SUBJECT: WILSHIRE BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT

ACTION: APPROVE THE REVISED FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

RECOMMENDATION

A. Certify the Revised Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (FEIR/EA) for the Wilshire BRT Project (Attachment A is the Executive Summary);

B. Adopt:
   1. Alternative A-1, Truncated Project with Reduced Length Bus Lanes Between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA);
   2. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Consideration; and

C. Authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to File a Notice of Determination.

ISSUE

At the December 9, 2010 meeting, the Board directed staff to: 1) conduct further environmental analysis of the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit Project (Wilshire BRT) excluding the Selby Avenue to Comstock Avenue segment, and 2) conduct a separate technical analysis to assess travel time delay and traffic impacts in the mixed-flow lanes along the project corridor (Attachment B). The analysis as well as a Revised Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (FEIR/EA) for the Wilshire BRT Project is now complete. The Board needs to certify the Revised FEIR/EA and adopt the project, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment C) and Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Consideration (Attachment D).

DISCUSSION

Wilshire Boulevard is the most heavily used transit corridor in Los Angeles County with over 80,000 weekday bus boardings. Implementation of the Wilshire BRT Project is intended to improve bus passenger travel times, service reliability, ridership, and
encourage a shift from automobile use to public transit.

The Wilshire BRT Project is a 12.5-mile project from just west of downtown Los Angeles to the Santa Monica city line, which seeks to construct curbside peak-period bus lanes in the City of Los Angeles (9.1 miles) and Los Angeles County (0.8 miles). Proposed improvements along this 9.9 miles of Wilshire Boulevard include restriping of traffic lanes; conversion of existing curb lanes to bus lanes in each direction during peak periods; upgrade of the existing transit signal priority system; reconstruction/resurfacing of curb lanes in select areas; selective street widening; and installation of traffic/transit signage and pavement markings.

The removal of the one-mile segment of bus lanes between Comstock and Selby Avenues is considered a refinement to Alternative A and is referred to in the revised FEIR/EA as Alternative A-1, Truncated Project with Reduced Length Bus Lanes Between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue (see Attachment A for project alternative maps). Alternative A-1 would implement the same components as Alternative A, with the exception of no bus lanes between Comstock and Selby Avenues and no curb lane reconstruction and resurfacing between the City of Beverly Hills and Westholme Avenue.

In February 2011, the Los Angeles City Council requested staff to study an additional alternative that would further reduce the length of the bus lanes to 5.4 miles by implementing them just east of the City of Beverly Hills between South Park View Street and San Vicente Boulevard. This request was made in consideration of comments the City received from Brentwood residents. This alternative (Alternative A-2, Truncated Project with Bus Lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard) is also considered a refinement to Alternative A and has been environmentally cleared in the revised FEIR/EA as well. Although Alternative A-2 would meet the project goals and objectives, the project benefits would not be as great as those in the recommended project. Therefore, staff is recommending the adoption of Alternative A-1, Truncated Project with Reduced Length Bus Lanes Between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue as the preferred alternative. Alternative A-1 will have significant impacts that are similar to or less than Alternative A.

Wilshire Boulevard Travel Time Delay Analysis

In response to the second part of the December 2010 Board directive, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) conducted a technical analysis to assess travel time delay in the mixed-flow travel lanes on Wilshire Boulevard with the implementation of the bus lanes. The analysis looked at the change in “current travel times” under two scenarios. An “opening day” scenario, which assumed no reduction in traffic on Wilshire due to transit mode shift or traffic diversion, and a post implementation scenario, which assumed a 10% reduction in traffic due to transit mode shift and traffic diversion (Attachment B).
Under the opening day scenario, average mixed-flow travel times during peak periods would increase from 42.80 minutes to 53.49 minutes, a total increase of 10.69 minutes or 1.23 minutes per mile. Under the post implementation scenario, average mixed-flow travel times during peak periods would increase from 42.80 minutes to 48.91 minutes, a total increase of 6.11 minutes or 0.70 minutes per mile. After project implementation, drivers are expected to adjust their travel routes, times, and mode, to compensate for changes in traffic patterns.

