOT A USC CAMPUS, YOU WILL SEE TO IT THAT
11 IT TERMINATES IN THE PARK WHICH WE USE THERE IN
12 BETWEEN THE ARENAS.

13 IF IT IS INDEED GOING TO BE SWIFT, IT
14 HAS TO BE ELEVATED. OF COURSE, WE ARE NOT -- I'M
15 NOT INTERESTED IN SPENDING AN INCREDIBLE AMOUNT OF
16 MONEY ON SUBWAYS. ELEVATION, AND PERHAPS YOU WILL
17 BE LOOKING TO MODERN RAIL TECHNOLOGY -- IT WILL BE
18 SOMETHING THAT'S PERHAPS DELAYING THE PROCESS A
19 LITTLE BIT, BUT YOU'RE EVENTUALLY GOING TO HAVE TO
20 ELEVATE THE BLUE LINE; AM I NOT CORRECT? AND ONCE
21 YOU DO THAT, YOU SHOULD ALSO THINK ABOUT ELEVATING
22 THIS PART.

23 SO FOR THE SAKE OF TECHNOLOGY AND FOR
24 THE SAKE OF SAFETY AND QUIET -- BECAUSE IF YOU'RE
25 GOING TO TELL US HOW MANY TIMES THE HORN WILL SOUND,

1 I THINK YOU WILL TOTALLY INDICATE THAT THE
2 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REPORT WILL BE TOTALLY
3 DEFEATED BECAUSE NOISE IS SOMETHING WHICH IS VERY
4 IMPORTANT. YOU SHOULD HAVE TO STAY AT A CROSSING AT
5 103RD STREET AND HEAR THAT HORN AS THOSE TRAINS
6 COME. IT IS UNNERVING. IT IS MORE THAN UNNERVING
7 THAN THE VIOLENCE AND THE HORROR OF THE ACCIDENTS
8 THAT TAKE PLACE.

9 ONE THING YOU MIGHT DO TO NEGATE THE
10 SOUND OF THE HORN, AS YOU NO DOUBT KNOW, AT
11 INTERSECTIONS THEY HAVE LITTLE BIRDS THAT CHIRP SO
12 THAT BLIND PEOPLE KNOW. YOU COULD USE COMPUTER
13 TECHNOLOGY AND USE A VOICE THAT INDICATES THAT THE
14 TRAIN IS COMING, BECAUSE ONE OF THE PROBLEMS THAT
15 YOU DO NOT PAY ATTENTION TO IS MANY PEOPLE DASH
16 ACROSS THOSE INTERSECTIONS, HUMAN BEINGS ON FOOT,
17 AND THEY'RE RUNNING THE RISK OF PERIL. AND IF YOU
18 HAVE SOME SORT OF SOUNDING MECHANISM THAT WOULD
19 ALERT THE CARS AND PERHAPS EVEN A VOICE TELLING
20 CARS, "DO NOT ATTEMPT TO CROSS THE TRACK," A HUMAN
21 VOICE WITH A VERY AUTHORITATIVE TONE, IT WOULD
22 PROBABLY BE MUCH BETTER THAN A HORN SOUNDING.

23 BRING IT UP TO TECHNOLOGY; GIVE US
24 WHAT WE'RE PAYING FOR. STOP SQUANDERING OUR MONEY
25 AND GIVE US BETTER WAYS FOR OUR PEOPLE TO RIDE.

1 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU, MR. HAYES. SISTER
2 DIANE DONOGHUE.

3 MS. DONOGHUE: MY NAME IS SISTER DIANE 310
4 DONOGHUE. I'M FROM -- DONOGHUE IS D-O-N-O-G-H-U-E.
5 AND I AM FROM ESPERANZA COMMUNITY HOUSING. THAT IS
6 BASED AT SAINT VINCENT CHURCH AT 621 WEST ADAMS
7 BOULEVARD.

8 I'M HERE THIS AFTERNOON TO SUPPORT
9 THE POSITION OF HAVING THE RAIL LINE ON THE WEST
10 SIDE OF THE STREET. I'M VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE
11 FACT THAT THE E.I.R. DOES NOT ADDRESS ANY OF THE
12 ALTERNATIVES THAT WERE TO BE CONSIDERED, AND THE
13 REPRESENTATIVES FROM ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL, I THINK,
14 HAVE MADE THAT POINT VERY CLEAR.

15 WE HAVE MET WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF
16 THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND IT IS OUR
17 UNDERSTANDING NOW THAT THERE IS A RECOMMENDATION AND
18 A CONSIDERATION FOR MOVING THE RAIL LINE TO THE WEST
19 SIDE OF THE STREET. BUT THAT ISN'T CONSIDERED AS
20 ONE OF THE ALTERNATIVES IN THE E.I.R., SO I WOULD
21 ASK, THEN, THAT THE WHOLE E.I.R. DOCUMENT BE
22 RECIRCULATED ONCE THE ANALYSIS IS COMPLETE. AT THIS
23 POINT IT IS INCOMPLETE. IT'S INCOMPLETE TO THE
24 EXTENT THAT THE IMPACT ON THE RESIDENTS ON THE
25 APARTMENT ON 23RD AND FLOWER, THERE IS NO CLEAR

1 ANALYSIS OF THE NOISE LEVEL, THE PEDESTRIANS'
2 SAFETY, THE RISKS OF TRAFFIC, THE LEVEL OF THE
3 EMISSIONS, AND THE IMPACT OF THE CONSTRUCTION
4 ACTIVITY. NONE OF THIS IS REFERRED TO IN THE
5 REPORT.

6 I'M ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT THE ISSUE OF
7 REPLACING THE HOUSING. MS. OCANA HAS REFERRED TO
8 THAT. IN ADDITION TO THE RELOCATION OF RESIDENTS
9 AND THE COMPENSATION FOR THE OWNER, THERE IS A
10 STRONG CONCERN THAT THE HOUSING MUST BE REPLACED.
11 YOU CANNOT SIMPLY TAKE THE HOUSING AND -- IN THIS
12 CITY NOW, IN THE CRISIS SITUATION WE ARE IN WITH
13 REGARD TO REPLACEMENT HOUSING, YOU HAVE TO HAVE THAT
14 CONCERN.

15 AND AN APPROPRIATE MITIGATION FOR
16 ALTERNATIVE HOUSING IS ONE OF THE CONCERNS THAT I
17 HAVE. WE ARE IN A PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT AND PROCESS
18 NOW WITH LOS ANGELES TRADE TECH -- WE, ESPERANZA
19 COMMUNITY HOUSING. THEY ARE INTERESTED IN
20 DEVELOPING A PARKING STRUCTURE ON 21ST AND GRAND,
21 JUST AROUND THE CORNER HERE, FOR THEIR STUDENTS AND
22 FACULTY. AND IN ADDITION TO THAT STRUCTURE, WE WANT
23 TO HAVE HOUSING THAT WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR THE
24 STUDENTS, FOR RESIDENTS HERE IN THE COMMUNITY, AS
25 WELL AS WORKERS IN THE SURROUNDING GOVERNMENT

1 BUILDINGS.

2 I AM INTERESTED IN WORKING WITH THE
3 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION WITH REGARD TO REPLACEMENT
4 HOUSING AND HAVING THAT HOUSING REPLACEMENT BE
5 DESIGNATED FOR THE PROJECT AT 21ST AND GRAND. SO
6 THAT IN THE WAY IN WHICH YOU TAKE THE HOUSING, AS A
7 RESULT OF GOING DOWN THE WEST SIDE OF THE STREET,
8 THAT YOU KNOW WHERE THOSE PEOPLE CAN BE RELOCATED
9 AND WHERE YOU HAVE A SPECIFIC PROJECT TO RELOCATE
10 THEM TO.

11 AT THIS POINT IN TIME, THERE ARE
12 APPROXIMATELY 100 UNITS THAT WOULD BE PROPOSED WHICH
13 WOULD BE ABLE TO ACCOMMODATE THE 60 FAMILIES THAT
14 ARE CURRENTLY RESIDING AT 23RD AND FLOWER.

15 AND, FINALLY, I THINK THAT YOU HAVE
16 TO UNDERSTAND THAT ANY OF THE ALTERNATIVES THAT HAVE
17 BEEN SUGGESTED RESULT IN THAT HOUSING BEING
18 UNINHABITABLE, WHETHER IT IS ON THE EAST OR ON THE
19 WEST SIDE, AND FOR THE VERY REASONS THAT I'VE
20 ALREADY SUGGESTED. AND WHEN THERE IS NO SUPPORTIVE
21 EVIDENCE WITH REGARD TO THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE
22 E.I.R., THAT, IN FACT, THERE IS NO IMPACT, THERE IS
23 NO BACKUP INFORMATION THAT SUPPORTS THOSE CLAIMS.

24 SO I'D ASK YOU, THEN, TO CONSIDER
25 MOVING IT TO THE WEST SIDE, WHERE IT DOES NOT IMPACT

1 THE HOSPITAL AS RIGOROUSLY AS IT DOES TO THE EAST
2 SIDE; TO CONSIDER THE POSSIBILITIES OF REPLACEMENT
3 HOUSING AS A PART OF THE PROJECT; AND TO MOVE AS
4 EXPEDITIOUSLY, IN SUCH A MANNER AS POSSIBLE.

5 THERE'S A REAL CONCERN THAT THE
6 FAMILIES WHO CURRENTLY RESIDE IN THAT APARTMENT
7 WOULD HAVE TO BE RELOCATED, AND YOU HAVE TO FIND
8 SUITABLE HOUSING FOR THEM. AT THIS POINT THERE IS
9 NONE. AND WHAT WE ARE OFFERING IS A VERY SPECIFIC
10 AND CONCRETE ALTERNATIVE THAT, IN FACT, WOULD BE A
11 MITIGATING ACTION. THANK YOU.

12 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU, VERY MUCH.

13 MR. HUNTER: MY NAME IS BILL HUNTER. I LIVE 311
14 HERE IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

15 JUDGE NEHER: MR. HUNTER, MAY I IMPOSE UPON
16 YOU TO RAISE YOUR VOICE JUST A LITTLE BIT.

17 MR. HUNTER: CAN YOU HEAR ME BETTER NOW? IS
18 THE MICROPHONE ON? CAN YOU HERE ME? CAN YOU HEAR
19 ME ALL RIGHT?

20 JUDGE NEHER: I WANT THE REPORTER TO HEAR
21 YOU. OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

22 MR. HUNTER: I'M SORRY I'M NOT MORE PREPARED
23 ON THIS. I WISH I HAD A MONTH'S TIME TO PREPARE, TO
24 MAKE MY COMMENTS, BUT I JUST READ THIS LITERATURE
25 HERE THAT YOU'VE GIVEN OUT. BUT FROM WHAT I CAN

1 UNDERSTAND, I WANT TO PREFACE MY COMMENTS WITH A
2 QUESTION TO YOU.

3 IS THIS GOING TO BE PART OF THE
4 AIRLINE EVENTUALLY? WHETHER IT'S GOING TO SANTA
5 MONICA, IS THIS GOING TO BE INCORPORATED WITH THE
6 AIRLINE? DOES ANYBODY KNOW THAT?

7 NOBODY KNOWS IF THIS IS GOING TO BE
8 PART OF THE AIRLINE? DO YOU KNOW WHAT THE
9 AIRLINE IS? THE AIRLINE IS THE ONE THAT'S CAUSING
10 SO MUCH CONTROVERSY, THAT THEY WANT TO BUILD THROUGH
11 CHEVIOT HILLS. DOES ANYONE KNOW WHAT THE AIRLINE
12 IS?

13 MR. DE LA LOZA: THIS PROJECT IS DESIGNED AS
14 A STAND-ALONE SYSTEM. IT WILL BE EXTENDED TO THE
15 EXPOSITION PARK/USC AREA. VERMONT WILL BE THE
16 TERMINUS. THE COMMISSION IS CURRENTLY LOOKING AT
17 ANOTHER SEPARATE STUDY AS POTENTIALLY EXTENDING SOME
18 TYPE OF SERVICE -- IT HASN'T BEEN DETERMINED WHETHER
19 IT WILL BE TROLLY OR LIGHT RAIL -- POTENTIALLY TO
20 SANTA MONICA. BUT, HOWEVER, THIS PARTICULAR PROJECT
21 IS BEING DESIGNED AS A STAND-ALONE SYSTEM THAT COULD
22 BE ADOPTED OR COULD BE EXTENDED. BUT THAT'S A
23 DECISION FOR A LATER HEARING.

24 MR. HUNTER: ALL RIGHT. QUESTION NUMBER 2:
25 IS IT GOING TO USE THE CURRENT RIGHT-OF-WAY IN THE

1 MIDDLE OF EXPOSITION BOULEVARD FROM FIGUEROA STREET
2 TO VERMONT?

3 MR. DE LA LOZA: YES, IT IS.

4 MR. HUNTER: ALL RIGHT. QUESTION NUMBER 3:
5 DO YOU NOW CURRENTLY OWN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY FROM
6 FIGUEROA TO THE CURRENT TRACKS OF THE BLUE LINE,
7 THAT PART OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY, DO YOU CURRENTLY OWN
8 THAT? DOES THE COUNTY OWN THAT?

9 MR. DE LA LOZA: FROM FIGUEROA TO --

10 MR. HUNTER: YEAH. DO YOU CURRENTLY OWN THE
11 RIGHT-OF-WAY, THE EXPOSITION RIGHT-OF-WAY?

12 MR. DE LA LOZA: WE DO. YES, WE DO.

13 MR. HUNTER: YOU DO OWN THAT, WHERE IT
14 CURRENTLY CROSSES THE BLUE LINE TRACKS?

15 MR. DE LA LOZA: I BELIEVE IT'S JUST SHY OF
16 THE BLUE LINE TRACKS, BUT YES, WE DO OWN IT TO ITS
17 TERMINUS.

18 MR. HUNTER: WELL, HOW SHY ARE THE BLUE-LINE
19 TRACKS? BECAUSE THE PROPOSAL I HAVE TO MENTION HERE
20 INVOLVES THIS LINE.

21 MR. DE LA LOZA: YES. WE DO OWN THE ENTIRE
22 RIGHT-OF-WAY.

23 MR. HUNTER: OKAY. GOOD. OKAY. GREAT.
24 THAT'S PERFECT. ANOTHER QUESTION: WHEN IS IT GOING
25 TO BE IN OPERATION? HOW LONG IS THIS GOING TO

1 TAKE? WHAT PERIOD WILL THIS OPEN UP THIS PROJECT TO
2 US?

3 JUDGE NEHER: PROBABLY SOMETIME AFTER WE
4 ANSWER ALL YOUR QUESTIONS.

5 MR. HUNTER: I'M SORRY. I'M SORRY TO DO
6 THIS. I'M SORRY TO ASK SO MANY QUESTIONS.

7 I'LL GET TO MY BASIC PREMIS.

8 THIS IS WHAT IT IS: I UNDERSTAND
9 THIS IS GOING TO TAKE AT LEAST FIVE YEARS TO BUILD,
10 DEMOLISHING PEOPLE'S HOMES WHO CAN LEAST AFFORD TO
11 MOVE AND ALL THIS. THAT'S ANOTHER SUBJECT.

12 BUT WHAT I'M GOING TO SUGGEST IS
13 THIS: NOBODY'S MENTIONED, AND I NEVER HEARD IT
14 MENTIONED, BEING AS YOU ALREADY OWN THAT
15 RIGHT-OF-WAY, WHY DON'T YOU JUST TEMPORARILY -- THIS
16 IS JUST TEMPORARY. YOU CAN STILL CONTINUE WITH
17 THIS, BUT RIGHT NOW I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THIS
18 SUGGESTION WILL ONLY TAKE ABOUT A YEAR TO COMPLETE
19 -- YOU RUN A TRAIN DOWN THE CURRENT BLUE LINE
20 TRACKS, JUST A FEW FEET SOUTH OF WASHINGTON WHERE
21 THE THESE CARS CROSS THE TRACKS; YOU HAVE TO RUN THE
22 TRAIN, YOU UPGRADE THAT TRACK TO PASSENGER SERVICE,
23 YOU PUT IN YOUR TRAIN -- YOU RUN YOUR TRAIN DOWN THE
24 CURRENT RIGHT-OF-WAY, RIGHT LIKE TOWARDS LONG BEACH,
25 JUST SOUTH OF WASHINGTON, IT VEERS OFF TO THE RIGHT

1 ON THAT RIGHT-OF-WAY THAT'S THERE. IT PROBABLY WILL
2 NOT TAKE MORE THAN A YEAR TO DO THIS, UPGRADE THAT,
3 THE SERVICE, PUT IN A TRAIN; IN THAT WAY RUN YOUR
4 TRAIN ON THE CURRENT RIGHT-OF-WAY; YOU ALREADY OWN
5 IT. YOU CAN HAVE THIS SERVICE IN OPERATION WITHIN A
6 YEAR.

7 IN TRUTH, YOU'RE GOING OUT OF YOUR
8 WAY. YOU'RE REALLY GOING EAST TO GO SOUTH AND
9 WEST. THAT'S TRUE. YOU ARE REALLY GOING OUT OF
10 YOUR WAY. BUT I'M NOT ADVOCATING YOU MUST STOP THIS
11 CURRENT PROJECT. I'M SAYING YOU CAN GET THIS OFF
12 AND RUNNING WITHIN A YEAR BECAUSE YOU OWN THE
13 TRACK. THEREFORE, PEOPLE, YOU CAN HAVE A JUNCTURE
14 THERE. NOW, LET'S SAY THE PERSON LEAVING VERMONT
15 STATION OR THE EXPOSITION PARK STATION DOESN'T WANT
16 TO GO ON TO LOS ANGELES; THEY WANT TO GO TO LONG
17 BEACH. GREAT. THIS IS GREAT FOR A TRAIN THAT GOES
18 TO LONG BEACH, IT GOES RIGHT TO LONG BEACH; THE NEXT
19 ONE WANTS TO GO TO LOS ANGELES, THE NEXT ONE SAYS TO
20 LOS ANGELES, TURN LEFT AND GO RIGHT. THEY USE THE
21 WASHINGTON STATION AS THE TRANSFER POINT AND THAT'S
22 PERFECT.