The Wilshire BRT Project is intended to improve passenger travel times, service reliability, and ridership of the existing bus service along Wilshire Boulevard. Once implemented, passenger travel times are expected to improve by an average of 24 percent. An average one-way travel time savings of 6 to 15 minutes is expected depending on the alternative. Based on the travel time improvements and associated ridership increases experienced with the Metro Rapid Program to-date, transit ridership along the Wilshire corridor is anticipated to grow between 15 and 20 percent as a result of the proposed project.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The proposed FY 2012 budget contains $15 million for this project in Cost Center 0441 (Non-Departmental), Project 405528 in Account 54002 (Subsidies-Others). Since this is a multi-year project, it will be the responsibility of the cost center manager and the Executive Director, Countywide Planning for budgeting expenses in future years.

Impact to Budget

This project is being funded by $23.3 million in FTA Very Small Starts Section 5309, $4.9 million in Proposition C 25%, and $3.3 million in City of Los Angeles local funds for a total project cost of $31.5 million. These funds are not eligible for bus and/or rail operating and capital.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could choose not to approve the Wilshire BRT Project. This option is not recommended because it would yield no benefits to transit such as improved bus passenger travel times, improved service reliability, and increased ridership. Nor would it encourage a shift from automobile use to public transit. MTA would also lose the funds identified in the FY 09 and FY 10 Federal Very Small Starts Program.

The Board could choose to adopt Alternative A-2, Truncated Project with Bus Lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard. This alternative would meet the project goals and objectives, however, the project benefits would not be as great as those with Alternative A-1. The Board could also choose to adopt the Proposed Project or Alternative A, which were presented to the Board in December 2010 and are also cleared in the Revised FEIR/EA.
NEXT STEPS

Upon Board approval, the Wilshire BRT Project will be presented to the Los Angeles City Council and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for final project approval and concurrence with the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations. Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is the final step to complete the environmental review and allow funding to be granted for project implementation. Upon issuance of the FONSI and all approvals by the Board and the responsible agencies, staff will proceed with preparation of contract documents with the City and County of Los Angeles for final design and construction of the Wilshire BRT Project components and file the Notice of Determination.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Wilshire BRT Executive Summary
B. Wilshire Boulevard Automobile Travel Time Delay Analysis
C. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
D. Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

Prepared by: Brad McAllester, Executive Officer, Long Range Planning
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Executive Summary

ES.1 Introduction and Background

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) completed the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (Final EIR/EA) for the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project in November 2010. This Final EIR/EA incorporated the Draft EIR/EA by reference. LACMTA is the lead agency in the preparation of the EIR in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The EIR’s purpose is to evaluate the social, economic, and environmental issues associated with the proposed improvements included in the Wilshire BRT Project within the Wilshire Boulevard corridor. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), an EA has been prepared as a joint document with the EIR. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is the lead agency for the EA. The Wilshire BRT Project is funded largely through the FTA Very Small Starts Program with local contributions from LACMTA and the City of Los Angeles.

Subsequent to the release of the Final EIR/EA, the LACMTA Board of Directors, in its December 2010 meeting, directed staff to study an additional alternative that would reduce the length of the bus lanes by one mile between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue. This alternative is considered a refinement to Alternative A and, as such, is referred to in this document as Alternative A-1. In addition, on February 2, 2011, the Los Angeles City Council requested that staff also include a second additional alternative that would further reduce the length of the bus lanes west of the City of Beverly Hills so that the bus lanes would only extend from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard. This second additional alternative is a further refinement to Alternative A and is referred to in this document as Alternative A-2. It should be noted that LACMTA staff have identified Alternative A-1 as the preferred alternative and are recommending adoption of this alternative to the LACMTA Board.

This Revised Final EIR/EA focuses on the addition of these refinements to Alternative A and changes to the previous responses to comments as a result of these additions. These revisions have been shown in track changes (i.e., all additions are presented as underlined text [in red], and all deletions are presented as strikethrough text [in red]) in Chapters 3.0, 5.0, 6.0, and 7.0 to allow the readers to compare updated information presented in the Draft EIR/EA and the previous Final EIR/EA since their publication in June 2010 and November 2010, respectively. This Revised Final EIR/EA also provides some further clarification and/or simplification of the project components within each project alternative.
ES.2 Project Goals and Objectives/Purpose and Need

The Wilshire BRT Project is intended to further improve bus passenger travel times, service reliability, ridership of the existing Wilshire BRT system, and encourage a shift from automobile use to public transit. When implemented, bus passenger travel times are expected to improve by an average of 24%. Up to a 10% mode shift from mixed flow to bus use is projected. Based on the bus travel time improvements and associated ridership increases experienced with the Metro Rapid Program to-date, transit ridership along the Wilshire corridor is anticipated to increase between 15% and 20%.