23 SO THAT'S JUST MY SUGGESTION ON
24 THAT. THAT YOU -- YOU KNOW, THAT MAY BE FANTASTIC.
25 I DON'T KNOW. I'M NOT AN ENGINEER. I DON'T KNOW

1 HOW MUCH WORK THAT INVOLVES. BUT IT SEEMS LOGICAL
2 THAT IF YOU OWN THE TRACK, THE RIGHT-OF-WAY, ALL YOU
3 HAVE TO DO IS UPGRADE THAT TRACK AND PUT IN A
4 TWO-TRACK SYSTEM AND EVERYTHING THAT THERE'S ROOM
5 FOR, AND YOU'VE GOT YOUR SYSTEM.

6 NOW, LET ME GET BACK TO MY COMMENTS
7 ON THIS PARTICULAR SYSTEM YOU HAVE HERE. WHY
8 DEMOLISH ANYTHING? WHY DEMOLISH? WHY ARE YOU GOING
9 TO DEMOLISH ANYBODY'S HOMES? I'M A LOW-INCOME
10 PERSON. I LIVE IN LOW-INCOME HOUSING AND I HATE TO
11 SEE MORE AND MORE AND MORE LOW-IMPACT HOUSING, TOO.
12 STILL EVERY BIT OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING THAT VANISHES,
13 THIS THROWS MORE BURDONS ON THE POOR PEOPLE. WHY
14 DON'T YOU SIMPLY JUST GO RIGHT DOWN FLOWER? IF YOU
15 DON'T WANT TO BUILD A SUBWAY, DIG A DITCH, CUT AND
16 COVER, GO STRAIGHT DOWN FLOWER RIGHT TO EXPOSITION.
17 YOU'VE GOT YOUR TRAIN; EVERYBODY'S HAPPY. YOU DON'T
18 HAVE TO GO THE SIDE OF FLOWER; YOU GO STRAIGHT DOWN
19 THE MIDDLE. AND YOU DON'T HAVE TO RELOCATE
20 ANYBODY. EXCEPT MAYBE IN THE STATION STOPS, MAKING
21 MORE LAND AT THE STATION STOPS. BUT GO STRAIGHT
22 DOWN FLOWER; THE BLUE LINE GOES STRAIGHT DOWN
23 FLOWER; FOLLOW THE BLUE LINE RIGHT DOWN FLOWER.

24 I UNDERSTAND YOU WANT AN ELEVATED
25 SYSTEM OR A GRADE SYSTEM ON FLOWER. YOU DON'T WANT

1 WHAT YOU HAVE ON FLOWER NOW; IS THAT CORRECT? WOULD
2 YOU WANT AN ELEVATED SYSTEM?

3 MR. DE LA LOZA: THIS IS BEING PROPOSED AT
4 GRADE, EXCEPT FOR THE INTERSECTION OF THE FIGUEROA
5 AND EXPOSITION BOULEVARD, WHERE WE'RE PROPOSING
6 THREE WAYS, OR WE'RE LOOKING AT THREE WAYS TO CROSS
7 THAT AT GRADE, AERIAL AND SUBWAY. THAT'S WHAT'S IN
8 THE DRAFT E.I.R.

9 MR. HUNTER: WILL THAT BE AT LEAST
10 CONSTRUCTIVE ON THE WHOLE THING UNDER A SUBWAY? YOU
11 ALREADY HAVE A SUBWAY IN FROM 7TH AND METRO STATION
12 ALMOST TO PICO. YOU CAN DO IT CUT AND COVER. YOU
13 DON'T -- BART WAS BUILT CUT AND COVER. THE WHOLE
14 SYSTEM WAS BUILT CUT AND COVER. AND THAT'S A LOT
15 CHEAPER WAY TO BUILD A SUBWAY.

16 ALL RIGHT. NOW, I'M ABOUT THROUGH
17 HERE.

18 OKAY. ANOTHER THING, AND THIS
19 PERTAINS TO ANY SYSTEM YOU BUILD, YOU MUST DO
20 SOMETHING; YOU'VE GOT TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT THIS
21 BLUE LINE IN COORDINATION OF THE LIGHTS ON
22 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD AND LONG BEACH BOULEVARD. THE
23 TRAIN IS TAKING MUCH TOO LONG. I'VE RIDEN THIS
24 TRAIN TO LONG BEACH AND SOMETIMES IT HITS EVERY
25 SINGLE LIGHT ON WASHINGTON; IF YOU'VE GOT TO GET TO

1 THE CITY -- I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE PROBLEM IS HERE.
2 I'M SURE THERE'S MODERN TECHNOLOGY WHEREBY WHEN THAT
3 TRAIN LEAVES THE STATION ALL THESE LIGHTS WILL BE
4 PROGRAMMED TO BE GREEN UNTIL THE NEXT STATION; THAT
5 TRAIN SHOULD NOT STOP BETWEEN STATIONS ON WASHINGTON
6 BOULEVARD OR LONG BEACH BOULEVARD. BUT IT'S NOW
7 STOPPING AT EVERY OTHER LIGHT PRACTICALLY. THAT IS
8 RIDICULOUS. THAT HAS TO BE ELIMINATED. YOU CAN
9 SHAVE 15 MINUTES OFF THE TIME IF YOU COULD GET
10 TOGETHER WITH THE CITY ON THE SITUATION OF
11 COORDINATING THESE LIGHTS. BUT, I UNDERSTAND,
12 THERE'S POLITICS INVOLVED. THEY DON'T WANT TO
13 INTERRUPT THE FLOW OF TRAFFIC. WHATEVER IT IS
14 YOU'RE DEALING WITH, WE'VE GOT GET TO TOGETHER
15 BECAUSE WE COULD HAVE A GOOD RUNNING SYSTEM, BUT YOU
16 CAN'T HAVE THIS THING STOPPING AT EVERY SINGLE LIGHT
17 ALL ALONG LONG BEACH BOULEVARD AND ALL ALONG
18 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD.

19 I THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

20 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU, MR. HUNTER. CHARLES
21 HOBBS.

22 MR. HOBBS: HELLO. CAN YOU HERE ME OKAY?

23 JUDGE NEHER: YEAH.

24 MR. HOBBS: ALL RIGHT. I JUST HAVE A FEW 312
25 COMMENTS TO MAKE AND SOME SUGGESTIONS ON THIS

1 PROJECT.

2 FIRST, IF POSSIBLE, WE REALLY NEED TO
3 LOOK AT CONTINUING THIS LINE ALL THE WAY INTO SANTA
4 MONICA, AT LEAST, OR AT LEAST UP TO VENICE
5 BOULEVARD, BECAUSE THIS TRANSIT SYSTEM IS REALLY
6 OVERDUE.

7 NUMBER 2: WE SHOULD LOOK AT USING
8 ELEVATED CONSTRUCTION WHENEVER POSSIBLE. AND
9 PARTICULARLY WHAT I'D LIKE TO SEE IS A SYSTEM THAT
10 COULD BE UPGRADED TO RAPID TRANSIT STANDARDS, AS THE
11 NEED OCCURS.

12 NUMBER 3: ECHO PARK; I'D LIKE TO
13 ALSO SEE CONSIDERED AN EXTENSION ALIGNED SOUTH ALONG
14 VENICE BOULEVARD.

15 NUMBER 4: AS THE LINE STANDS ALONG
16 FLOWER BOULEVARD, WE CAN MAKE FLOWER A ONE-WAY
17 STREET FROM THE CURRENT -- WASHINGTON/EXPOSITION
18 COULD BE A ONE-WAY STREET GOING SOUTH ONLY. THE
19 LINE COULD BE -- THE LINE COULD BE ON THE SURFACE
20 AND DEPRESSED UNDER THE HOSPITAL ENTRANCE TO
21 MAINTAIN ACCESS TO THE HOSPITAL. AND THAT GRADE
22 SEPARATION NEAR THE FREEWAY AT FLOWER AND EXPOSITION
23 IS ALL ONE WAY.

24 THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP.

25 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. JAMES

1 WASHINGTON.

2 MR. WASHINGTON: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A FEW BRIEF
3 COMMENTS ON YOUR PROPOSED LINE. 313

4 I THINK THIS IS LONG OVERDUE. AND I
5 WOULD LIKE TO SEE SOME SORT OF AN ALIGNMENT ALL THE
6 WAY DOWN TO VERMONT. HOWEVER, VERMONT, I WOULD LIKE
7 THE PROJECT TO GO ALL THE WAY TO SANTA MONICA AT THE
8 EARLIEST POSSIBLE DATE. AND ALSO, OF COURSE, I AM
9 IN FAVOR OF ADDING THE HARBER FREEWAY TRANSIT
10 PROJECT TO THE SYSTEM SO WE CAN FIGURE THIS PROJECT
11 TO START IMMEDIATELY. I THINK ALL THESE LINES COULD
12 START IMMEDIATELY IF WE NEED THEM.

13 NOW BEING REALISTIC ABOUT IT, I AGAIN
14 SUPPORT ALL YOUR EFFORTS FOR THIS ALIGNMENT. I KNOW
15 IT'S ALSO COUNTERING, SO I SUPPORT THE SERVICE ROUTE
16 AS IS.

17 AND I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE E.I.R.
18 LOOK AGAIN AT THE LOCATION OF THE JEFFERSON
19 STATION. I THINK YOU WANT TO BE AS CLOSE TO USC AS
20 POSSIBLE. I THINK THIS WOULD BE AN IDEAL SITUATION
21 THERE. IF, FOR WHATEVER REASONS, YOU CAN'T HAVE THE
22 AREIAL STRUCTURE TO THE CURB THERE, I DO WANT A
23 STATION FOR CARS LOCATED SOUTH OF JEFFERSON AND
24 STILL HAVE A STATION. THAT'S ONE KEY POINT, THAT
25 POSSIBLY IT WOULD BE A BETTER LOCATION, PLUS A

1 STATION CLOSER TO THE HOTEL, CLOSER TO THE SCHOOL
2 AND CLOSER TO THE CONVENTION CENTER IN THAT AREA.

3 NOW, BEYOND THAT, I WOULD ALSO LIKE
4 TO SEE THE PROJECT EXPEDITED IN CONSTRUCTION
5 OVERALL. AND WE'VE SEEN THESE THINGS HAPPEN OVER
6 THE YEARS; NOTHING HAPPENS, NOTHING HAPPENS. BUT,
7 NOW, WE FINALLY GET TO THE POINT OF WE WANT THIS
8 EXPEDITED; GET THIS THING BUILT NOW.

9 SO AGAIN, I'M IN FAVOR OF WHAT YOU'RE
10 DOING BASICALLY, BUT I DO WANT YOU TO KEEP IT
11 SIMPLE; KEEP IT TRUE TO THE BLUE LINE. THANK YOU.

12 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
13 PAT MOSER.

14 MR. MOSER: I'M PAT MOSER OF THE SOUTHERN
15 CALIFORNIA TRANSIT ADVOCATES. AND, BY THE WAY, I
16 CAME HERE BY TRAIN, THE METRO BLUE LINE. ONE
17 STATION, IT'S TRUE, BUT I CAN STILL RIDE ON THE
18 TRAIN.

19 OUR POSITION, OF COURSE, IS THAT ALL
20 RAIL SERVICE SHOULD BE RAPID TRANSIT. RAPID TRANSIT
21 IS, OF COURSE, CONVENTIONAL TWIN-RAIL,
22 GRADE-SEPARATED SERVICE WITH CAPACITY CARS AND
23 ABSOLUTELY NO GRADE POLICY AND ABSOLUTELY NO STREET
24 RUNNING. HOWEVER, BEING THAT THIS EXTENSION IS
25 OBVIOUSLY NOT GOING TO BE RAPID TRANSIT, BUT AN

1 EXTENSION OF THE METRO BLUE LINE, I WANT TO SAY THAT
2 WE TOTALLY AGREE WITH THE WHOLE CONCEPT OF THE
3 COLISEUM EXTENSION, AND FEEL THAT IT'S WAY OVERDUE.

4 BY THE WAY, I WISH YOU WOULD NOT CALL
5 THE 23RD STREET STATION "THE 23RD STREET STATION";
6 IT SHOULD BE "TRADE TECH COLLEGE STATION," SINCE
7 IT'S GOING TO BE RIGHT BY THE SIDE. THAT SHOULD
8 HAVE BEEN THE TRADE TECH STATION ACTUALLY.

9 BUT IN ANY CASE, BE THAT AS IT MAY,
10 THE SERVICE BEING PROPOSED IS GOOD WITHIN THE
11 CONFINES OF THE LIGHT-RAIL SERVICE. IT'S LONG
12 OVERDUE. IT WAS, OF COURSE, THE OLD P.E. AIRLINE,
13 WHICH WENT DIRECTLY FROM SOUTH L.A. TO SANTA
14 MONICA. AND I'D LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT THE
15 UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND THE CITY OF
16 SANTA MONICA IS WHOLLY IN SUPPORT OF THIS AND, IN
17 FACT, THEY'VE OFFERED TO PAY FOR THE E.I.R. FOR THE
18 EXTENSION WEST OF VERMONT AVENUE.

19 I WOULD SAY THAT, AGAIN, GENERALLY,
20 IT'S A GOOD IDEA. IT WOULD FIT THE CONTEXT OF
21 LIGHT-RAIL SERVICE.

22 AND THERE SHOULD BE A STATION AT
23 FIGUEROA STREET. LET'S HAVE A FIGUEROA STREET 314
24 STATION. BUT IT'S TOO BAD THAT YOU ARE GOING TO
25 HAVE A GRADE CROSSING AT FIGUEROA STREET. IT SHOULD

1 HAVE BEEN AN ELEVATED GRADE CROSSING.

2 ALSO, I PROPOSE, SINCE YOU DO OWN THE
3 RIGHT-OF-WAY BETWEEN FIGUEROA STREET AND LONG BEACH
4 AVENUE, I PROPOSE THAT YOU HAVE AN OPERATION
5 EXTENSION ON THAT RIGHT-OF-WAY. YOU OWN THE
6 RIGHT-OF-WAY UP TO LONG BEACH AVENUE, YOU SHOULD USE
7 THAT RIGHT-OF-WAY SO THAT TRAINS GOING ON EXPOSITION
8 BOULEVARD WOULD, INSTEAD OF GOING NORTH TO DOWNTOWN
9 LOS ANGELES, WOULD GO DIRECTLY TO THE CURRENT BLUE
10 LINE AND THEN GO SOUTH TO DEL AMO AVENUE, WHERE THEY
11 COULD BUILD AN L SERVICE TO THE MAINTAINENCE YARD.

12 AND SO THOSE ARE ESSENTIALLY MY
13 REMARKS. AND MY ONLY FEELING, SPEAKING FOR MYSELF,
14 IS LET'S GET GOING; LET'S GET THE JOB STARTED, AND
15 IT'S TOO BAD WE HAVE TO WAIT FOR THE YEAR 2001
16 BEFORE THE FIRST TRAINS ACTUALLY ROLL ON THE
17 RIGHT-OF-WAY.

18 AND THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR
19 TIME.

20 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU. A COUPLE OF THE
21 PEOPLE THAT SPOKE AND ARE STILL HERE HAD SOME
22 SPECIFIC QUESTIONS.

23 DID ANY OF YOU WRITE THEM DOWN AND
24 WOULD YOU LIKE TO RESPOND?

25 MR. DE LA LOZA: IS MS. OCANA STILL HERE?

1 I AM THE PROJECT MANAGER FOR THE
2 LACTC. I'D BE HAPPY TO MEET WITH YOU AND DISCUSS
3 WHAT OUR RELOCATION POLICIES ARE. WE HAVE BEGUN
4 BRINGING ON A RELOCATION REAL ESTATE PERSON ON BOARD
5 AS PART OF THE TEAM TO LOOK AT THAT. BUT WE'RE
6 AVAILABLE TO DISCUSS THE ISSUES WITH YOU AT ANY
7 TIME.

8 MS. OCANA: IN ADDITION TO RELOCATION, I'M
9 MORE CONCERNED WITH ALTERNATIVE HOUSING, REPLACEMENT
10 HOUSING.

11 MR. DE LA LOZA: I THINK THERE'S
12 POTENTIAL --

13 MS. OCANA: DO YOU HAVE THAT?

14 MR. DE LA LOZA: YEAH. I THINK THAT WE HAVE
15 HAD, THROUGHOUT THE PROCESS, IN DISCUSSIONS WITH
16 SISTER DONOGHUE OF ESPERANZA HOUSING CORPORATION,
17 WHICH WE ARE VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THAT INSTITUTION,
18 AND I THINK THAT WE'LL BE AVAILABLE TO DISCUSS WHAT
19 COULD BE DONE AFTER THE 45-DAY REVIEW PROCESS.

20 MS. OCANA: AFTER THE WHAT?

21 MR. DE LA LOZA: AFTER THE 45-DAY PUBLIC
22 REVIEW PROCESS.

23 MS. OCANA: FINE. I'LL EXCHANGE CARDS WITH
24 YOU.

25 MR. MOSER: EXCUSE ME. BOB ASKED TO SPEAK

1 BUT WAS NOT ON THE ROLL.

2 JUDGE NEHER: I HAVE ONE NAME THAT WAS A LATE
3 COMER, ROBERT RICHMOND. WELL, LET ME PUT IT THIS
4 WAY: HE WAS AN EARLY COMER AND A LATE SIGN-UP.
5 MR. RICHMOND, GO AHEAD.