The goals and objectives for the project have been developed from the transportation and land use goals and objectives of local and regional agencies, including the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), who serves as the regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and are consistent with the other transit improvements currently planned in Los Angeles County. The following is a list of general project goals and objectives that have been developed for the proposed project:

- Improve bus passenger travel times by allowing buses to travel in dedicated peak-period bus lanes for the majority of the alignment between Valencia Street to the east and Centinela Avenue to the west;
- Improve bus service reliability by separating buses from the already high levels of corridor traffic congestion;
- Improve traffic flow along Wilshire Boulevard;
- Repave the curb lanes along damaged portions of Wilshire Boulevard to allow their effective use by buses during peak periods and by both buses and automobiles during non-peak periods;
- Encourage shift from automobile use to public transit by continuing to attract new transit riders;
- Improve air quality in Los Angeles County with the reduction in mobile source emissions resulting from a mode shift from automobile use to bus use; and
- Minimize impacts to existing on-street parking.

Another benefit of the Wilshire BRT Project is the increased person-throughput with bus lanes compared to mixed-flow curb lanes. Currently, the curb lanes can carry a maximum of 800 cars per lane per hour. With the correct average occupancy of 1.32 persons per car, the existing total person throughput with cars is 1,056 persons per lane per hour. When converted to bus lanes, the curb lanes would carry approximately 30 buses per lane per hour. The average passenger load is approximately 50 persons per bus during peak hours for the popular Metro Rapid Lines 720, 920 and Local Line 20 on Wilshire Boulevard. This would yield 1,500 persons per lane per hour for buses in each curbside bus lane. The person throughput with bus lanes (1,500) is, therefore, superior to that of mixed-flow lanes (1,056) during peak
hours. This does not incorporate expected increases in bus ridership on Wilshire Boulevard after the bus lanes are implemented, which would further improve the bus lanes' person throughput. Person throughput could potentially increase anywhere from 1,725 to 1,800 persons per lane per hour for buses in each curbside bus lane.

**ES.3 Project Description**

The proposed project runs through the densely populated mid-western portion of the City of Los Angeles, from the western edge of downtown at Valencia Street to the east, and to the eastern boundary of the City of Santa Monica at Centinela Avenue to the west. The proposed project spans approximately 12.5 miles along Wilshire Boulevard from Valencia Street on the east to Centinela Avenue on the west. Of the 12.5 miles, improvements would occur on 9.9 miles of Wilshire Boulevard, and the buses would operate in mixed-flow traffic between San Vicente Boulevard and the western boundary of the City of Beverly Hills (2.6 miles).

The Metro Rapid service on Wilshire Boulevard currently operates approximately every two minutes during the peak periods and approximately every 7 minutes during off peaks. Service spans from about 4:00 a.m. to approximately midnight using specially branded 60-foot, low-floor, articulated buses. In addition, bus priority is provided at every signalized intersection along the project corridor as well as branded stations at every stop. These existing attributes of Metro Rapid on Wilshire Boulevard would be maintained. Not only would Metro Rapid further benefit from the implementation of bus lanes along the Wilshire corridor but local service would benefit as well.

Metro Rapid peak period average travel times between Wilshire Boulevard/Valencia Street and Wilshire Boulevard/Centinela Avenue are approximately 51 to 57 minutes in the a.m. and approximately 54 to 71 minutes in the p.m. A reduction of 12 to 17 minutes per trip is anticipated with the implementation of bus lanes. The implementation of bus lanes would also benefit and improve the local service on Wilshire Boulevard as well, which operates approximately 29% slower (on average) than the Metro Rapid service during peak hours.

A variety of activities are proposed along the entire length of the project corridor within the City of Los Angeles boundaries (approximately 9.1 miles). Most of the existing curb lanes on Wilshire Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles would be “converted” to a bus and right-turn only operation in the peak periods (7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.) on weekdays. In these segments, the curb lanes would be repaired or reconstructed, where necessary, and restriped and signed as peak period bus lanes. In other areas, curbside bus lanes would be added as new lanes to Wilshire Boulevard by widening or with the removal of jut-outs. Upgrades to the transit priority system (TPS) would also be implemented, including (1) addition of bus signal priority at intersections with near-side bus stops, (2) increase in maximum available time for transit signal priority from 10 percent to 15 percent of the traffic signal cycle at minor intersections, and (3) reduction in the number of
traffic signal recovery cycles from two to one at key intersections along the corridor.

A portion of the project corridor is under County jurisdiction, between Veteran Avenue and Federal Avenue (approximately 0.8 mile) near the Veterans Administration facilities. In this area, the project proposes to widen Wilshire Boulevard between Bonsall Avenue and Federal Avenue, modify adjacent sidewalks to a uniform width, traffic lane restriping, adjustments to geometrics and traffic signals, signage and markings, and a 470-foot extension of an eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda Boulevard.

The following improvements are proposed on different segments of Wilshire Boulevard between Valencia Street to the east and Centinela Avenue to the west:

- 9.7 miles of bus lanes from Valencia Street to San Vicente Boulevard (6.1 miles), the western border of the City of Beverly Hills to Sepulveda Boulevard (2.3 miles), and Bonsall Avenue to Centinela Avenue (1.3 miles);
- 3.0 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing between Western Avenue and Fairfax Avenue;
- Removal of jut-outs and realignment of curbs for bus lanes between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue (1.0 mile);
- Lengthen the eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda Boulevard by approximately 470 feet;
- Widen Wilshire Boulevard between Bonsall Avenue and Barrington Avenue to accommodate bus lanes (0.7 mile); and
- TPS enhancements, signage, and restriping for bus lanes, as necessary, along the project corridor.

**ES.4 Alternatives to the Proposed Project**

**No Project Alternative**

This alternative is required by Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines and by Section 1502.14 of the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing NEPA and assumes that the proposed project would not occur. Under the No Project Alternative, proposed improvements to 9.9 miles of the Wilshire corridor included under the proposed project would not be implemented. Specifically, the proposed restriping and widening of some existing portions of the Wilshire corridor would not occur. The No Project Alternative would not include the conversion of existing curb lanes to bus lanes in each direction during peak periods; upgrade of the existing transit signal priority system; selective street widening; reconstruction/resurfacing of curb lanes in select areas; and, installation of traffic/transit signage and pavement markings, as necessary, to implement dedicated peak period bus lanes. Existing conditions of the Wilshire corridor would remain under this alternative. Consequently, the No Project
Alternative would not achieve or fulfill any of the goals and objectives of the proposed project.

**Alternative A: Truncated Project Without Jut-Out Removal**

Alternative A – Truncated Project Without Jut-Out Removal would include the development of 8.7 miles of bus lanes from the Wilshire Boulevard/South Park View Street intersection to the Wilshire Boulevard/Centinela Avenue intersection. This alternative would reduce the length of the bus lanes to 8.7 miles from the 9.7 miles under the proposed project. Additionally, unlike the proposed project, this alternative would retain the existing jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue (1.0 mile). The existing traffic lane would be converted to a bus lane in each direction between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue. Under Alternative A, compared to the proposed project, an additional 1.8 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing would occur between Fairfax Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard (0.6 miles) and between the western border of the City of Beverly Hills and Westholme Avenue (1.2 miles). In areas along Wilshire Boulevard where no bus lanes are implemented, the buses would operate with mixed-flow traffic.

A reduction of approximately 10 to 15 minutes in passenger travel time per bus trip is anticipated with the implementation of Alternative A. The implementation of Alternative A would also greatly benefit and improve the local service on Wilshire Boulevard as well, which operates approximately 29% slower (on average) than the Metro Rapid service during peak hours. Schedule reliability would also be significantly improved with the implementation of Alternative A.

The key features of this alternative are summarized from east to west (and implemented in both the eastbound and westbound directions), as follows:

- 8.7 miles of bus lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard (5.4 miles), the western border of the City of Beverly Hills to mid-block Gayley/Veteran Avenue (2.0 miles), and Bonsall Avenue to Centinela Avenue (1.3 miles);

- 4.8 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing between Western Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard (3.6 miles) and between the western border of the City of Beverly Hills and Westholme Avenue (1.2 miles);

- Retention of the jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue (1.0 mile);

- Lengthen the eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda Boulevard by approximately 470 feet;

- Widen Wilshire Boulevard between Bonsall Avenue and Barrington Avenue to accommodate bus lanes (0.7 mile); and

- TPS enhancements, signage, and restriping for bus lanes, as necessary, along the project corridor.

In consideration of comments received during the public review of the Draft EIR/EA, LACMTA staff recommended adoption of this alternative to the
LACMTA Board. However, at the LACMTA Board Meeting on December 9, 2010, the Board directed staff to study a new alternative that would reduce the length of the bus lanes by one mile between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue within the Westwood Community Plan Area. In addition, on February 2, 2011, the Los Angeles City Council directed staff to study a second additional alternative that would further reduce the length of the bus lanes west of the City of Beverly Hills so that the bus lanes would only extend from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard. These alternatives are considered refinements to Alternative A and are discussed below as Alternatives A-1 and A-2.