6 MR. RICHMOND: YES, I WAS HERE BEFORE THE
7 MEETING STARTED. I DON'T KNOW HOW THEY MISSED MY 315
8 NAME.

9 JUDGE NEHER: IT'S DOWN TO NUMBER 15 AND SHE
10 JUST HANDED IT TO ME. BUT GO AHEAD.

11 MR. RICHMOND: MY NAME IS ROBERT H. RICHMOND,
12 R-I-C-H-M-O-N-D, AND I'M A CITIZEN OF PASADENA;
13 HOWEVER, FOR THE PAST 40 YEARS, THE SUBJECT OF
14 TRANSIT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND ALL ASPECTS OF
15 IT HAS BEEN MY PRIMARY AVOCATION AND CIVIC INTEREST;
16 AND THUS, MY VIEW -- MY FOCUS IS REGIONWIDE, AND I'M
17 JUST AS CONCERNED ABOUT THIS WOULD-BE PROJECT LINE
18 AS I AM ABOUT THE ONE THAT'S BEING PRESSED ON TO THE
19 CITY I LIVE IN.

20 AND I'M CONCERNED BECAUSE FROM THE
21 VERY BEGINNING, STARTING WITH THIS LINE, WHEN THEY
22 TALKED ABOUT ALTERNATIVE VEHICLE METHODS, THE RAPID
23 TRANSIT METHOD WAS COMPLETELY IGNORED AND LEFT OUT.

24 IN CASE SOME OF YOU DON'T KNOW IT, IN
25 1980, FOR THE FIRST TIME IN HISTORY, A SUFFICIENT

1 MAJORITY OF VOTERS WENT TO THE POLLS IN THIS COUNTY
2 AND VOTED FOR A FUNDING MEASURE CALLED PROPOSITION
3 A, WHICH WAS A HALF-CENT INCREASE IN THE STATE SALES
4 TAX LEVY IN THIS COUNTY. AND IT HAD SPECIFIC
5 STIPULATIONS AS TO HOW THAT MONEY WAS TO BE SPENT.
6 THE LARGEST STIPULATION, APPROPRIATELY, WAS FOR
7 RAPID TRANSIT. IT DID NOT MENTION OR IMPLY THAT ANY
8 OTHER TYPE OF RAIL TRANSIT, SUCH AS LIGHT RAIL,
9 MONORAIL, AUTOMATED DRIVERLESS TRAINS, OR ANY OTHER
10 KIND OF VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY, COULD BE FUNDED FROM
11 PROPOSITION A'S -- ANY PART OF PROPOSITION A,
12 ESPECIALLY FROM THE RAIL RAPID TRANSIT PROVISION.
13 AND THAT'S THE NAME OF THE FUNDING PROVISION, AND I
14 OBJECT VERY, VERY STRONGLY AND I FEEL THAT THERE IS
15 A MATTER OF OUTRIGHT GOVERNMENT FRAUD BEING
16 COMMITTED, NOT JUST CONCERNING THIS LINE, BUT WE
17 COULD FOCUS ON IT FROM THIS POINT, JUST AS WE COULD
18 FROM THE OTHERS. NO ONE HAS BEEN ABLE TO EXPLAIN
19 WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM, LEGALLY, TO PAY FOR ANY
20 KIND OF LIGHT RAIL LINE ANYWHERE IN THIS COUNTY.

21 I WOULD ASK RESPECTFULLY -- THE
22 CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE MENTIONED THAT HE WAS A
23 JUDGE, AND I ASSUME THAT MEANS THAT HE HAS A CERTAIN
24 MANNER OF OFFICIAL AUTHORITY. I DON'T KNOW TO WHAT
25 DEGREE THIS ISSUE WOULD HAVE IN HIS PURVIEW OF THAT

1 AUTHORITY, BUT THERE IS A VERY, VERY SERIOUS
2 IMPROPRIETY BEING COMMITTED BY THIS AGENCY CALLED
3 THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.
4 AND THE ONLY ONES THAT KNOW THAT AS WELL AS I DO ARE
5 MOST OF THE VETERAN MEMBERS OF THAT COMMISSION.

6 WE NEED MANY HUNDREDS OF MILES OF
7 RAPID TRANSIT LINE. NOW THAT'S A BIG ORDER, AND I
8 KNOW IT LOOKS LIKE SOMETHING IN THE FUTURE; BUT
9 NEVERTHELESS, THE PEOPLE VOTED FOR RAPID TRANSIT,
10 WHETHER YOU CAN BUILD ONE MILE OF IT IN ONE YEAR OR
11 100 MILES. THAT IS THE ONLY PURPOSE FOR WHICH
12 PROPOSITION A MONIES CAN BE USED. NO ONE HAS BEEN
13 ABLE TO PRODUCE ANY SUFFICIENT LEGALLY DOCUMENTED
14 AUTHORIZATION THAT SAYS THE MONEY FOR PROPOSITION A
15 CAN BE SPENT ON SOMETHING LIKE A LIGHT RAIL LINE
16 SUCH AS THIS.

17 NOW, LITERALLY, THE LIGHT RAIL LINE
18 IS FUNDAMENTALLY INFERIOR TO RAPID TRANSIT, AS FAR
19 AS SERVICE, PERFORMANCE, VALUE TO THE PUBLIC, AND
20 THUS TO THE COMMUNITY IS CONCERNED. OF COURSE,
21 RAPID TRANSIT COST MORE BECAUSE IT CAN DO MORE AND
22 WILL DO MORE IF ALLOWED TO.

23 I DON'T KNOW WHAT ELSE TO SAY HERE.
24 I DISAPPROVE OF THIS ENTIRELY. THIS IS A FALSE
25 PROJECT. IT HAS NO BASIS IN LAW. BUT I DON'T SAY

1 JUST STOP AND DITHER AROUND. LOOK INTO THE REASONS
2 WHY WE ARE NOT RECEIVING RAPID TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT
3 ON THIS ROUTE, AND WHY IT WASN'T BUILT AS A RAPID
4 TRANSIT LINE BETWEEN DOWNTOWN L.A. AND LONG BEACH;
5 WHY WE ARE JUST BEING ATROCIOUSLY LIED TO, THAT WE
6 VOTED MONEY TO BUILD SO-CALLED LIGHT RAIL OR
7 MONORAIL OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. MODERN RAIL RAPID
8 TRANSIT HAS ALWAYS BEEN PRESCRIBED AS THE FIRST
9 ORDER OF THE DAY FOR A MAJOR TRANSIT SYSTEM
10 DEVELOPMENT IN THIS REGION; IT DOESN'T MEAN ANY
11 OTHER FORUM IS NECESSARY, BUT THE POINT IS, THAT'S
12 THE FIRST ORDER OF THE DAY. THAT'S LIKE THE
13 FRAMEWORK OF A BUILDING. WE'RE NOT GETTING ANY
14 FRAMEWORK; WE'RE GETTING A BUNCH OF CHEAP BAMBOO
15 STICKS THAT LOOK GOOD BECAUSE WE HAVEN'T SEEN THEM
16 BEFORE, OR BECAUSE THEY VAGUELY LOOK LIKE SOMETHING
17 FROM THE PAST.

18 I, THEREFORE, LEAVE WITH THIS NOTE,
19 AND, SIR, IF YOU'RE A JUDGE, YOU HAVE AUTHORITY TO
20 CALL ATTENTION TO SOME HIGHER -- SAY THE STATE
21 ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE TO MAKE AN INVESTIGATION
22 OF THE READING; MAKE WHAT'S CALLED A READING OF THE
23 LAW, THE PROPOSITION A LAW. AND THE PROPOSITION C,
24 WHICH I BELIEVE IS 1990, OR SO, DID NOT OVERRIDE
25 PROPOSITION A IN ANY WAY.

1 IS THERE ANY QUESTIONS, GENTLEMEN?
2 ARE THERE ANY FEARS? YES, THERE'S A LOT OF FEARS.
3 JUDGE NEHER: HAVE YOU COMPLETED, SIR?
4 MR. RICHMOND: WELL, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE SOME
5 SIGN, AS A CITIZEN AND A TAX PAYER, THAT THIS IS A
6 SERIOUS MATTER AND I HAVE CONVEYED IT TO YOU
7 RESPECTFULLY.
8 JUDGE NEHER: LET ME EXPLAIN TO YOU,
9 MR. RICHMOND, THAT I AM AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
10 FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, OFFICE OF
11 ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS; OKAY?
12 MR. RICHMOND: YES.
13 JUDGE NEHER: I'VE BEEN ASKED TO SIT IN THIS
14 HEARING TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU GOT YOUR COMMENTS
15 SAID. I DO NOT ADVISE THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY
16 TRANSIT AUTHORITY; I DO NOT ADVISE ANY OF THE
17 INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE HERE AND SPEAKING FOR AND
18 AGAINST WITH RESPECT TO VARIOUS INTERESTS, AND
19 THAT'S THE REASON I'M HERE IS BECAUSE I DON'T HAVE A
20 SIDE; OKAY?
21 MR. RICHMOND: YES.
22 JUDGE NEHER: I'M HERE TO SEE THAT THE SIDES
23 GET SPOKEN.
24 MR. RICHMOND: YES.
25 JUDGE NEHER: IF YOU HAVE A CONCERN THAT YOU

1 WISH TO SHARE WITH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, I SUGGEST
2 YOU CALL HIM UP. AND IF YOU BELIEVE THAT THERE IS A
3 VIOLATION OF THE LAW, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT YOU DO
4 WHATEVER YOU THINK IS PROPER TO DO. I'M HERE TO
5 MAKE SURE THAT EVERYBODY GETS THEIR SAY.

6 MR. RICHMOND: I APPRECIATE THAT, BUT YOU
7 MAY -- CONSIDERING MAYBE YOU'RE HEARING FROM A
8 CITIZEN WHO HAS BECOME DESPERATE BECAUSE HE'S TRIED
9 ALL THE THINGS THAT YOU'VE SUGGESTED, AND HIS
10 COMPLAINTS HAVE BEEN BRUSHED ASIDE, EVEN THOUGH
11 BRUSHING IT ASIDE SIMPLY COULD NOT PROVIDE AN
12 EXPLANATION TO COUNTER THE CHARGE THAT THERE IS A
13 MAJOR MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FROM THE PROPOSITION
14 A SOURCE.

15 OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I KNOW
16 THIS IS UNUSUAL, BUT I INTEND -- I HOPE THE OTHERS
17 HERE BEGIN TO WONDER TOO. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR
18 THE PRIVILEGE, GENTLEMEN.

19 JUDGE NEHER: MR. RICHMOND, THANK YOU. SUE
20 GLAD.

21 MS. GLAD: MY NAME IS SUE GLAD. I AM THE
22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE CALIFORNIA MUSEUM OF SCIENCE
23 AND INDUSTRY, AND I'M HERE TODAY REPRESENTING THAT
24 INSTITUTION.

25 I'M SORRY THAT NO ONE IS HERE FROM

1 THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, AND SINCE
2 THEY'RE NOT HERE TODAY, I EXPECT THAT YOU EITHER
3 HAVE OR WILL BE HEARING FROM THEM WITH THEIR
4 COMMENTS.

5 THE MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY
6 WELCOMES THE E.I.R. REPORT REGARDING THE BLUE LINE
7 EXTENSION. THAT'S A TIMELY REACTION TO THE PARK
8 MASTER PLAN. THE EXTENSION OFFERS EXCITING OPTIONS
9 FOR INCREASING PARK AND MUSEUM VISITORSHIP, TRAFFIC
10 MITIGATION TO MAJOR EVENTS AT THE COLISEUM AND
11 SPORTS ARENA, AND PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITIES OF MUTUAL
12 BENEFIT TO DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES AND THE PARK
13 INSTITUTIONS.

14 WE FEEL THAT THE FOLLWING POINTS ARE
15 MAJOR CONCERNS AND OBJECTIVES.

16 ONE: A STATION LOCATED NEAR MENLO
17 WILL NOT SERVE THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MAJORITY OF
18 THE PARK VENDORS; FOR EXAMPLE, THE SPORTS ARENA, THE
19 AFRO-AMERICAN MUSEUM OR THE CALIFORNIA MUSEUM OF
20 SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY. WE FEEL STRONGLY THAT TWO **316**
21 STATIONS SHOULD BE BUILT ALONG EXPOSITION, ONE NEAR
22 FIGUEROA AND ONE NEAR OR ACROSS FROM THE MALL. TWO
23 STATIONS WILL SERVE THE PARK, THE UNIVERSITY AND THE
24 LOCAL COMMUNITY BEST.

25 SECOND: BOTH THE AERIAL, THE TWO-WAY

1 PROPOSITION AND THE SUBWAY TO MEET THE ALTERNATIVES
2 PRECLUDE SERVICE AT TWO STATIONS. OF THE TWO, WE
3 FEEL THAT THE AERIAL CHOICE IS LEAST ACCEPTABLE
4 BECAUSE IT IS PRONE. AND THE FACT THAT IT IS 317
5 NECESSARY TO BRING CARS TO GRADE LEVEL AT THE
6 STATION WOULD ABSOLUTELY DEFY THE UNIVERSITY AND THE
7 PARK. THE SUBWAY CHOICE, 2B, WOULD HAVE THE SAME
8 EFFECT. THERE IS CONSIDERABLE NEED TO MAINTAIN THE
9 EXPOSITION BOULEVARD CROSSING PATTERNS FOR BOTH
10 SPECIALTY CENTERS, THE COLISEUM AND SPORTS ARENA,
11 AND TO PRESERVE THE VISUAL CONNECTION BETWEEN THE
12 TWO INSTITUTIONS.

13 AND THIRD: FOR ANY CHOICE, WE FEEL
14 THAT URBAN DESIGN ISSUES ARE OF PARAMOUNT
15 IMPORTANCE. AND IN VIEW OF THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR
16 EXPOSITION PARK AND THE ONGOING EFFORTS OF THE 318
17 UNIVERSITY TO BEAUTIFY THEIR CAMPUS, WE URGE THE
18 COMMISSION TO USE MAXIMUM EFFORTS IN PLANNING URBAN
19 SETTINGS WHICH WILL ENHANCE OUR EFFORTS AND CREATE A
20 PARKWAY WHICH WILL BE AESTHETICALLY PLEASING TO ALL
21 STUDENTS, ART VISITORS, TOURISTS AND COMMUNITY
22 INTERESTS. THANK YOU.

23 JUDGE NEHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MS. GLAD.
24 ARE THERE ANY MORE SPEAKERS? OKAY.

25 OKAY. WE'LL CONCLUDE THE PUBLIC

1 PORTION OF THE HEARING AT THIS TIME, BUT BEAR IN
2 MIND THAT THE TIME FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS IS OPEN, FOR
3 THOSE OF YOU THAT WISH TO MAKE FURTHER COMMENTS OR
4 WRITTEN COMMENTS, UNTIL THE 13TH OF JULY, 1992, IS
5 THE COMMENT PERIOD. I GAVE THE ADDRESS AT THE
6 OUTSET. IF ANY OF YOU WERE NOT HERE, YOU CAN GET
7 THE ADDRESS FROM YVETTE PIERRE, WHO IS ON THE
8 STAFF.

9 MR. MADISON, YOU HAD A QUESTION EARLY
10 ON, AND I'VE ASKED THE PROJECT MANAGER,
11 MR. DE LA LOZA, IF HE'D STAY AROUND FOR A COUPLE OF
12 MINUTES. AND IF THERE ARE PERSONAL QUESTIONS OR
13 PRIVATE QUESTIONS AND SO FORTH, OR CONCERNS THAT YOU
14 WANT TO ASK HIM AT THIS TIME, THEN HE CAN DO THAT;
15 IS THAT OKAY?

16 OKAY. THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH FOR
17 YOUR ATTENTION AND INTEREST, AND I WANT TO
18 COMPLIMENT YOU ON THE MANNER IN WHICH YOU KEPT ORDER
19 SO THAT WE COULD PROCEED AND HEAR EVERYBODY'S
20 COMMENTS. THANK YOU ALL.

21 (THE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED)
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, EILEEN V. BANE, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND
REPORTER FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY
CERTIFY:

THAT SAID PUBLIC HEARING WAS TAKEN BEFORE ME
PURSUANT TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION, AT THE TIME AND PLACE THEREIN SET FORTH,
AND WAS TAKEN DOWN BY ME IN SHORTHAND AND THEREAFTER
REDUCED TO TYPEWRITING VIA COMPUTER-AIDED
TRANSCRIPTION UNDER MY DIRECTION;

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I AM NEITHER COUNSEL
FOR, NOR RELATED TO, ANY PARTY TO SAID ACTION, NOR
IN ANYWISE INTERESTED IN THE OUTCOME THEREOF.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE HEREUNTO
SUBSCRIBED MY NAME THIS 16th DAY OF July,
1992.

Eileen V. Bane
EILEEN V. BANE
CSR NO. 9009



APPENDIX A

**INITIAL STUDY AND
NOTICE OF PREPARATION**



NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

To: Affected Agencies, Organizations, and
Interested Citizens

From: Los Angeles County Transportation
Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Contact: Jim de la Loza

Project Title: Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor
Route

Date: Sept. 6, 1991

The Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC) will be the lead agency and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project identified above. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in conjunction with the proposed project. If your agency has an action related to the project, it will need to use the EIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project. The project description, location, and the probable environmental effects are contained in the attached materials. A copy of the Environmental Checklist is attached.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. Please send your response to Jim de la Loza at the address shown above. We will need the name for a contact person in your agency.