**Alternative A-1: Truncated Project with Reduced Length Bus Lanes Between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue**

Alternative A-1 – Truncated Project with Reduced Length Bus Lanes Between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue includes the same improvements as Alternative A; however, Alternative A-1 proposes 7.7 miles of bus lanes as compared to 8.7 miles under Alternative A. Alternative A-1 reduces the length of the bus lanes by one mile between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue. Similar to Alternative A, an additional 0.6 mile of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing would occur between Fairfax Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard. Unlike Alternative A, Alternative A-1 would not reconstruct the curb lanes and resurface the roadway between the western border of the City of Beverly Hills and Westholme Avenue (1.2 miles). In addition to the TPS enhancements under the proposed project and Alternative A, this alternative would also include a TPS communication system upgrade that would help synchronize the traffic signal progression along Wilshire Boulevard, thus reducing potential delay and congestion on the corridor. In areas along Wilshire Boulevard where no bus lanes are implemented, the buses would operate with mixed-flow traffic.

A reduction of approximately 9 to 14 minutes in passenger travel time per trip is anticipated with the implementation of Alternative A-1. The implementation of Alternative A-1 would also greatly benefit and improve the local service on Wilshire Boulevard, which operates approximately 29% slower (on average) than the Metro Rapid service during peak hours. Schedule reliability would also be significantly improved with the implementation of Alternative A-1. The key elements of this refined alternative are summarized from east to west, as follows:

- 7.7 miles of bus lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard (5.4 miles), the western border of the City of Beverly Hills to Comstock Avenue (0.5 mile), Selby Avenue to mid-block Gayley/Veteran Avenue (0.5 mile), and Bonsall Avenue to Centinela Avenue (1.3 miles);
- 3.6 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing between Western Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard;
- Retention of the jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue (1.0 mile);
- Lengthen the eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda Boulevard by approximately 470 feet;
- Widen Wilshire Boulevard between Bonsall Avenue and Barrington Avenue to accommodate bus lanes (0.7 mile); and
- TPS communication system upgrade, TPS enhancements, signage, and restriping for bus lanes, as necessary, along the project corridor.

As discussed above, LACMTA staff have identified this alternative as the preferred alternative and are recommending adoption of Alternative A-1 to the LACMTA Board.

**Alternative A-2: Truncated Project with Bus Lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard**

Alternative A-2 – Truncated Project with Bus Lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard includes the development of 5.4 miles of bus lanes on Wilshire Boulevard east of the City of Beverly Hills, as compared to the 9.7 miles developed under the proposed project or 8.7 miles with Alternative A. Alternative A-2 further reduces the length of the bus lanes west of the City of Beverly Hills so that the bus lanes would only extend from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard. Additionally, this alternative would retain the existing jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Avenue (1.0 mile). Similar to the proposed project, 3.6 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing would occur between Western Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard. Alternative A-2 would also include a design option for up to 1.4 miles of additional curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing from Hoover Avenue to Western Avenue, subject to the availability of funding. In addition to the TPS enhancements under the proposed project and Alternative A, another design option would include a TPS communication system upgrade that would help synchronize the traffic signal progression along Wilshire Boulevard, thus reducing potential delay and congestion on the corridor. In areas along Wilshire Boulevard where no bus lanes are implemented, the buses would operate with mixed-flow traffic.

A reduction of approximately 6 to 10 minutes in passenger travel time per trip is anticipated with the implementation of Alternative A-2. The implementation of Alternative A-2 would also greatly benefit and improve the local service on Wilshire Boulevard, which operates approximately 29% slower (on average) than the Metro Rapid service during peak hours. Schedule reliability would also be significantly improved with the implementation of Alternative A-2, particularly east of the City of Beverly Hills. The key elements of this refined alternative are summarized from east to west, as follows:

- 5.4 miles of bus lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard;
- 3.6 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing between Western Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard;
Retention of the jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue (1.0 mile);

- TPS enhancements, signage, and restriping for bus lanes, as necessary, along the project corridor; and

- Inclusion of several design options that include (1) 1.4 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing between Hoover Street and Western Avenue; and (2) a TPS communication system upgrade.

**Alternative B: Truncated Project**

Alternative B – Truncated Project includes the development of 8.7 miles of bus lanes within the 12.5-mile project corridor, compared to the 9.7 miles of bus lanes under the proposed project. This alternative would reduce the length of the bus lanes by 1.0 mile by not implementing the bus lanes from Valencia Street to South Park View Street (0.7 mile) and from mid-block Gayley Avenue/Veteran Avenue to Sepulveda Boulevard (0.3 mile). Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would remove the jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue.

Although this project would meet the project’s objectives, this alternative is not being evaluated further because it would neither avoid nor substantially lessen any of the significant and unavoidable effects identified for the proposed project. In addition, there is strong community opposition to the removal of the jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue and the associated impacts to access to residential buildings along Wilshire Boulevard, on-street parking, and street trees. As such, this project alternative was considered infeasible and eliminated from further analysis in this EIR/EA.

**Alternative C: Mini-Bus Lanes**

The Mini-Bus Lanes Alternative would include a 2.5-mile bus lane compared to the 9.7 miles that would be included under the proposed project. This alternative would include bus lanes in selected segments plus street improvements and engineering enhancements. This alternative is not being evaluated further because, while it would improve bus travel time through several congested locations, it would not substantially improve schedule reliability and reduce bus “bunching” due to congested conditions elsewhere in the corridor. One of the goals of the project is to increase transit ridership by providing more reliable bus service, and this alternative would not meet that goal. This alternative would also be very difficult to enforce because of the intermittent nature of the bus lanes, as well as their short length, and would require an intensive enforcement approach. Additionally, this alternative would require physical widening of Wilshire Boulevard within the Wilshire Community Plan Area, which the Community Plan prohibits. As such, this project alternative was considered infeasible and eliminated from further analysis in this EIR/EA.
**Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit Project**

**Project Alternative A**

- **Sepulveda to Federal - 0.6 miles**
  - Reduce sidewalk on both sides of Wilshire to a uniform width of 10 ft.
  - Restripe east and westbound lanes.
  - Lengthen eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda. Add eastbound peak period bus lane.

- **Westholme to Mid-block Gayley/Veteran - 0.8 miles**
  - Retain jut-outs and convert existing curb/traffic lanes to peak period bus lanes.

- **Beverly Hills to Westholme - 1.2 miles**
  - Retain jut-outs, reconstruct existing curb/traffic lanes, and convert to peak period bus lanes.

- **Mid-Block Gayley/Veteran to Sepulveda - 0.3 miles**
  - No bus lane in this segment.

- **Federal to Barrington - 0.1 miles**
  - Widen both sides of Wilshire by reducing sidewalk widths. Add eastbound peak period bus lane. Convert westbound curb lane to peak period bus lane.

- **Western to San Vicente - 3.6 miles**
  - Reconstruct curb lanes and convert to peak period bus lanes.

- **S. Park View to Western - 1.8 miles**
  - Convert existing curb lanes to peak period bus lanes.

- **S. Park View to Western - 1.8 miles**
  - Convert existing curb lanes to peak period bus lanes.

- **Venice to S. Park View - 0.7 miles**
  - No bus lane in this segment.
Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit Project
Project Alternative A-1

- Sepulveda to Federal - 0.6 miles
  - Reduce sidewalk on both sides of Wilshire to a uniform width of 10 ft.
  - Restrripe east and westbound lanes.
  - Lengthen eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda.
  - Add eastbound peak period bus lane.

- Selby to Mid-block Gayley/Veteran - 0.5 miles
  - Retain jut-outs and convert existing curb/traffic lanes to peak period bus lanes.

- Beverly Hills to Comstock - 0.5 miles
  - Convert existing curb lanes to peak period bus lanes.

- Comstock to Selby - 1.0 miles
  - No bus lane in this segment.

- Mid-Block Gayley/Veteran to Sepulveda - 0.3 miles
  - No bus lane in this segment.

- Federal to Barrington - 0.1 miles
  - Widen both sides of Wilshire by reducing sidewalk widths.
  - Add eastbound peak period bus lane.
  - Convert westbound curb lane to peak period bus lane.

- S. Park View to Western - 1.8 miles
  - Convert existing curb lanes to peak period bus lanes.

- Western to San Vicente - 3.6 miles
  - Reconstruct curb lanes and convert to peak period bus lanes.

- Valencia to S. Park View - 0.7 miles
  - No bus lane in this segment.