Neil Peterson
Executive Director



**EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL
TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE**

**Initial Study for
Environmental Impact Report**

**Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Contact: Mr. Jim de la Loza
(213) 244-6261**

September 6, 1991

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

Lead City Agency: Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC)

Project Title: Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route


I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is a rail transit improvement. As shown in Figure 1, the Exposition Park Branch Line will operate as a branch of the Metro Blue Line. Figure 2 shows the proposed local route which would extend along Flower Street from the existing Blue Line terminus at Washington Boulevard. The proposed alignment would extend south along Flower Street and continue on to the Exposition Boulevard right-of-way to the proposed terminus at Vermont Avenue. The 1.8 mile route would likely have a total of three stations along this alignment. Stations are proposed to be located at Flower and 23rd Streets to serve Orthopedic Hospital and the Harbor Freeway Transitway, at Flower Street and Jefferson Boulevard to serve USC, the Shrine Auditorium and planned developments in the vicinity, and a third station at a point near the Exposition Boulevard right-of-way and Vermont Avenue to serve USC and the Coliseum-Exposition Park complex.

Background. Representatives of major institutions along the proposed rail line approached LACTC staff in July, 1990 to discuss the feasibility of study efforts to extend light rail service to the USC/Exposition Park area. At an initial meeting, area representatives expressed their strong support for the rail project and their willingness to provide private sector funding for the study process. An USC/Exposition Park Blue Line Task Force was formed with representatives from local institutions, elected officials, community organizations, public agencies and property owners to organize and fund the study effort.

Conceptual level planning completed by Wilbur Smith Associates, as part of the Central Los Angeles Year 1995 Multi-Modal Transit Study, identified the viability of the extension of a branch line from the Metro Blue Line two miles south to serve the USC/Exposition Park area and adjacent neighborhoods.

In May 1991, the Commission solicited professional assistance to perform route refinement work including conceptual engineering refinement and costing evaluation of the proposed alignment and station locations for at-grade, aerial and subway alternatives. In addition an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) following the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines will be prepared for the proposed Light Rail Transit (LRT) project.



Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route
LOS ANGELES TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FIGURE 1

REGIONAL LOCATION

An Exposition Park Branch Line Task Force has been formed with representatives from local institutions, elected officials, community organizations, public agencies and property owners to organize and fund the branch line study process. Task Force members will be active participants throughout the study process.

Project Objectives. The overriding goal of the process is to refine the proposed LRT project to ensure the improvement of both regional and local transit service and to either avoid or successfully mitigate negative impacts within budgeting constraints. In addition, the LACTC and Task Force members have developed the following goals for the proposed project:

1. Provide improved regional and local access to the educational, cultural, and recreational facilities of the USC/Exposition Park area;
2. Support and enhance area revitalization and redevelopment efforts such as those planned for the Figueroa Corridor and surrounding neighborhoods;
3. Provide opportunities for integration of station facilities into future station area development such as currently proposed development projects or potential joint development projects;
4. Identify methods to encourage pedestrian circulation and access; new and existing small businesses; and residential development;
5. Design and integrate the light rail project into an existing urban neighborhood primarily as an urban design and community issue with engineering parameters;
6. Encourage interface with existing transportation systems and planned improvements currently underway including interface with the SCRTD bus system and the Harbor Freeway Transitway project;
7. Facilitate patron transfer between rail and bus service;
8. Provide parking at proposed stations for adjacent neighborhoods not within walking distance of a rail station;
9. Encourage improved access to health care facilities and other public services in the extended rail transit corridor.
10. Every attempt will be made to keep the alignment on Flower Street within the existing street dedication. The use of a portion of excess CALTRANS right-of-way where it runs parallel to Flower Street adjacent to the Harbor Freeway or south of Jefferson Boulevard will also be considered. However,

at station sites and possibly at some other specific locations along the alignment, track constraints and additional station site amenities such as park and ride facilities and bus transfer areas may require some private property acquisitions.

II. SETTING

The proposed Exposition Park Branch Line alignment would begin in the southern part of downtown Los Angeles and would terminate in South Central Los Angeles near the northwestern corner of Exposition Boulevard and Vermont Avenue. This line would operate as a branch of the Metro Blue Line which serves the area from downtown Los Angeles to Long Beach.

The proposed route would traverse two City of Los Angeles community plan areas including the Southeast Los Angeles Community (that portion of the line along Flower Street between the Washington Boulevard and Exposition Boulevard) and the South Central Los Angeles Community (that portion of the line along Exposition Boulevard from Figueroa to Vermont).

Land uses along the proposed route are primarily a mixture of commercial, industrial and institutional. The route would begin at Washington Boulevard and Flower Street where the Los Angeles Trade Technical School (Trade Tech) is located. South, along Flower Street to the Harbor Freeway is mostly light industrial uses on the west side of Flower with the Orthopedic Hospital located on the east side between 23rd Street and the Harbor Freeway over pass. South of the Freeway along the east side of Flower is the freeway right-of-way. There are no developed uses immediately adjacent to Flower all the way to Exposition Boulevard. Along the west side of Flower between the freeway and Jefferson there are a mixture of older warehouse buildings and fast food restaurants. On the southwest corner of Jefferson and Flower is the vacant site of the proposed USC Plaza, a mixed-use office/hotel project. The former Southern Pacific railroad right-of-way now owned by LACTC runs down the center of Exposition Boulevard between Figueroa and westerly past the route terminus at Vermont. Exposition Park is located along the south side of Exposition Boulevard between Figueroa and Vermont. Uses within the park include museums and a rose garden. The University of Southern California (USC) is located along the north side of Exposition Boulevard between Figueroa and Vermont. West of Vermont, on the north side of Exposition, there is an Islamic Temple under construction and west of that are single-family homes. On the south side of Exposition, west of Vermont, there is a gas station, a multi-family housing development and further west, single-family homes.

The Harbor Freeway (I-10) parallel to the north-south segment of this alignment is currently under construction. It is being widened and a separate four lane aerial transitway (for buses and car pools) is being constructed down the center of the

freeway. The transitway will have an off ramp at Adams Boulevard, with buses and carpools utilizing city streets to reach downtown. A transit station on the transitway is planned at 37th Street near Exposition Park. As a mitigation measure for the transitway project, Figueroa and Flower Streets will be redesigned south of Washington Boulevard. Flower Street will be converted to a one-way southbound street. Figueroa Street will be restriped with off-set striping to accommodate up to five lanes northbound but retaining two southbound lanes for local access.

The proposed route is not located within the City of Los Angeles Special Studies Zone for Fault Rupture nor within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The closest known potentially active faults to the proposed alignment are the Santa Monica-Hollywood fault which lies approximately 5 miles to the north and the Newport-Inglewood fault which is located approximately 5 miles to the west of the route. The project would conform to the City of Los Angeles adopted Seismic Safety Plan and all applicable provisions of the Municipal Code, including the revised Division 23, Section 2312, of the Building Code which sets forth regulations concerning proper earthquake design and engineering. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Maps, most of the proposed route lies within Zone C which has little to no flood hazard potential.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Since the entire project lies within a developed urban setting, it has the potential to create varying degrees of adverse environmental impacts. The following Environmental Checklist and responses (Attachment A) identifies key impacts to be addressed in the EIR, as well as others to be identified during the formal environmental process.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The following checklist of environmental issues has been prepared in accordance with Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines:

1. Name of Proponent: Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
2. Address/Phone Number: 818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017; (213) 623-
3. Date Checklist Submitted: _____
4. Agency Requiring Checklist: Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
5. Name of Proposal: Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (Explanation of all "yes" and "maybe" answers are provided in Attachment A sheets).

	YES	MAYBE	NO
1. EARTH. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
b. Disruption, displacement, compaction or overcovering of the soil?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
c. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
f. Changes in the deposition or erosion of beach sands or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure or similar hazards?	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
2. AIR. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
b. The creation of objectionable odors?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
c. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (Page 2)**YES** **MAYBE** **NO****Project Name:** Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route**3. WATER.** Will the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|----|--|-------|-------|--------------|
| a. | Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, either marine or fresh waters? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| b. | Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amounts of surface water runoff? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| c. | Alterations to the course of flow of flood waters? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| d. | Change in the amount of surface water in any water body? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| e. | Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| f. | Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| g. | Change in the quantity or ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| h. | Reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| i. | Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| j. | Changes in the temperature, flow or chemical content of surface thermal springs? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |

4. PLANT LIFE. Will the proposal result:

- | | | | | |
|----|--|-------|--------------|--------------|
| a. | Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops and aquatic plants)? | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
| b. | Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants? | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
| c. | Introduction of new species of plants into an area or is a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| d. | Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |

5. ANIMAL LIFE. Will the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|----|---|-------|--------------|--------------|
| a. | Change in the diversity of species or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms or insects)? | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
| b. | Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| c. | Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| d. | Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (Page 3)

YES MAYBE NO

Project Name: Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route

6. **NOISE.** Will the proposal result in:
 - a. Increases in existing noise levels? X
 - b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels? X
7. **LIGHT AND GLARE.** Will the proposal produce new light or glare? X
8. **LAND USE.** Will the proposal result in an alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? X
9. **NATURAL RESOURCES.** Will the proposal result in:
 - a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources? X
10. **RISK OF UPSET.** Will the proposal involve:
 - a. A risk of explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions? X
 - b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency response evacuation plan? X
11. **POPULATION.** Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area? X
12. **HOUSING.** Will the proposal affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing? X
13. **TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.** Will the proposal result in:
 - a. Generation of additional vehicular movement? X
 - b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking? X
 - c. Substantial impact on existing transportation systems? X
 - d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods? X
 - e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic? X
 - f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclist or pedestrians? X

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (Page 4)

YES MAYBE NO

Project Name: Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route

14. **PUBLIC SERVICES.** Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:
 - a. Fire protection?

X
 - b. Police protection?

X
 - c. Schools?

X
 - d. Parks or other recreational facilities?

X
 - e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

X
 - f. Other governmental services?

X
15. **ENERGY.** Will the proposal result in:
 - a. Use of exceptional amounts of fuel or energy?

X
 - b. Significant increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?

X
16. **UTILITIES.** Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or alterations to utilities?

X
17. **HUMAN HEALTH.** Will the proposal result in:
 - a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?

X
 - b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

X
18. **AESTHETICS.** Will the proposed project result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of any aesthetically offensive site open to public view?

X
19. **RECREATION.** Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?

X
20. **CULTURAL RESOURCES:**
 - a. Will the proposal result in the alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric archaeological site?

X
 - b. Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, or object?

X
 - c. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?

X
 - d. Will the proposal restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

X

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (Page 5)

YES MAYBE NO

Project Name: Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- | | | | | |
|----|---|-------|--------------|--------------|
| a. | Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
| b. | Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| c. | Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant). | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| d. | Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

(For narrative description of environmental impacts please see Attachment A.)


DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. []

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED. []

I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. []


Neil Peterson, Executive Director
Los Angeles County Transportation

Date

ATTACHMENT A

EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Responses to "yes", "maybe" and "no" answers identified in the Initial Study Checklist are discussed below in the corresponding order:

1. Earth

a) Unstable Earth Conditions or Changes in Geologic Subsurfaces.

Maybe. The proposed project would require surface grading, the placement of retaining walls and aerial structural footings which may effect the geologic substructure along the alignment route. The EIR will address these potential geotechnical issues.

b) Disruptions, Displacements, Compaction or Overcovering of the Soil.

Maybe. The grading activities required for project construction could result in the disruption, displacement, compaction or overcovering of the soil along the project site alignment.

c) Change in Topography or Ground Surface Relief Features.

Maybe. Topographic or ground surface relief feature changes would be minor as the majority of the route is relatively flat. This change in topography is not considered a significant impact and does not require further analysis in the EIR.

d) The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features.

No. The proposed project would be located in a built urban environment and would not alter any unique geologic or physical feature and does not require further analysis in the EIR.

e) Any Increase in Wind or Water Erosion of Soils on or off site.

Maybe. Earthwork required for the construction of the rail line may create the potential for soil erosion during the construction period. The EIR will examine this potential effect and recommend erosion and fugitive dust control measures for the project.

- f) Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream.

No. The project would not be located near any coastal or surface water bodies.

- g) Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards.

Yes. The EIR will document seismic risks and describe design measures required to minimize potential hazards.

2. Air

- a) Air Emissions and Deterioration of Ambient Air Quality

Maybe. The rail project would potentially create a beneficial impact to regional air quality by diverting vehicular trips to transit. However, street changes and the provision of station area parking could increase local traffic related emissions. The EIR air impact analysis will focus on localized air quality impacts around station areas and construction sites. Short term impacts would include fugitive dust, heavy construction equipment emissions, truck traffic to and from construction sites, and long-term emissions generated by auto traffic attracted to rail transit stations and parking lots. Appropriate mitigation measures will be developed and included in the EIR.

- b) The Creation of Objectionable Odors.

No. The proposed project would not emit any detectable gases.

- c) Alteration of Air Movement, Moisture or Temperature or any Change in Climate Locally or Regionally.

No. According to criteria established in the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning EIR Manual, a project of this type would not be of sufficient height or mass to change the air movement, moisture or temperature locally or regionally.

3. Water

- a) Changes in Currents or the Course of Water Movements in Marine or Fresh Waters.

No. The project would not be located near any marine or surface water bodies.

b) Changes in Absorption Rates, Drainage Patterns, and the Rate or Amounts of Surface Runoff.

No. Paving for surface parking or impervious surfaces created by the proposed stations would insignificantly increase the existing impervious surface area.

c) Alteration to the Course or Flow of Flood Waters

No. The rail line and stations would not be of sufficient size or mass to alter the flow of any flood waters.

d) Change in the Amount of Surface Water in any Water Body.

No. The project would not be located near any marine or surface water bodies.

e) Discharge into Surface Waters, or in Any Alteration of Surface Water Quality.

No. During construction, the proposed project could result in a minimal increase in runoff which may increase/alter surface water quality at the discharge location. This effect would be short-term and minimal and is not considered significant and does not require further analysis in the EIR.

f) Alteration of the Direction or the Rate of Flow of Ground Water.

No. There would not be substantial subsurface structures or other project features which would affect ground water in the project corridor.

g) Change in the Quantity of Ground Waters, either through direct additions or Withdrawals or by cuts or Excavations.

No. There would be no additions or withdrawals of ground water and no interceptions of an aquifer by cuts or excavations.

h) Substantial Reduction in the Amount of Water Available for Public Water Supplies.

No. No water fixtures for public use would be provided at proposed stations. The project would comply with applicable City ordinances requiring water conservation or low flow devices. The proposed project is not anticipated to reduce public water supplies.

- i) Exposure of People or Property to Water Related Hazards Such as Flooding or Tidal Waves.

No. The project would not be located in a flood plain nor near tidal waters and would therefore not expose people or property to flood hazards or tidal waves.

4. Plant Life

- a) Change in Diversity of Species, or Number of any Species of Plants.

Maybe. The LRT facility would be constructed along existing street and railroad rights-of-way and therefore it is not anticipated that significant impacts on plant and animal habitats would occur. However, there is potential to disturb mature palms along Flower Street south of Adams Ave. The EIR will identify plant removal requirements of the project and propose mitigation measures where significant plant life impacts may occur.

- b) Reduction in the Numbers of any Unique, Rare or Endangered Species of Plants.

Maybe. See response to 4a.

- c) Introduction of New Species of Plants Into an Area.

No. The proposed project would introduce landscaping along portions of the route but it is not anticipated that this vegetation would introduce new species of plants into the area.

- d) Reduction in Acreage of any Agricultural Crop.

No. The proposed corridor is in a developed urban area. The alignment would not displace any land in agricultural use.

5. Animal Life

- a) Change in the Diversity of Species or numbers of any Species of Animals.

Maybe. See response to 4a.

- b) Reduction in the Numbers of any Unique, Rare or Endangered Species of Animals.

No. There are no state or federally designated rare, threatened, or

endangered animal species along the proposed rail route.

c) Introduction of New Species of Animals Into an Area Resulting in a Barrier to the Movement of Animals.

No. The proposed rail project would not introduce new species of animals into the area.

d) Deterioration of Existing Fish or Wildlife Habitat.

No. The proposed project is not located near any fish or wildlife habitat.

6. Noise

a) Increase in Existing Noise Levels.

Maybe. During construction of the proposed project, it is anticipated that there would be periods when noise levels and vibration would be expected to rise above existing levels in the area. Long-term LRT activity as a noise source is not high for individual train operations, but may become significant based on the frequency of operations where sensitive land uses are located adjacent to the facility. The LRT may also generate increased structural or ground-borne vibration. The EIR will assess the potential increase in noise and vibration caused by LRT operation and identify mitigation measures as necessary.

b) Exposure of People to Severe Noise Levels

Maybe. See response 6a.

7. Light and Glare

New Light or Glare From Street Lights or Other Sources.

Maybe. Current sources of illumination in the project area consist of street lamps and ornamental lighting for businesses along the corridor route. The proposed project could introduce new illumination and glare sources into the project area. The EIR will assess station area and LRT facility lighting impacts, if any, on adjacent uses.

8. Land Use

Substantial Alteration of the Present or Planned Land Use of an Area.

Maybe. Construction and operation of the proposed project could result in the displacement of existing residential, commercial, and parking uses, particularly in the proposed station areas. Any displacements will be identified and discussed in the EIR.

9. Natural Resources

Increase in the rate of use of any Natural Resource.

No. The construction and operation of the building would not significantly increase the rate of use of any natural resource.

10. Risk of Upset

a) A Risk of Explosion or the Release of Hazardous Substances.

Maybe. The potential for discovering subsurface contamination and hazardous materials is possible along the corridor route. The EIR will examine this potential impact and identify mitigation measures as necessary.

b) Possible Interference with an Emergency Response Plan or an Emergency Response Evacuation Plan.

Maybe. The proposed facility or associated station areas may require the cul-de-sac of local streets which could affect emergency vehicle access. In addition, an at-grade alignment along Flower Street would possibly require that emergency vehicles accessing Orthopedic Hospital to cross rail transit tracks.

11. Population

Alteration of the Location, Distribution, Density or Growth Rate of an Area.

Maybe. The LRT may, at station locations, encourage more intensive commercial and/or residential growth. Potential growth inducing impacts such as increased development intensity, and possibly spillover parking will be discussed in the EIR,

12. Housing

Affect on Existing Housing or Create the Demand for Additional Housing.

Maybe. See response 11.

13. Transportation/Circulation

a) Generation of Substantial Additional Vehicular Movement.

Yes. The proposed project would generate additional vehicular movement in highly localized areas to and from station locations.

b) Effects on Parking

Yes. The proposed project would create a demand for new parking facilities at the new rail transit stations. Potential alignment options within the Flower Street or Exposition Boulevard rights-of-way may also require the removal of on-street curb parking in some areas.

c) Impact on Existing Transportation Systems

Maybe. There would be an increase in vehicular traffic around the stations during peak periods and during construction of the facility.

d) Alterations to the Present Patterns of Circulation of People or Goods

Yes. The proposed project would alter the pattern of circulation as a result of traffic traveling to and from station locations. Local streets that may be cal-de-sac could also affect circulation patterns.

e) Alterations to Waterborne, Rail or Air Traffic.

No. The proposed project would not alter waterborne, rail or air traffic.

f) Increase in Traffic Hazards to Motor Vehicles, Bicyclists or Pedestrians.

Maybe. There is always a potential for accidents with increased traffic as there would be at the proposed station locations. At-grade alignment options that are being considered could also increase the potential for traffic and rail vehicle conflicts.

14. Public Services

a) Fire Protection.

Maybe. The new stations may create the demand for additional fire protection services at the station locations.

b) Police Protection.

Maybe. Although transit service personnel would be available, existing police protection may have to be enhanced at the proposed stations.

c) Schools.

Maybe. Los Angeles Trade Tech and the University of Southern California would be located adjacent to the proposed alignments under consideration. Pedestrian and vehicular access to these facilities could be affected by the proposed project. In addition, construction and operational-related noise may be a factor. Both of these issues will be addressed in the EIR.

d) Parks or Other Recreational Facilities.

Maybe. Exposition Park would be located adjacent to the proposed rail transit route. Depending on the alignment configuration, it is possible that pedestrian and/or vehicular access to the park could be affected. In addition, construction and operational-related noise may be a factor. Both of these issues will be addressed in the EIR.

e) Maintenance of Public Facilities Including Roads.

Maybe. The proposed project could increase localized traffic at the station locations which could result in the need for increased road maintenance services.

f) Other Governmental Services.

No. The proposed LRT would not affect any other governmental services.

15. Energy

a) Use of Exceptional Amounts of Fuel or Energy.

Yes. The proposed LRT project will result in the increased use of electrical energy. Gasoline consumption is expected to decrease from reduced

automobile usage, which has the potential to offset the increased use of electricity needed to operate the transit system.

b) Substantial Increase Upon Existing Sources of Energy or Require Development of New Sources.

No. Operation of the proposed project would result in an increase in electrical use but the demand is not expected to be substantial, nor is the demand expected to require the development of new sources of energy.

16. Utilities

Need for New Systems or Substantial Alterations to Utilities.

Yes, Construction of the proposed project may require the relocation of underground or overhead utilities.

17. Human Health

a) Creation of any Health Hazard.

No. The proposed project would not include any elements that could create a health hazard or potential health hazard.

b) Exposure of People to Potential Health Hazards.

No. See response 17a.

18. Aesthetics

The Obstruction of Any Scenic Vista or View Open to the Public or the Creation of an Aesthetically Offensive Site Open to Public View.

Maybe. Construction of the LRT would introduce overhead wires and catenary supports as well as aerial structure supports. The at-grade portions may impact the visual setting of major cultural/institutional facilities located along the proposed alignment. The palms along Flower Street may require relocation, changing the visual appearance of the street. Construction activity may present a temporary visual impact. The Eir will identify sensitive view corridors and analyze the visual impacts of the LRT facility. Mitigation measures will be identified as required.

19. Recreation

No. See 14d.

20. Cultural Resources

- a) The Alteration of or the Destruction of a Prehistoric or Historic Archaeological Site.

Maybe. There is the possibility that there could be prehistoric or historic archaeological resources under the proposed alignment route.

- b) Adverse Physical or Aesthetic Effects to a Prehistoric or Historic Building, Structure or Object.

Maybe. There may be historic structures located along the proposed alignment route which would look onto the proposed LRT.

- c) Physical Changes Which Would Affect Unique Ethnic Cultural Values.

No. There are no unique ethnic organizations which would be affected by the development of the proposed project.

- d) Restrict Existing Religious or Sacred Uses Within the Potential Impact Area.

No. No religious uses or organizations would be effected by the proposed rail alignment.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- a) Maybe. The proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b) No. The project does not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.
- c) No. The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- d) Maybe. The project may have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

APPENDIX B

**RESPONSE TO
NOTICE OF PREPARATION**

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH

1400 TENTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814NOP
DRAFT
EIR
E/SZ

194739



DATE: Oct 08, 1991

TO: Reviewing Agency

RE: LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION's NOP for
EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR
SCH # 91101009

Attached for your comment is the LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COM
Notice of Preparation of a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the
EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR.

Responsible agencies must transmit their concerns and comments on the
scope and content of the EIR, focusing on specific information related
to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of this
notice. We encourage commenting agencies to respond to this notice and
express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

JIM DE LA LOZA
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
818 WEST SEVENTH ST. STE. 1100
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

with a copy to the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the
SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the review process, call
Tom Loftus at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'David C. Nunenkamp'.

David C. Nunenkamp
Deputy Director, Permit Assistance

Attachments

cc: Lead Agency

Notice of Completion

Appendix F

See NOTE below

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 916/445-0613

SCH # **91101009**

Project Title: Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor

Lead Agency: Los Angeles County Transportation Commission **Contact Person:** Jim de la Loza

Street Address: 818 West Seventh Street, suite 1100 **Phone:** 213-244-6261

City: Los Angeles **Zip:** 90017 **County:** Los Angeles

Project Location

County: Los Angeles **City/Nearest Community:** Los Angeles

Cross Streets: _____ **Total Acres:** _____

Assessor's Parcel No. _____ **Section:** _____ **Twp.** _____ **Range:** _____ **Base:** _____

Within 2 Miles: **State Hwy #:** _____ **Waterways:** _____

Airports: _____ **Railways:** _____ **Schools:** _____

Document Type

CEQA: ☒ **NO**

☐ Early Cons

☐ Neg Dec

☐ Draft EIR

☐ Supplement/Subsequent

☐ EIR (Prior SCH No.) _____

☐ Other _____

NEPA:

☐ NOI

☐ EA

☐ Draft EIS

☐ FONSI

Other:

☐ Joint Document

☐ Final Document

☐ Other _____

Local Action Type

☐ General Plan Update

☐ General Plan Amendment

☐ General Plan Element

☐ Community Plan

☐ Specific Plan

☐ Master Plan

☐ Planned Unit Development

☐ Site Plan

☐ Rezone

☐ Prezone

☐ Use Permit

☐ Land Division (Subdivision,
Parcel Map, Tract Map, etc.)

☐ Annexation

☐ Redevelopment

☐ Coastal Permit

☐ Other _____

Development Type

☐ Residential: Units _____ Acres _____

☐ Office: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____

☐ Commercial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____

☐ Industrial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____

☐ Educational _____

☐ Recreational _____

☐ Water Facilities: Type _____ MGL _____

☐ Transportation: Type _____

☐ Mining: Mineral _____

☐ Power: Type _____ Watt _____

☐ Waste Treatment: Type _____

☐ Hazardous Waste: Type _____

☐ Other: _____

Project Issues Discussed in Document

☐ Aesthetic/Visual

☐ Agricultural Land

☐ Air Quality

☐ Archeological/Historical

☐ Coastal Zone

☐ Drainage/Absorption

☐ Economic/Jobs

☐ Fiscal

☐ Flood Plain/Flooding

☐ Forest Land/Fire Hazard

☐ Geologic/Seismic

☐ Minerals

☐ Noise

☐ Population/Housing Balance

☐ Public Services/Facilities

☐ Recreation/Parks

☐ Schools/Universities

☐ Septic Systems

☐ Sewer Capacity

☐ Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading

☐ Solid Waste

☐ Toxic/Hazardous

☒ Traffic/Circulation

☐ Vegetation

☐ Water Quality

☐ Water Supply/Groundwater

☐ Wetland/Riparian

☐ Wildlife

☐ Growth Inducing

☐ Landuse

☐ Cumulative Effects

☐ Other _____

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Use

Project Description The proposed project is a rail transit improvement.

S = sent by lead agency

X = sent by SCH

Resources Agency

☐ Karen Cagle
Dept. of Boating & Waterways
1629 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/445-6281

☐ Gary L. Holloway
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-2219
415/543-8555

☐ Reed Holderman
State Coastal Conservancy
1330 Broadway, Suite 1100
Oakland, CA 94612
415/464-1015

☒ Dennis O'Bryant
Dept. of Conservation
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1326-2
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/322-5873

☐ Div. of Mines and Geology
☐ Div. of Oil and Gas
☐ Land Resources Protect. Unit

☐ Douglas Wicklizer
Dept. of Forestry
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1516-2
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/322-0128

☐ Hans Kreutzberg
Office of Historic Preservation
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001
916/322-9621

☒ Mike Doyle
Dept. of Parks and Recreation
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001
916/324-6421

☐ Anna Leena Bronson
Reclamation Board
1416 Ninth Street Room 706
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/322-3740

☐ Nancy Wakeman
S.F. Bay Conservation & Dev't. Comm.
30 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2011
San Francisco, CA 94102
415/557-3686

☐ Nadell Gayou
Dept. of Water Resources
1416 Ninth Street, Room 449
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/445-7416

Fish and Game - Regional Offices

☐ Gary Stacey, Regional Manager
Department of Fish and Game
601 Locust
Redding, CA 96001
916/225-2300 (8-442)

☐ Jim Messersmith, Regional Manager
Department of Fish & Game
1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
916/355-0922 (8-438)

☐ B. Hunter, Regional Manager
Department of Fish and Game
P.O. Box 47
Yountville, CA 94599
707/944-5518

☐ G. Nokes, Regional Manager
Department of Fish and Game
1234 East Shaw Avenue
Fresno, CA 93710
209/222-3761 (8-421)

☒ Fred A. Worthley, Jr., Reg. Manager
Department of Fish and Game
330 Golden Shore, Suite 50
Long Beach, CA 90802
213/590-5113 (8-635)

Independent Commissions

☐ John R. Nuffer
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, MS-15
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/323-9180

☐ William A. Johnson
Native American Heritage Comm.
915 Capital Mall, Room 288
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/322-7791

☐ William Meyer
Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
415/557-1375 (8-597)

☒ Betty Eubanks
State Lands Commission
1807 - 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/322-2795

Business, Transportation, & Housing

☐ Sandy Hesnard
Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics
P.O. Box 942874
Sacramento, CA 94274-0001
916/324-1833

☐ Sgt. Jim Weddell
California Highway Patrol
Long Range Planning Section
Planning and Analysis Division
2555 First Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95818
916/445-1981

☒ Ron Helgason
Caltrans - Planning
P.O. Box 942874
Sacramento, CA 94274-0001
916/445-5570

**Department of Transportation
District Contacts**

☐ Jo Sanford
Caltrans, District 1
1656 Union Street
Eureka, CA 95501
707/445-6671 (8-538)

☐ Michelle Gallagher
Caltrans, District 2
1657 Riverside Drive
Redding, CA 96001
916/225-3259 (8-442)

☐ Brian J. Smith
Caltrans, District 3
703 B Street
Marysville, CA 95901
916/741-4277 (8-457)

☐ Gary S. Adams
Caltrans, District 4
P.O. Box 7310
San Francisco, CA 94120
415/557-9162 (8-597)

☐ Jerry Laumer
Caltrans, District 5
P.O. Box 8114
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403-8114
805/549-3161 (8-629)

☐ Moses Pacheco
Caltrans, District 6
P.O. Box 12616
Fresno, CA 93778
209/276-5989 (8-422)

☒ Gary McSweeney
Caltrans, District 7
120 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
213/620-2376 (8-640)

☐ Harvey Sawyer
Caltrans, District 8
247 West Third Street
San Bernardino, CA 92403
714/383-4808 (8-670)

☐ Lisa Flores
Caltrans, District 9
500 South Main Street
Bishop, CA 93514
619/872-0203 (8-627)

☐ Al Johnson
Caltrans, District 10
P.O. Box 2048
Stockton, CA 95201
209/948-7838 (8-423)

☐ Jim Cheshire
Caltrans, District 11
P.O. Box 85406
2829 Juan Street
San Diego, CA 92138-5406
619/237-6755 (8-631)

☐ Aileen Kennedy
Caltrans, District 12
2501 Pullman St.
Santa Ana, CA 92705
714/724-2239 (8-655)

Food and Agriculture

☐ Vashak Cervinka
Dept. of Food and Agriculture
1220 N Street, Room 104
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/322-5227

Health & Welfare

☐ Quy Tu
Dept. of Health
714 P Street, Room 1253
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/323-6111

☐ DISTSD: _____

State and Consumer Services

☐ Robert Sleppy
Dept. of General Services
400 P Street, Suite 3460
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/324-0214

Environmental Affairs

☒ Barbara Fry
Air Resources Board
1102 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/322-8267

☐ Jeannie Blakeslee
Calif. Waste Management Board
1020 Ninth Street, Room 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/327-0454

State Water Resources Control Board

☐ Allan Patton
State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Clean Water Programs
P.O. Box 944212
Sacramento, CA 94244-2120
916/739-4414

☐ Dave Berlinger
State Water Resources Control Board
Delta Unit
P.O. Box 2000
Sacramento, CA 95810
916/322-9870

☐ Ed Anton
State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Water Quality
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95801
916/445-9552

☐ Mike Falkenstein
State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Water Rights
901 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/324-5636

☐ APCDAQMD: *SOUTH COAST*

Regional Water Quality Control Board

☐ NORTH COAST REGION (1)
1440 Chumerville Rd.
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
707/576-2220 (8-590)

☐ SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION (2)
2101 Webster, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94614
415/464-1255 (8-561)

☐ CENTRAL COAST REGION (3)
81 Higuera Street, Suite 200
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-5414
805/549-3147 (8-629)

☒ LOS ANGELES REGION (4)
101 Center Plaza Drive
Monterey Park, CA 91754
213/266-4460 (8-640)

☐ CENTRAL VALLEY REGION (5)
3443 Router Road, Suite A
Sacramento, CA 95827-3098
916/361-5600

☐ Fresno Branch Office
3614 East Ashlan Avenue
Fresno, CA 93726
209/445-5116 (8-421)

☐ Redding Branch Office
415 Knollcrest Drive
Redding, CA 96002
916/224-4845 (ATS-411)

☐ LAHONTAN REGION (6)
2092 Lake Tahoe Boulevard
Suite #2
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
916/544-3481

☐ Victorville Branch Office
15428 Civic Drive, Suite 108
Victorville, CA 92392-2159
619/241-6583

☐ COLORADO RIVER BASIN
REGION (7)
73-271 Highway 111, Suite 21
Palm Desert, CA 92260
619/346-7491

☐ SANTA ANA REGION (8)
6809 Indiana Avenue, Suite 200
Riverside, CA 92506
714/782-4130 (8-632)

☐ SAN DIEGO REGION (9)
9771 Clairemont Mesa Blvd., Suite 1
San Diego, CA 92124-1331
619/265-5114 (8-636)

OTHER: _____

OTHER: _____



DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
DIVISION OF MINES AND GEOLOGY
DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS
DIVISION OF RECYCLING



1416 Ninth Street
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
TDD (916) 324-2555
ATSS 454-2555
(916) 445-8733

91 NOV 5 AM 11:48
November 4, 1991

Mr. Jim De La Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90017

Dear Mr. De La Loza:

Subject: NOP for Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit
Corridor SCH # 91101009

The Department of Conservation's Division of Oil and Gas has reviewed the NOP of a Draft EIR for the proposed project and submits the following comments for your consideration.

The proposed transit corridor extends through the La Cienega oil field. However, there are no recorded active or abandoned wells in proximity to the project.

However, if any unrecorded or abandoned wells are uncovered or damaged during excavation or grading, remedial plugging operations may be required. If such damage occurs, the Division's district office should be contacted to obtain information on the requirements for and approval to perform remedial operations.

If any structure is to be located over or in the proximity of a previously abandoned well, there is the possibility that the well may need to be plugged and abandoned to current Division specifications. Section 3208.1 of the Public Resources Code authorizes the State Oil and Gas Supervisor to order the reabandonment of any previously abandoned well when construction of any structure over or in the proximity of the well could result in a hazard. The cost of reabandonment operations is the responsibility of the owner of the property upon which the structure will be located.

Although the possibility for future problems from oil and gas wells that have been plugged and abandoned or reabandoned to the Division's current specifications are remote, we, nevertheless, suggest that a diligent effort be made to avoid building over any abandoned well.


Mr. De La Loza
November 4, 1991
Page Two

If construction over an abandoned well is unavoidable, we suggest that an adequate gas venting system be placed over the well.

The scope and content of information that is germane to the Division's responsibility are contained in Section 3000 et seq. of the Public Resources Code, and administrative regulations under Title 14, Chapter 4 of the California Code of Regulations.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact John Jepson at the Division district office in Long Beach. The address is 245 West Broadway, Suite 475, Long Beach, CA 90802; phone (213) 590-5311.