- City of Beverly Hills - 2.6 miles
  - Not included in BRT project.
Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)
Mixed-Flow Travel Time Analysis

In January 2011, LADOT conducted a Mixed-Flow Travel Time Analysis by operating floating car runs along Wilshire Boulevard to establish existing mixed-flow travel times during peak periods and then adjusted these travel times to reflect the reduced mixed-flow capacity anticipated with the implementation of bus lanes.

The project area was first divided into three segments and assumed the inclusion of bus lanes along each as proposed in the original Proposed Project:

- Mid-City – South Parkview St. to San Vicente Bl. (segment east of Beverly Hills)
- Westwood – Comstock Ave. (near western border of Beverly Hills) to I-405 Fwy.
- Brentwood – I-405 Freeway to Centinela Ave. (City of Santa Monica city line)

LADOT engineers operated floating car runs along each of these three segments on January 19, 20, and 25, 2011 (Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday) between the hours of 7:00–9:00 AM and 4:00–7:00 PM, when the bus lanes would operate. This involved driving with the flow of traffic and recording the time it took to traverse the length of each segment. At least three runs were made in each segment for both AM and PM peak periods. Run time averages were taken for each of the three segments for each peak period. These run time averages are shown as “Current Travel Times” on each of the following Mixed-Flow Travel Time tables.

To calculate the change in mixed-flow travel times with the implementation of bus lanes, the “Current Travel Times” were reduced by two different factors to reflect two potential scenarios. In the first scenario, “Current Travel Times” were reduced by 26.16%, the average difference in delay at all intersections along Wilshire Boulevard based on the reduction in mixed flow traffic capacity when the bus lanes are in operation. This was conducted by LADOT to show “opening day” conditions, or worst case scenario, and assumed no reduction in traffic on Wilshire Boulevard due to transit mode shift or traffic diversion. Prior to the actual implementation of the bus lanes, Metro and LADOT will conduct an extensive public awareness campaign to ensure that drivers are given ample notice about the project and are given the opportunity to adjust their travel patterns accordingly. LADOT and Metro staff will also implement a six-month project monitoring program upon opening in order to make any needed adjustments and fine tuning. The public outreach and monitoring will be important to implementation success.

In the second scenario, the “Current Travel Times” were reduced by 15.39%, the average difference in delay at all intersections along Wilshire Boulevard based on the
reduction in mixed flow traffic capacity and assuming a 10% reduction in traffic on Wilshire Boulevard due to transit mode shift and traffic diversion. After project implementation, drivers are expected to continue adjusting their travel routes, times, and modes in response to increased traffic congestion, just as they do in response to any long-term reduction in roadway capacity. Based on the history and record of the existing Metro Rapid service on Wilshire Boulevard, it is expected that some drivers will switch to public transit to take advantage of the faster and more reliable travel times. In both scenarios, the increase in travel time in the eastbound Brentwood segment was adjusted downward by one minute to reflect the project’s proposed widening of Wilshire Boulevard between Barrington Avenue and Bonsall Avenue. The additional roadway capacity will accommodate an eastbound bus lane in this busy approach to the I-405 Freeway.

It should be noted that the original Proposed Project included bus lanes between Veteran Avenue and the I-405 Freeway, but this (short) segment of bus lanes was removed in the project alternatives because of potential interweaving problems at the freeway ramps. Since LADOT’s mixed-flow travel time analysis assumed the inclusion of the bus lanes in this segment, the projected impact on mixed-flow travel times in Westwood may be slightly over-estimated.

The analysis yielded the following findings:

- For the “opening day” scenario, average mixed-flow travel times along Wilshire Boulevard during peak periods would increase from 42.80 minutes to 53.49 minutes (total all three segments at 8.7 miles). This is an average total increase of 10.69 minutes, assuming no mode shift to transit or traffic diversion off Wilshire Boulevard. This equates to an average increase in mixed-flow travel times of 1.23 minutes per mile. Average increases in mixed-flow travel times for each of the three segments range from 0.99 to 2.2 minutes per mile. Table 1, “Mixed-Flow Travel Times on Wilshire Boulevard – Opening Day” provides a breakdown of current and projected mixed-flow travel times along each segment of Wilshire Boulevard.