Sincerely,



Stephent E. Oliva
Environmental Program Coordinator

cc: John Jepson, Division of Oil and Gas, Long Beach
Mike Stettner, Division of Oil and Gas, Sacramento

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 7, 120 SO. SPRING ST.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
TDD (213) 620-3550

CMNT
EXCD
RA -
TLE
JCR

October 10, 1991

OCT 17 1991

MICROFILM

195572

County of Los Angeles
IGR/CEQA
NOP-EIR-Initial Study;
Exposition Park Branch
Line Rail Transit Corridor
Route
Vic LA-110-R0.91-R21.44



Mr. Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. De la Loza:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above-referenced NOP. Based on the information received, we have the following comments:

1. At Flower Street and Adams Boulevard where the rail crosses the Harbor Freeway, Caltrans should be a responsible agency in the development of the design for rail to cross the freeway. Caltrans has many issues that need to be resolved at this location.
2. Caltrans 110 Transitway project will install a station between 37th Street and Exposition Boulevard. The Exposition Park Branch line should have an inface station as close as possible to allow service from the Harbor area to Santa Monica and back. Caltrans station has been placed to accommodate the Exposition Park line to run west and east.

If you have any questions regarding comments 1 & 2, please call George Hayakawa at (213) 897-4644 and Michelle Smith at (213) 897-0133.


3. Also, please be advised that the proposed LRT line appears to be in close proximity to the Saint John Episcopial Church which has been determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Other nearby properties are also of historic importance. Local community groups are very interested in transportation projects: These groups include the ADHOC Committee, 23rd Street Neighbors, and the CRA Adams Normandie 4321 PAC. Businesses and non-profit organizations in the area that have shown a keen interest in transportation projects includes: the Los Angeles Orthopaedic Hospital, Saint Vincent De Paul Church, the Automobile Club of Southern California, and the University of Southern California.

Mr. Jim de la Loza
October 10, 1991
Page Two

Of particular interest to these groups has been a projects vibration, traffic circulation, noise, community, and cultural resources impacts.

If you have any questions regarding environmental issues please call Cleave Govan at (213) 897-0665. Any other questions regarding this response, please call at (213) 897-1338.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Wilford Melton". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent "W" and "M".

WILFORD MELTON
IGR/CEQA Coordinator
Transportation Planning &
Analysis Branch

January 24, 1955

Mr. Herbert Cameron, President
Board of Public Utilities
City Hall
Los Angeles 12, California


Dear Herb:

This will confirm our telephone conversation regarding a petition to be presented to the Board of Public Utilities on January 28, 1955.

I understand that a request is being made to reinstate passenger service on the Santa Monica Airline running from Los Angeles to Santa Monica. The student body at the University of California at Los Angeles would be very interested in seeing that this service is resumed. We have approximately 550 students living in the area near Exposition Boulevard running from Main Street to Crenshaw Boulevard. I am sure that some of these students would avail themselves of this transportation service.

Therefore it is our recommendation that your Honorable Board give very careful consideration to reinstating this service as soon as it seems advisable. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,



William C. Ackerman
General Manager

WCA:ls

cc: Mrs. Marjorie H. Rainey
Mrs. Garnet Rainey

C
O
P
Y

2DU70
RPT
YBD
24
COR



South Coast
AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
9150 FLAIR DRIVE, EL MONTE, CA 91731 (818) 572-6200

Distribution
R. Barantes



191437

Neil Peterson
Los Angeles County Transportation
818 West Seventh St. Ste. 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

**Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for
Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor
District No. LAC910912-01**

Dear Mr. Peterson:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced environmental document. District staff has reviewed and assessed potential impacts that may result from the above referenced project.

Preliminary staff assessment indicates that the proposed project may adversely affect air quality. Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated into the proposed project to reduce air quality impacts to insignificant level. Refer to the District's "Air Quality Handbook for Preparing Environmental Impact Reports" to assess and mitigate adverse air quality impacts.

Upon completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Report, please forward two copies to:

South Coast Air Quality Management District
Planning Division
9150 Flair Drive
El Monte, CA 91731

Attn: Local Government - CEQA

If you have any questions, please call me at (818) 307-1519.

Yours truly,

Connie Day

Connie Day
Program Supervisor
Environmental Review

CD:es

Attachment

EXHIBIT A

POTENTIAL EMISSION SOURCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- A. To Minimize Construction Activity Emissions
 - o Water site and equipment in the morning and evening.
 - o Spread soil binders on site, unpaved roads, and parking areas.
 - o Re-establish ground cover on construction site through seeding and watering.
- B. Reduce Construction Equipment Emissions
 - o Wash off trucks leaving site.
 - o Properly tune and maintain all equipment.
 - o Use low-sulfur fuel for equipment.
- C. Reduce Construction-Related Traffic Congestion
 - o Provide rideshare incentives.
 - o Provide transit incentives for construction personnel.
 - o Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interferences.
 - o Minimize obstruction of through-traffic lanes.
 - o Provide a flagperson to guide the traffic properly.
 - o Schedule operations affecting roadways for off-peak traffic hours.
- D. Limit Emissions From Vehicle Trips and Roadway Construction
 - o Operate a Transportation management Plan per SCAQMD regulation XV.
 - o Provide commuter rideshare incentives.
 - o Provide commuter transit incentives.
 - o Promote Transportation Demand Management Associations.
 - o Establish a program of alternative work schedules.
 - o Establish a telecommuting program.
 - o Schedule goods movements for off-peak traffic hours.
 - o Promote local shuttle and regional transit systems.
 - o Provide dedicated turn lanes as appropriate.
 - o Provide transit shelters.
 - o Provide bicycle lanes, storage areas and amenities.
 - o Ensure efficient parking management.
 - o Prioritize Construction of HOV lanes.
 - o Work closely with cities in the region to implement TDM goals.
- E. Minimize Indirect- Source Emissions
 - o Implement energy conservation measures beyond state and local requirements.
 - o Install energy-efficient street lighting.
 - o Include energy costs in capital expenditure analyses
 - o Landscape with native drought-resistant species to reduce water consumption and to provide passive solar benefits.

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD—
LOS ANGELES REGION**

101 CENTRE PLAZA DRIVE
MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754-2156
(213) 266-7500



1991 SEP 30 PM 12:13

September 25, 1991

File: 700.300

Jim de la Loza
County of Los Angeles
Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION - EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL TRANSIT
CORRIDOR ROUTE, DOWNTOWN. L. A. COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

We have reviewed the subject document regarding the proposed project, and have the following comments:

Based on the information provided, we recommend the following:



We have no further comments at this time.



The proposed project should address the attached comments in the environmental document.

Thank you for this opportunity to review your document. If you have any questions, please contact Eugene C. Ramstedt at (213) 266-7553.

JOHN L. LEWIS, Unit Chief
Technical Support Unit

cc: Tom Loftus, State Clearinghouse

(07-13-89)

Community Redevelopment Agency

PD400

of the City
of Los Angeles

PREP
DOT
DRAFT
EXBD

354 South Spring Street
Suite 800
Los Angeles
California 90013-1258
213 977 1600

Telecopier
Number 213 977 1665

An Affirmative Action
Equal Opportunity
Employer

Date October 9, 1991

File Code

MICROFILMED
COPY 11 195001

1991 OCT 11 2 12 PM

Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90017

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF PREPARATION FOR THE DRAFT EIR FOR THE EXPOSITION
PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE

Dear Mr de la Loza,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route.

We have reviewed the Notice of Preparation for this development and would like your agency to address the following area of concern in your draft EIR. The area of concern is the issue of the potential impact upon existing residential and commercial neighborhoods from additional commuter, vehicular traffic generated at the stations.

Also, we would like your agency to add emphasis to the following areas of concern in your draft EIR. These areas of concern are listed as project objectives in your Initial Study:

1. Support and enhance area revitalization and redevelopment efforts such as those planned for the Figueroa Corridor and surrounding neighborhoods.
2. Provide opportunities for integration of station facilities into future station area development such as currently proposed development projects or potential joint development projects.
3. Identify methods to encourage pedestrian circulation and access, new and existing small business, and residential development.
4. Design and integrate the light rail project into an existing urban neighborhood primarily as an urban design and community issue within engineering parameters.
5. Identify the opportunities for integration of Blue Line with the Harbor Freeway Transit Way.
6. Coordinate the project with the Exposition Park Master Planning effort.

At this time, I recommend that 1) the traffic generated impacts on existing residential and commercial neighborhoods and 2) the project objectives, noted above, be added to the list of EIR focus issues.

James M. Wood
Chairman

Norman H. Emerson

Linda Gringo

W. Hall, Jr.


Thomas Kipore, Jr.

Frank Kawanaka

Dennis P. Love

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Rich Macias, Principal Environmental Planner at (213) 977-1738.

Sincerely,



John Spalding
Director of Planning and Urban Design

CRA
LA

DRAFT
CMNT
EXBD
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS
MEMBERS

FELICIA MARCUS
PRESIDENT
DENNIS N. NISHIKAWA
VICE-PRESIDENT
PERCY DURAN, III
M. E. "RED" MARTINEZ
JOHN MURRAY, JR.
JAMES A. GIBSON
SECRETARY

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



TOM BRADLEY
MAYOR

SEP 27 1991

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS
BUREAU OF
ENGINEERING
ROBERT S. HORII
CITY ENGINEER
ROOM 800, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

1991 OCT -3 PM 1:06

193373

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, Ca 90017

Attention: Jim de la Loza

Dear Mr. de la Loza,

SUBJECT: PRE-DRAFT COMMENTS - EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL
TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE

Staff of the Environmental Coordination Unit (ECU) have reviewed the above referenced document, and submit the following wastewater related comments.

Portions of the Los Angeles North Central Outfall Sewer exist along the proposed section of Exposition Boulevard. This sewer consists of a very old 2 ring brick pipe particularly sensitive to disturbance.

The portion of Flower Street, proposed for the rail line, contains several sewer lines along and transverse to the street. Pipes consist of varying sizes of clay and reinforced concrete pipe. Several portions of abandoned sewer line are also present along the street.


The proposed alignment should be coordinated with the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering Wastewater Program Management Division's Collection Systems Task Force and the Central Engineering District to avoid possible interference with the existing sewer system and any future sewer system plans.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please contact Kelvin Lew at (213) 485-8272.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. HORII
City Engineer

By:


BRADLEY M. SMITH
Division Engineer
Wastewater Program
Management Division

BMS/kdl
(j:expopark.wp) 
ENV-2-1

cc: Jim Doty-PMD

PD 400
EXBD
COR
AT

CITY PLANNING
COMMISSION
—
WILLIAM G. LUDDY
PRESIDENT
THEODORE STEIN, JR.
VICE-PRESIDENT

SUZETTE NEIMAN
FERNANDO TORRES-GIL

—
RAMONA HARO
SECRETARY

—
ROOM 503, CITY HALL
(213) 485-5071

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



TOM BRADLEY
MAYOR

L.A.C.T.C.
1991 SEP 30 PM 2:32

193169

DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING
ROOM 561, CITY HALL
200 N. SPRING ST.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801

—
MELANIE FALLON
DIRECTOR

September 26, 1991

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Attn: Jim de la Loza


Dear Mr. de la Loza:

The City Planning Department, Neighborhood Planning Division, has reviewed the Notice of Preparation for the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route.

This division would like the DEIR to address any potential impacts to existing transportation systems and alterations to rail traffic under the transportation/circulation section. The impact to existing sources of energy for the construction and operational phases of the project should also be addressed in the DEIR. It can be expected that this project would stimulate land use impacts in residential and commercial areas, and those potential impacts should be examined.

If this division can be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact Cheryl Rogers of my staff at 617-7294.

Yours truly,


Robert Duenas
City Planner

TDB-L263
RD:CR:tp

PD400
NOP

S.E. (ED) ROWE
GENERAL MANAGER

MICROFILMED
COPY IN RMS

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
ROOM 1200, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
(213) 485-2265
FAX (213) 237-0960

L.A.C.T.C.
1991 OCT 13 PM 12:24
195481

October 10, 1991

TOM BRADLEY
MAYOR

Mr. Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

**EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE: NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT (DEIR)**

The City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) has reviewed the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). We believe that the project will have significant impact on existing transportation systems. Furthermore, we request that LACTC adequately address and respond to the following concerns in the DEIR:

- o As a member of the Task Force representing LADOT, I have raised concerns regarding adverse impacts of an at-grade operation on traffic safety and circulation. In our view, the proposed at-grade operation along Flower Street would seriously degrade the capacity on a route where we are trying to expedite the movement of southbound buses and car-pools destined for the Harbor Freeway Transitway. Hence, the concern over the substantial impacts from an at-grade operation should provide the impetus to consider aerial and subway alternatives in the DEIR for discussion and evaluation.
- o Construction impact and mitigation measures should be evaluated in light of the frequent special events which severely impact traffic circulation in this area. During major sports, entertainment and other events staged at the adjacent activity centers, Flower Street becomes a critical alternate traffic route because of limited or prohibited use of Figueroa Street, and serves as an important inlet and outlet for event traffic. The severity of traffic congestion and circulation problems caused by the events has necessitated LADOT to direct traffic and provide special traffic controls to mitigate the impact on circulation. With respect to these special conditions, the construction methods for this Light Rail line should be studied and chosen for the least amount of exacerbation and impact. The DEIR should consider possible construction impact mitigation such as limiting the size of the project impact area during any one period of time, and phasing and staging of work.

Mr. Jim de la Loza

October 10, 1991

Page 2

The comments above do not preclude other concerns LADOT may have as we continue to provide input to your studies at future meetings.

Please call me at (213) 485-3039 if you have any questions.



James M. Okazaki
Chief of Transit Programs
Bureau of Transit Programs

JMO/PC:pc
EXPOPK.NOP

cc: Tom Conner, Planning, Design, and Regulation
John E. Fisher, Bureau of Design & ATSAC
Joe Crowley, Northwest Area District Operations
Jim Sherman, Bureau of Traffic Management

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



TOM BRADLEY
MAYOR

BOARD OF
FIRE COMMISSIONERS
485-6032

JAMES E. BLANCARTE
PRESIDENT

CARL R. TERZIAN
VICE-PRESIDENT

AILEEN ADAMS

NICHOLAS H. STONNINGTON

KENNETH S. WASHINGTON

EVA WHITELOCK
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

DEPARTMENT OF FIRE

200 NORTH MAIN STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

DONALD O. MANNING
CHIEF ENGINEER
AND
GENERAL MANAGER

October 30, 1991

Los Angeles County Transportation
Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Attention: Jim De La Loza

Dear Mr. De La Loza:

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental
Impact Report - Exposition Park Branch
Line Rail Transit Corridor Route

The Exposition Park Branch Line will operate as a branch of the Metro Blue Line. The proposed alignment would extend south along Flower Street and continue on to the Exposition Boulevard right-of-way to the proposed terminus at Vermont Avenue. The 1.8 mile route will have a total of three stations along this alignment.

The following comments are furnished in response to your request for this Department to review the proposed development:

A. FIRE-FLOW

The adequacy of fire protection for a given area is based on required fire-flow, response distance from existing fire stations, and this Department's judgment for needs in the area. In general, the required fire-flow is closely related to land use. The quantity of water necessary for fire protection varies with the type of development, life hazard, occupancy, and the degree of fire hazard.

Fire-flow requirements vary from 2,000 gallons per minute (G.P.M.) in low density areas to 12,000 G.P.M. in high-density commercial or industrial areas. A minimum residual water pressure of 20 pounds per square inch (P.S.I.) is to remain in the water system, with the required gallons per minute flowing.

Adequate public fire hydrants will be required.

81 NOV 7
P 2 : 49

Mr. Jim De La Loza
October 30, 1991
Page 2

Any necessary improvements to the water system or to the existing fire hydrants due to the Rail Transit Corridor Route construction or to any street ending in a cul-de-sac, will be at the applicant's expense.

B. FIREFIGHTING APPARATUS ACCESS

Access for Fire Department apparatus and personnel to and into all structures shall be required.

Flower Street will become a one-way street. One northbound contra-flow lane will be provided to serve Orthopedic Hospital. A possible conflict with traffic flow may occur with the Northern Terminus Harbor Transitway Project.

All street intersections with a level of service of "E" or "F" decreases the level of fire protection and emergency medical services provided by this Department.

The Fire Department recommends there be continuous, through streets. If a cul-de-sac is created above Fire Department objections, all fire lanes or dead-ending streets shall terminate in an approved turning area.

When required access is provided by an improved street, fire lane, or combination of both which results in a dead-end in excess of 700 feet in length from the nearest cross street, at least one additional ingress-egress roadway shall be provided in such a manner than an alternative means of ingress-egress is accomplished.

CONCLUSION


The proposed Rail Transit Corridor Project shall comply with all applicable State and local codes and ordinances, and the guidelines found in the Fire Protection and Fire Prevention Plan, as well as the Safety Plan, both of which are elements of the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles (C.P.C. 19708).

Definitive plans and specifications shall be submitted to this Department and requirements for necessary permits satisfied prior to commencement of any portion of this project.

Mr. Jim De La Loza
October 30, 1991
Page 3

The proposed project shall comply with all applicable State and local codes and ordinances, and the guidelines found in the Fire Protection and Fire Prevention Plan, as well as the Safety Plan, both of which are elements of the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles (C.P.C. 19708).

DONALD O. MANNING
Chief Engineer and General Manager



Dal L. Howard, Assistant Fire Marshal
Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety

DLH:ASM:vg/3140E

cc: Councilman Mark Ridley-Thomas
Councilwoman Rita Walters
Environmental Affairs Commission
Fire Department Planning Section

NOV
EX 2D
RAIL
TRS
COR
RTE

Department of Water and Power



the City of Los Angeles

TOM BRADLEY
Mayor

Commission
MICHAEL J. GAGE, *President*
RICK J. CARUSO, *Vice President*
ANGEL M. ECHEVARRIA
DOROTHY GREEN
MARY D. NICHOLS
JUDITH K. DAVISON, *Secretary*

1991 OCT 31 PM 1:25

DANIEL W. WATERS, *General Manager and Chief Engineer*
ELDON A. COTTON, *Assistant General Manager - Power*
JAMES F. WICKSER, *Assistant General Manager - Water*
NORMAN L. BUEHRING, *Assistant General Manager - External Affairs*
NORMAN J. POWERS, *Chief Financial Officer*

197103 October 29, 1991

Mr. Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90017

Dear Mr. de la Loza:

Notice of Preparation
Exposition Park Branch
Line Rail Transit Corridor Route

This is in reply to your letter dated September 6, 1991 requesting comments concerning the above project.

The proposed project is a rail transit improvement. The Exposition Park Branch Line will operate as a branch of the Metro Blue Line. The proposed local route would extend along Flower Street from the existing Blue Line terminus at Washington Boulevard.

Electric service will be provided in accordance with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's (LADWP) rules and regulations. The cumulative effect of this and other projects planned in the area may eventually require the construction of additional power distribution facilities. Power distribution facility construction may cause limited temporary impact on the surrounding communities in the form of unavoidable noise, air pollution, and traffic congestion during construction.

Based on the project description, some of the enclosed energy conservation measures may apply and should be considered for inclusion into the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Commercial Energy Conservation Mitigation Measures

During the design process, the applicant should consult with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Energy Services Subsection, regarding possible energy conservation measures. The applicant shall incorporate measures which will exceed minimum efficiency standards for Title XXIV of the California Code of Regulations.

- Built-in appliances, refrigerators, and space-conditioning equipment should exceed the minimum efficiency levels mandated in the California Code of Regulations.
- Install high-efficiency air conditioning controlled by a computerized energy-management system in the office and retail spaces which provides the following:
 - A variable air-volume system which results in minimum energy consumption and avoids hot water energy consumption for terminal reheat;
 - A 100-percent outdoor air-economizer cycle to obtain free cooling in appropriate climate zones during dry climatic periods;
 - Sequentially staged operation of air-conditioning equipment in accordance with building demands; and
 - The isolation of air conditioning to any selected floor or floors.
 - Consider the applicability of the use of thermal energy storage to handle cooling loads.
- Cascade ventilation air from high-priority areas before being exhausted, thereby, decreasing the volume of ventilation air required. For example, air could be cascaded from occupied space to corridors and then to mechanical spaces before being exhausted.
- Recycle lighting-system heat for space heating during cool weather. Exhaust lighting-system heat from the buildings, via ceiling plenums, to reduce cooling loads in warm weather.
- Install low and medium static-pressure terminal units and ductwork to reduce energy consumption by air-distribution systems.
- Ensure that buildings are well-sealed to prevent outside air from infiltrating and increasing interior space-conditioning

loads. Where applicable, design building entrances with vestibules to restrict infiltration of unconditioned air and exhausting of conditioned air.

- A performance check of the installed space-conditioning system should be completed by the developer/installer prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy to ensure that energy-efficiency measures incorporated into the project operate as designed.
- Finish exterior walls with light-colored materials and high-emissivity characteristics to reduce cooling loads. Finish interior walls with light-colored materials to reflect more light and, thus, increase lighting efficiency.
- Install thermal insulation in walls and ceilings which exceeds requirements established by the California Code of Regulations.
- Design window systems to reduce thermal gain and loss, thus, reducing cooling loads during warm weather and heating loads during cool weather.
- Install heat-reflective draperies on appropriate exposures.
- Install fluorescent and high-intensity-discharge (HID) lamps, which give the highest light output per watt of electricity consumed, wherever possible including all street and parking lot lighting to reduce electricity consumption.
- Install occupant-controlled light switches and thermostats to permit individual adjustment of lighting, heating, and cooling to avoid unnecessary energy consumption.
- Install time-controlled interior and exterior public area lighting limited to that necessary for safety and security.
- Control mechanical systems (HVAC and lighting) in the building with timing systems to prevent accidental or inappropriate conditioning or lighting of unoccupied space.
- Incorporate windowless walls or passive solar inset of windows into the project for appropriate exposures.
- Design project to focus pedestrian activity within sheltered outdoor areas.

For additional information concerning these conservation measures, please contact Mr. Brian Belier, Manager of the New Construction Unit of Energy Services Subsection, at (213) 481-5735.

Mr. Jim de la Loza

- 2 -

October 29, 1991

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. If you or your staff have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Mr. Douglas E. Varner of my staff at (213) 481-3233.

Sincerely,



EDWARD KARAPETIAN
Manager of Environmental and
Governmental Affairs

Enclosure

c: Mr. Douglas E. Varner w/o Enclosure

EXDL

TRS

COR

RTE

OFFICERS
N. MATTHEW GROSSMAN
PRESIDENT
WILLIAM R. ROBERTSON
VICE PRESIDENT
MARGARET U. FARNUM
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER



SITE OF 1932 AND 1984
OLYMPICS ATHLETICS COMPETITION
OPENING & CLOSING CEREMONIES



SITE OF 1984 OLYMPICS
BOXING COMPETITION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
JESSE A. BREWER
JAMES F. DICKASON
N. MATTHEW GROSSMAN

CHRISTY C. WALTERS
ALTERNATE

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
DEANE DANA
EDMUND D. EDELMAN

KENNETH HAHN
ALTERNATE

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
NATE HOLDEN
RICHARD J. RIORDAN
WILLIAM R. ROBERTSON

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
J. STANLEY SANDERS
ALTERNATES

MICROFILMED
IN RMC

L.A.C.T.C.
1992 JAN - 6 PM 12:39

LOS ANGELES MEMORIAL COLISEUM COMMISSION

COLISEUM, 3911 SO. FIGUEROA ST. • 747-7111 — SPORTS ARENA, 3939 S. FIGUEROA ST. • 748-6136
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90037

204064

January 3, 1992

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90017

ATTENTION: Jim de la Loza

RE: EXPOSITON PARK BRANCH LINE RAIL TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE

Dear Mr. de la Loza:

Although this is later than we had originally anticipated, we do want to address a few items on your Notice of Preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Report with regard to the Branch Line Rail Transit. They are as follows:

1. On Page 5 under Project Objectives, we have two comments as noted below:
 - a. In Item 1, we would suggest that the words "and major entertainment" be inserted between recreational and facilities. The word "and" could be deleted at the end of the first line.
 - b. We would believe that one of the Project Objectives might be the consideration of the existing parking lots in Exposition Park as peripheral parking for Downtown Los Angeles to relieve traffic congestion in the inner city.
2. Page 6 -- It might be more definitive if the sentence in the third paragraph under "SETTING", Line 15, might read as follows:

Uses within the Park include museums, a rose garden, a sports complex (arena/stadium), swimming pool, and community center.

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
Page Two
January 3, 1992

3. Page 14 -- In reference to Number 13, "Transportation/Circulation", we do have a couple of questions with regard to 'b' and 'c'. If on-street curb parking is removed in our area, will parking be made available elsewhere? How would an increase in vehicular traffic around the stations on Exposition at either Vermont or Figueroa be mitigated, if it impacts traffic attending events?
4. On Page 15 -- we would also ask under No. 14 "Public Services" how any affected pedestrian and/or vehicular access that might be affected would be mitigated?
5. Although I am certain that this is not a matter for the EIR, we would request that special schedules of the Light Rail Blue Line be in effect for events held in our facilities, particularly in the Coliseum.

If you have any questions concerning the content of this letter, please call.


Sincerely,



(Mrs.) Margaret Farnum
Chief Administrative Officer

gbl

EXBD
LR
TRS
JR



CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 485-3311

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

L.A.C.T.C.
1991 SEP 25 PM 12:14
192131
TOM BRADLEY
MAYOR

September 23, 1991

Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street
Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Re: Exposition Park Branch Line Rail Transit Corridor Route NOP

Dear Mr. de la Loza:


I have reviewed the above and have one concern that needs to be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. I understand that 56 families currently reside at 2315 South Flower Street, a site which may be acquired for placement of the station or other site amenities. I would urge you to consider the environmental impact such displacement might work on such families, including, but not limited to:

- a) The cost of the families' current rents;
- b) The cost of replacement housing for such families;
- c) The ability of LACTC to provide such families homes in proximity to where they now reside.

I know that LACTC is already legally required to provide relocation, not necessarily replacement, housing assistance to these families. Arguably, however, these families might require more than relocation assistance to truly mitigate the environmental impact caused by placement of the rail station or amenities at the proposed location.

The Mayor's Office strongly supports building of the Exposition Park Branch Line. This letter is sent merely to ask your consideration of the above.

Very truly yours,


Michael Bodaken
Housing Coordinator

cc: Jane Ellison

EXPORAIL

Exposition Rail Committee
P.O. Box 34-1483
Los Angeles, California 90034
213-394-3799 FAX 213-664-5529
September 10, 1991

Mr. Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. de la Loza:

The Exposition Rail Committee (formerly Committee to Preserve the Right-of-Way) is an independent citizens group volunteering our time in support of the LACTC's recent purchase of the Exposition right-of-way and for the use of this right-of-way for light rail transit.


We strongly support the LACTC's decision to begin the Route Refinement Study and Environmental Impact Report for the Metro Blue Line extension to the Exposition Park/USC area. This is a first step toward the potential use of the entire Exposition right-of-way, west to Santa Monica, and east to the Long Beach line as a Washington Blvd. express bypass.

Recognizing the importance of this first phase of Exposition, we would suggest addition to the Route Refinement Study of a route alternative to Flower Street between Adams Blvd. and Exposition Blvd. The benefits of this route alternative include:

- Faster running time
- A connection to an Exposition express bypass of Washington Blvd. east of the Harbor Freeway
- Potentially less cost, by combining construction with the planned Harbor Freeway improvements
- A transfer station with the Harbor Freeway Transitway

The attached description and diagrams provide more detail about this proposed route alternative.

Sincerely,



Alan Fishel
Chair

Darrell R. Clarke
Co-Director

ExpoExpress Option for the Exposition Park Branch Line

[1] *Orthopedic Hospital*

CalTrans has several location options for the new Flower Street Bridge. If the most westerly option is chosen, there would be room to:

1. Gradually bring the LRT tracks from at-grade along Flower near 23rd Street to aerial structure at the Harbor Freeway, following the east side of the proposed CalTrans HOV aerial structure on its way south. This would keep the LRT tracks further from the hospital than the existing freeway.
2. Maintain existing vehicular access from Flower Street, all grade-separated from the LRT tracks.
3. Provide a new parking area between the hospital main entrance and the LRT tracks.

[2] *Station at Jefferson Boulevard*

An attractive pedestrian promenade, built as part of a widened Jefferson Boulevard freeway overpass, could connect the station just east of the freeway to Flower Street. This distance is approximately 280 feet.

[3] *A Future LRT Easterly Extension*

With this option, future west-to-east and north-to-east LRT extensions would be greatly facilitated. Since all special trackwork would be located east of the freeway, a simple, more graceful aerial structure in the vicinity of Figueroa Street (Location [5]) could be built.

[4] *Interface with Transit Center and Busway*

This option would provide an at-grade station using the existing railroad underpass at the freeway which would have direct interface with the proposed CalTrans HOV/Busway station above and surface transit center to be built beneath the freeway at that location.

This LRT station would be particularly important for transit patrons traveling from the Harbor Freeway to the Santa Monica Corridor and vice-versa. It would also serve as an excellent surface transit feeder for central-city-bound LRT traffic as well. The planned Flower Street alignment would not directly interface with this facility and would therefore likely lose a valuable source of transit patrons.

[5] *LRT Aerial Structure over Figueroa Street*

Please see discussion of Figueroa Street in Item [3].

[6] *Flower Street South of Adams Boulevard*


With the ExpoExpress option, this portion of Flower Street could be fully beautified free of the physical limitations imposed by the LRT tracks and wires. The excess CalTrans right-of-way now required for the LRT tracks could be incorporated into the streetscape improvements.


PROPOSED EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE

EXPO-EXPRESS LRT OPTION


LEGEND:

- || || || || Red Line
- Blue Line
- ■ ■ ■ ■ Blue Line Extension, At-grade Segment
- ||||| Blue Line Extension, Aerial Segment
- Harbor Freeway Transitway
- Proposed Stations
- Existing Stations





1 ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL



4 INTERFACE WITH TRANSIT CENTER AND BUSWAY

SAINT VINCENT DE PAUL CHURCH

621 WEST ADAMS BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007
(213) 749-8950

RECEIVED
SEP 23 1991
191509

Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street #1100
Los Angeles, 90017, CA

**Re: Exposition Park Branch Line
Rail Transit Corridor Route**

Dear Mr. de la Loza,

I am writing to you regarding the impact of the proposed Exposition Park line on the residents of the apartment at 2315 So Flower Street, directly across the street from the Orthopaedic Hospital.

In the preliminary studies that I have seen, there has been discussion regarding a possible Metro Station at 23rd and Flower which would be a wonderful convenience for Orthopaedic Hospital and one that we would support.

On page 6 of the Report it is noted that "at station sites and possibly other specific locations along the alignment, track constraints and additional station site amenities such as park and ride facilities and bus transfer areas may require some private property acquisitions". "along Flower Street to the Harbor Freeway is mostly light industrial uses on the west side of Flower (where the Apartment is located) with the Orthopaedic Hospital located on the east side between 23rd Street and the Harbor Freeway over pass."

Litt, Marguez & Fajardo is representing the residents of 2315 So. Flower in a sium landlord suit against Robert Gluckstein, the owner of the building. My concern is for the residents of the 56 apartments who may have to find affordable housing in an area where there is no available housing for low income families. If the owner accepts an offer from LATC for his property, I want to make sure that there is provision for *replacement housing* as well as relocation costs for the residents.

SAINT VINCENT DE PAUL CHURCH

621 WEST ADAMS BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007
(213) 749-8950

-2-

I can appreciate the fact the Blue Line will need a station and additional amenities. I want to be sure that the needs of the residents in the apartment are also considered.

If you have need of additional information please contact me.

Sincerely,



Sr. Diane Donoghue

PREP
NOT
-ir
DRAFT

191050 1991 SEP 19 AM 11:45

L.A.C.T.C.

MEMORANDUM TO: Jim de la Loza, LACTC

FROM: Sue Glad, Deputy Director for External Affairs

RE: Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR

DATE: September 17, 1991

Regarding the Notice of Preparation Document requesting comments from the affected agencies, the following points should be noted:

1. Page 2 (I), the California Museum of Science and Industry would prefer wording to describe the location of the third station "at a point on Exposition Boulevard between Figueroa Street and Vermont Boulevard", rather than any possible designation of the station's location.

2. On Page 15, 14. Public Services, c) Schools. You should add that a new school will be developed in Exposition Park in conjunction with the museum and although the exact location has not yet been determined, the alignments could have an effect on that school, as well as Los Angeles Trade Tech and the University of Southern California.

Pete Wilson
Governor
State of California

Board of Directors

Fred L. Friedman
President

James Dickason
Vice President

Michael D. Bagdasarian

Jesse A. Brewer

N. Matthew Grossman

Alexander Haagen

Christy Campbell-Walters

Jeffrey N. Ruppel
Executive Director

NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM
of Los Angeles County

L.A.C.T.C.
1991 SEP 24 AM 10:59

900 Exposition Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90007

September 20, 1991


Mr. Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation
Commission
818 West Seventh Street
Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. de la Loza:

The Museum of Natural History is pleased to report it is in concurrence with the EIR development as proposed.

It is requested that all information regarding this project be forwarded to **Mark A. Rodriguez, Chief Deputy Director.**

Sincerely,


MARK A. RODRIGUEZ
Chief Deputy Director

MAR/cec



Orthopaedic Hospital



1991 OCT -4 AM 11:12

Richard McCarthy
Executive Vice President/Administrator

October 1, 1991

Mr. Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Jim,

Thank you for sending the Draft Environmental Impact Report to Orthopaedic Hospital for review and comment. I would like to outline the concerns that Orthopaedic Hospital has regarding any significant construction and/or increased traffic flow in proximity to the hospital. I am also enclosing a report developed by Hospital staff last year in response to the planned Cal Trans HOV project. Some of the issues raised in this study may be relevant to the EIR study and should be given consideration in both route planning and construction plans for the Blue Line Project.


We are primarily concerned with maintenance of good access to the Hospital including access from Flower Street and full access to the rear of the hospital from 23rd Street. We believe that access can best be maintained by placement of the light rail line along a right of way on the west side of Flower. Placement of the light rail line in the center of Flower or on the east side of the street would significantly reduce both northbound and southbound entry to the Hospital. We also want to be certain that the Light Rail project will not negatively impact the eastbound and westbound traffic flow on 23rd Street. Many of our patients access the hospital through the 23rd Street entrance.

Other environmental issues relate to noise levels and vibration levels during the light rail construction phases as well as any impact resulting from ongoing light rail operations. We also are interested in processes to mitigate ambient dust flow during construction. Concerns related to these issues are described in greater detail in the attached report.

We would be pleased to work with you and the EIR consultants to be certain that the above outlined issues are appropriately considered in the Environmental Assessment.

Best regards,

Rich McCarthy
Richard McCarthy



Los
Angeles
Trade-Technical
College

400 WEST WASHINGTON BLVD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015
TELEPHONE (213) 744-9010

THOMAS L. STEVENS, JR.
President

October 1, 1991

EIR
DRAFT
RESP

194284

L.A.C.T.C.

1991 OCT -7 PM 1:14

Jim de la Loza
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. de la Loza;

RE: EXPOSITION PARK BRANCH LINE TRANSIT CORRIDOR ROUTE

In response to the Draft Environmental Impact Report dated September 6, 1991, there are two Transportation/Circulation issues which are of concern to our institution.

1. The precedence of trains over vehicular traffic should be reversed. As the Blue Line is currently configured, vehicular traffic has precedence over the trains. Due to the ability of trains to carry much larger numbers of people more efficiency, trains should have precedence. People are more inclined, I believe, to ride the train when its faster than driving a car. It is my understanding that this was the same issue that ultimately led to the decline of the Red Car system years ago.
2. In addition to the precedence issue, the specific plan for Flower Street indicates the possibility of the train line switching from an easterly alignment to a westerly alignment between Washington Blvd. and 23rd St. I believe this swerving trainline will cause a major traffic obstacle on Flower St. when it becomes a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) on-ramp for the Harbor Freeway. If the street must be crossed, I would suggest an aerial guideway be considered.

Obviously I am trying to minimize traffic congestion in the vicinity of our college. The Blue Line has been very well received by both our students and staff and I anticipate the Exposition Line will also be positively received.

Sincerely,

James A. Grivich
Vice President, Administration

91-094

L.A.C.T.C.
1991 SEP 13 PM 1:10

James W. Norton
600 West Ninth Street, No. 1001
Los Angeles, California 90015

September 12, 1991

Mr. James L. de la Loza
Project Manager, Central Area
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street
Los Angeles, California 90017

Dear Mr. de la Loza:


I attended the public workshop/scoping meeting at the Sports Arena featuring the proposed Blue Line Exposition Branch Line. It appears that the various entities involved with--or affected by--the project are eager to cover all bases, as well as get the project going as soon as practical.

As a long-time employee and resident of "South Downtown" (I work at the Automobile Club of Southern California and live in the Skyline Condominiums), I am encouraged by the Blue Line extension--it is a very good idea, both in terms of better transportation service and, perhaps more importantly, positive urban development.

Three elements that came quickly to mind when reviewing the proposal are these:

1. There doesn't really need to be a choice between building a Vermont Avenue or a USC/Exposition Park station. Throughout the world, rapid transit stations, including approaches, ramps and platforms, often extend 800 feet or more. If both-end access is provided at the station, the west end could focus on Vermont, the east end on USC/Exposition Park.
2. A close coordination between the Exposition Boulevard Station of the Harbor Freeway Transitway and a Blue Line station should be established. The proposed Jefferson Boulevard Station, if placed to the south of Jefferson, would probably work--Exposition is less than 1000 feet from Jefferson at this point.
3. The proposed 23rd Street Station should focus on Adams Boulevard rather than 23rd. Adams is a major transit and employment corridor; 23rd isn't a major anything. By making 23rd a double-end station, Trade Tech would also be well served.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to following the development of this important new transit line.


James W. Norton

APPENDIX C
DISTRIBUTION LIST

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Amy Trask, Esq.
Los Angeles Raiders
332 Center St.
El Segundo, CA 90245

Doug Albo
Los Angeles Raiders
332 Center Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Jeff Birren, Esq.
Los Angeles Raiders
332 Center Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Alan Deines
Greater L.A. Raiders Boosters
One Ridgewood Court
Phillips Ranch, CA 91766

Damon Zumwalt
Contemporary Services Corp.
1607 Pontius
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Rod Cabbell
Contemporary Services Corp.
1438 W. 126th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90047

Pete Kranske
Contemporary Services Corp.
1607 Pontius
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Allyn D. Rifkin, Principal Eng.
L.A. Dept. of Transportation
Room 1200, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tony Ennis, Asst. Bureau Commdr.
Bureau of Fire Prevention
City of L.A. Fire Dept.
200 N. Main St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Gene D. McPherson, Dist. Engineer
Bureau of Engineering, Dept. of Public
Works.
Room 800, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Edward Karapetian
Mgr., Environmental & Govt. Affairs
Dept. of Water & Power
111 N. Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90051

Laurent McReynolds, Engineer
Water Operating Div.
Dept. of Water & Power
111 N. Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90051

L.A. City Fire Dept.
Environmental Review Section
Room 920, City Hall East STOP 250
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Los Angeles Police Dept.
Attn: Planning Section
207 S. Broadway, Rm. 200 STOP 442
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Delwin A. Biagi, Director
Bureau of Sanitation (Public Works)
Rm. 1410, City Hall East, STOP 520
Los Angeles, CA 90012

T.K. Prime, Sr. Transp. Engineer
Dept. of Transportation
Rm. 1200, City Hall, STOP 725
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dept. of Water & Power
Lim Wickser (Water Systems)
111 N. Hope St., Rm. 1455, STOP 800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Jane Blumenfeld
Mayor's Office
Room M-1, City Hall, STOP 370
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attn: Keith Comerie
City Administrative Officer
Room 300, City Hall, STOP 130
Los Angeles, CA 90012

The Honorable Robert Farrell
Councilman,
8th District
Rm. 380, City Hall STOP 213
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ninth Council District
Rm. 375, City Hall STOP 215
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Wallace Stokes, Central Dist. Eng.
L.A. Dept. of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering
City Hall STOP 494
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Melanie Fallon
Planning Dept.
Room 561, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

J.P. Ellman
Office of Chief Legislative Analyst
Room 255, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Elias Martinez
City of Los Angeles
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Earl Talley
Dept. of Transportation
7510 S. Figueroa
Los Angeles, CA 90003

Deputy Chief Matthew Hunt
L.A. Police Dept.
3375 S. Hoover, Suite 3-G
Los Angeles, CA 90007

The Honorable Nate Holden
Councilman,
10th District
Rm. 380, City Hall, STOP 217
Los Angeles, CA 90012

The Honorable John Ferraro,
Presidel L.A. City Council
Rm. M-30, City Hall STOP 206
Los Angeles, CA 90012

The Honorable Tom Bradley
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Rm. 305, City Hall STOP 370
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dr. Michael B. McGee
University of Southern Calif.
Heritage Hall, Rm. 203A
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0602

Dr. Robert Biller
Vice Pres., External Affairs
840 Childs Way, Suite 400
Los Angeles, CA 90089-2542

Jim Browder
University of Southern Calif.
835 W. 34th St., URC 102
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0751

Dr. Al Rudisill
University of Southern Calif.
835 W. 34th St., URC 102
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0751

Anthony Lazzaro, Vice President
University of Southern Calif.
Owens Hall, Rm. 100
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0582

Mike Garrett
University of Southern Calif.
Heritage Hall, Rm. 203-A
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0602

Dr. Cornelius Pings
University of Southern Calif.
Adm. 102
Los Angeles, CA 90089-4019

Ray Girvigian, Chairman
State Historical Bldg. Code Bd.
State of Calif., Dept. of Gen.Svcs
P.O. Box 220
S. Pasadena, CA 91031

U.S. Dept. of the Interior
National Park Service, Western Reg.
450 Golden Gate Ave., Box 36063
San Francisco, CA 94102

National Park Service
Santa Monica Mountains Rec. Area
30401 Agoura Rd., No. 100
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Hans Kreutzberg
State Ofc. of Historic Preservation
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

Barbara Hoff
Los Angeles Conservancy
727 W. 7th St.
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dr.Jay Rounds
Los Angeles Conservancy
727 W. 7th St., Suite 955
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Attn: David W. Look
NPS, Western Region
U.S. Dept. of Interior
450 Golden Gate Ave., Box 36063
San Francisco, CA 94102

State of California
Office of Planning and Research
1400 10th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Calif. Regional Water Quality Control
Board
Los Angeles Region
101 Centre Plaza Drive
Monterey Park, CA 91754

State of California
Dept. of Transportation
District 7, 120 S. Spring St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ted Fukushhna
State Lands Commission
1807 13th St.
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sgt. Jim Weddell
C.H.P., Long Range Planning Section
Planning & Analysis Div.
2555 1st Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95818

Robert Sleppy
Dept. of General Services
400 'P' Street, Suite 3460
Sacramento, CA 95814

Bonnie Guiton
State & Consumer Services Agency
1020 North Street, Rm. 576
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attn: Terri Tollette
State Clearinghouse
Office of Planning & Research
1400 10th Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Teresa Hughes Member,
State Assembly
3253 S. Hoover, Suite F
Los Angeles, CA 90007

The Honorable Bill Greene
Member, State Senate
9300 S. Broadway
Los Angeles, CA 90003

The Honorable Art Torres
Member, State Senate
107 S. Broadway, No. 2105
Los Angeles, CA 90012

The Honorable Marguerite
Archie-Hudson
U.S. Representative
8501 S. Broadway
Los Angeles, CA 90003

The Honorable Maxine Waters
U.S. Representative
4509 S. Broadway
Los Angeles, CA 90037

The Honorable Diane Watson
Member, State Senate
4401 Crenshaw Blvd., Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90043

The Honorable Gwen Moore
Member, State Assembly
3683 Crenshaw Blvd., 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Charlene Meeks
Dept. of Social Services
744 "P" Street, Rm 1750, MS 17-13
Sacramento, CA 95814

Gary McSweeney
Caltrans, District 7
120 S. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ann Post
Office of Senator Diane Watson
4401 Crenshaw Blvd., Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90043

Barry Wallenstein
South Coast AQMD
9150 Flair Drive
El Monte, CA 91731

Steve Smith
South Coast AQMD
9150 Flair Drive
El Monte, CA 91731

The Honorable Kenneth Hahn
Member, Board of Supervisors
866 Hall of Administration
500 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dr. Craig Black, Director
County Museum of Natural History
900 Exposition Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Mark Rodriguez
County Museum of Natural History
900 Exposition Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Larry J. Monteilh, Executive Officer
County of Los Angeles
383 Hall of Administration
500 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

County Clerk
111 N. Hill Street, Room 106
Los Angeles, CA 90012

A. R. de la Cruz
County Transportation Commission
818 W. 7th Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Sue Glad/Jeffrey N. Rudolph, Exec. Dir.
Calif. Museum of Science & Ind.
700 State Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Robert Campbell, Exec. Dir.
Calif. Afro-American Museum
600 State Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Fred L. Riedman, President
CMSI Board of Directors
Riedman, Dalessi & Dybens
444 W. Ocean Blvd., Suite 400
Long Beach, CA 90802-4527

Oscar Jauregui
Community Redevelopment Agency
2823 S. Vermont
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Robert Tague
Community Redevelopment Agency
354 S. Spring St., Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Laura Meyers
Hoover PAC
1818 S. Gramercy Place
Los Angeles, CA 90019

Michael Thomson, Hoover PAC
Special Event Parking
3436-40 S. Figueroa
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Irvin Lai
Hoover PAC
2815 S. Vermont
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Rudolph Pan
Hoover PAC
2672 S. Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Barbara Elwood
Hoover PAC
461 W. 38th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90037

John Black
Hoover PAC
2820 South Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Dominick W. Rubalcava, Esq.
Rec. & Parks Commissioner
2115 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90405

James Hadaway
Dept. of Recreation & Parks
Room 1330, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Frank Catania
Dept. of Recreation & Parks
Room 1330, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

So. Calif. Assoc. of Governments
818 W. 7th St., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Arnold Sherwood
So. Calif. Assoc. of Governments
818 W. 7th St., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Al Hocking
13831 Eastbrook
Bellflower, CA 90701

Richard Aller
REA Vending Services
7814 Conklin
Downey, CA 90242

Michelle Sheffield
Crowd Management
P.O. Box 1765
Inglewood, CA 90308

Vernon Humphries
4507 Don Zarembo Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90008

Mr. Stan Horowitz
Bureau of Street Lighting
City of Los Angeles
600 S. Spring Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90014

Albert A. Salah
3540 South Figueroa
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Shawn Karama
Subway
3974 South Figueroa
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Mike Jacobo
LAMSA
4112 S. Figueroa, Suite 2
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Joseph H. Duff
Los Angeles NAACP
1551 HiPoint Street
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Levi Kingston
Community Consortium
3109\$ S. Western Ave.
Los Angeles, CA90018

Juanita Tate
Concerned Citizens of So. Central
5918 S. Vermont Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90011

Maria R. Narvaez
1922 W. 20th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90018

Salah M. Abdul-Wahid
Omar Ibn Al Khattab Islamic Foundation
1118 W. 37th Drive., Suite 5
Los Angeles, CA 90007

David G. Cameron
P.O. Box 611
Santa Monica, CA90406

Southern Calif. Gas Co.
P.O. Box 2815
Torrance, CA 90509

Roger Jon Diamond
2115 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Gary Spivack, Dir. of Planning
So. Calif. Rapid Transit Dist.
425 S. Main St.
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Frank Gomez, Technical Supv.
So. Calif. Gas Company
P.O. Box 3249, Terminal Annex
Los Angeles, CA 90051

Shari Davis
Rose & Kindel
900 Wilshire Blvd., No. 1030
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Hugo Bandi
Inter-America Soccer Club
1541 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 401
Los Angeles, CA 9001?

Margaret Farnum, CEO
L.A. Memorial Coliseum Commission
3911 S. Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90037

N. Matthew Grossman, Pres.,
LAMCC Parker, Milliken, Clark, O'Hara
& Samuelian
333 S. Hope St., 27th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Sister Diane Donahue
St. Vincent Catholic Church
621 W. Adams Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Allan Gitlin
Margarita Jones
3760 S. Figueroa St.
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Paul Hudson
Broadway Federal S & L
4501 S. Broadway
Los Angeles, CA 90037

James F. Dickason
Newhall Land & Farming Co.
523 W. 6th St., Suite 1234
Los Angeles, CA 90014

Bill Marcel
Mickey Thompson Entertainmt.Group
P.O. Box 25168
Anaheim, CA 92825

Steve Obradavich
Julie's
3730 S. Flower St.
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Jackie Dupont-Walker
Ward Economic Devt. Corp.
1188 W. 24th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90007

John Mack
Urban League of L.A.
3450 Mount Vernon Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90008

Harold Patrick
McDonald's Family Restaurant
1071 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Candace Smith
United Neighborhood Council
835 W. 34th St., Suite 101
Los Angeles, CA 90089

Bob Underwood
Volume Services
3939 S. Figueroa
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Gene Hale
Black Businessmen's Assoc.
5140 Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90043

Reverend Dumas Harshaw
Jefferson Park Improvement Project
2040 W. Jefferson Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90018

Marva Smith Battle-Bay
Vermont/Slauson Economic Developmt.
5918 S. Vermont Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90044

Jasper Williams
Community Development Dept.
215 W. 6th St., Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90014

Clyde Johnson
Black Employees Association
5462 Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90043

Jack Needleman
Anjac Fashions
819 Santee St.
Los Angeles, CA 90014

Greta Pruitt
32nd St., USC Magnet School
822 W. 32nd Street
Los Angeles, CA 90062

Genethia Hayes
SCLC
4182 S. Western Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90062

Mark Ridley-Thomas
SCLC
4182 S. Western Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90062

Thomas McKernan, Jr.
Auto Club of So. Calif.
2601 S. Figueroa St.
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Maxine Chavez
Adams-Normandie Redevelopmt. Area
1115 W. Adams Blvd., Suite 204
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Donald Mark Kaplan
612 N. Sepulveda Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Thomas Kilgore, Jr.
1238 W. Chester Place
Los Angeles, CA 90019

Ray Remy, President
L.A. Chamber of Commerce
404 S. Bixel Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Ms. Edie Turisk
Hebrew Union College
3077 University Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Richard McCarthy
Orthopaedic Hospital
2400 S. Flower Street
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Brian Murphy
Avalon Attractions
17835 Ventura Blvd., Suite 201
Encino, CA 91316

Mr. Clinton Irving
Office of Senator Bill Greene
9300 S. Broadway
Los Angeles, CA 90003

Ms. Ann Opperman
California Medical Center Foundation
1401 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 900a5

Mr. Saeed Samater
Eighth Council District
City of Los Angeles
Room 380, City Hall
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ms. Carol Schatz
Central City Association
606 South Olive Street, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, CA 90014

Mr. Nick Shammus
3330 South Figueroa
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Mr. David Stein
Southern California Assn. of
Governments
8a8 West Seventh Street, Suite 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Ms. Pat White
Office of Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes
3253 S. Hoover, Suite F
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Mr. Jerome Williams
Eighth Council District
City of Los Angeles
Room 380, City Hall
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Mr. Sina Zarifi
Community Redevelopment Agency
354 South Spring Street, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Mr. Steve Andrews
Community Redevelopment Agency
354 South Spring Street, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Dr. Robert Biller
USC External Affairs Department
840 Childs Way, Suite 400
Los Angeles, CA 90089

Ms. Mary Lou Echternach
L. A. County Transportation
Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Mr. George Gonzalez
Spectacor Management Group
3939 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Mr. J. A. Grivich
L. A. Trade Technical College
400 West Washington Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Mr. Chariie Isgar
L. A. Memorial Coliseum Commission
3911 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Mr. Greg Xeiley
L. A. County Dept. of Public Works
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803

Mr. Levin Kingston, Exec. Dir,
Community Consortium
3109 1/4 South Western Avenue
Suite B
Los Angeles, CA 90018

Mr. George Kirkland
L. A. Convention & Visitors Bureau
515 South Figueroa Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Mr. Peter Luukko
Spectacor Management Group
3939 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Sister Colleen McEver
Mount St. Mary's College
10 Chester Place
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Mr. James McLaughlin
Department of Transportation
200 N. Spring Street, Room 1600
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ms. Nancy Michali
L. A. County Transportation Commission
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Mr. Rick Moss
California Afro-American Museum
700 State Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Mr. Ken Nakano
L. A. Trade-Technical College
400 West Washington Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Mr. Leonard Navarro
L. A. County Museum of Natural History
900 Exposition Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Mr. Jerry Nielsen
Spectacor Management Group
3939 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90037

Mr. James Okazaki
Department of Transportation
205 South Broadway Ave., Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90012

HE 4491 .E9 E93 1992 c.3

Los Angeles County
Transportation Commission.

Exposition Park branch line
rail transit corridor route

28343

Acc. No. 28343

MTA LIBRARY

ONE GATEWAY PLAZA
15TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

MTA DOROTHY GRAY LIBRARY & ARCHIVE



100000262368