- Beyond opening day, after traffic conditions have normalized, the average mixed-flow travel times along Wilshire Boulevard during peak periods would increase from 42.80 minutes to 48.91 minutes (total all three segments at 8.7 miles). This is an average total increase of 6.11 minutes after 10% of drivers have either shifted to transit or diverted off Wilshire Boulevard. This equates to an average increase in mixed-flow travel times of 0.70 minutes per mile. Average increase in mixed-flow travel times for each of the three segments range from 0.55 to 1.19 minutes per mile. Table 2, “Mixed-Flow Travel Times on Wilshire Boulevard – On-going BRT Operations,” provides a breakdown of current and projected mixed-flow travel times along each segment of Wilshire Boulevard.
## Table 1

### WILSHIRE BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT

**MIXED-FLOW TRAVEL TIMES ON WILSHIRE BLVD - OPENING DAY**

*January 2011*

**LADOT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>AM Peak Period (7-9 AM)</th>
<th>PM Peak Period (4-7 PM)</th>
<th>AM &amp; PM</th>
<th>Length of Segment in Miles</th>
<th>Average Minutes of Delay Per Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Travel Time</td>
<td>w/Bus Lanes</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Current Travel Time</td>
<td>w/Bus Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Park View St. to San Vicente Bl. (Beverly Hills)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>16.74 min</td>
<td>21.12 min</td>
<td>+4.38 min</td>
<td>25.70 min</td>
<td>32.42 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>17.50 min</td>
<td>22.08 min</td>
<td>+4.58 min</td>
<td>21.51 min</td>
<td>27.13 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Change Both Directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTWOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comstock Ave. (Beverly Hills) to I-405 Fwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>5.97 min</td>
<td>7.53 min</td>
<td>+1.56 min</td>
<td>6.09 min</td>
<td>10.19 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>8.28 min</td>
<td>10.46 min</td>
<td>+2.17 min</td>
<td>33.31 min</td>
<td>42.02 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Change Both Directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRENTWOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405 Fwy to Centinela Ave. (Santa Monica)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>7.64 min</td>
<td>8.64 min</td>
<td>+1.00 min</td>
<td>18.53 min</td>
<td>22.34 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>3.91 min</td>
<td>4.93 min</td>
<td>+1.02 min</td>
<td>4.03 min</td>
<td>5.08 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Change Both Directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL ALIGNMENT (PROJECT ALT. A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mid-City + Westwood + Brentwood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>30.35 min</td>
<td>37.29 min</td>
<td>+6.94 min</td>
<td>52.31 min</td>
<td>64.95 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>29.66 min</td>
<td>37.48 min</td>
<td>+7.82 min</td>
<td>58.85 min</td>
<td>74.23 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions/Conditions:**

1. Current mixed flow travel time data was collected with floating car runs during last two weeks of Jan 2011 (Tue, Wed, Thu, excluding holidays)
2. Calculations of travel time with bus lanes are based on a 20.10% overall travel time increase for mixed flow traffic on Wilshire Bl with bus lanes (from LADOT report to City Council 4/19/2007) except for increases in the eastbound Brentwood segment, which were adjusted downward by 1 min. to reflect additional roadway capacity from proposed widening of eastbound Wilshire Bl. between Barrington Ave. and Sonsal Ave.
3. Assumes inclusion of bus lanes between Veteran and 405 Fwy (eliminated in Locally Preferred Alternative)
4. Assumes inclusion of bus lanes between Selby and Cornstock in Westwood (bus lanes eliminated in this segment by Metro Board action Dec. 6, 2010)
5. Assumes no mode shift to transit or traffic diversion off of Wilshire Bl.
## Table 2

### WILSHIRE BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT

#### MIXED-FLOW TRAVEL TIMES ON WILSHIRE BLVD - ON-GOING BRT OPERATIONS

January 2011

LADOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>AM Peak Period (7-9 AM)</th>
<th>PM Peak Period (4-7 PM)</th>
<th>AM &amp; PM</th>
<th>Length of Segment in Miles</th>
<th>Average Minutes of Delay Per Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Time</td>
<td>Time w/Bus Lanes</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Current Time</td>
<td>Time w/Bus Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-CITY S. Park View St. to San Vicente Bl. (Beverly Hills)</td>
<td>16.74 min</td>
<td>19.32 min</td>
<td>+2.58 min</td>
<td>23.76 min</td>
<td>28.06 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>17.50 min</td>
<td>20.19 min</td>
<td>+2.69 min</td>
<td>21.51 min</td>
<td>24.82 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Change Both Directions</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.64 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTWOOD Comstock Ave. (Beverly Hills) to I-405 Fwy</td>
<td>6.07 min</td>
<td>6.89 min</td>
<td>-0.82 min</td>
<td>6.08 min</td>
<td>9.32 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>8.28 min</td>
<td>9.55 min</td>
<td>+1.27 min</td>
<td>33.31 min</td>
<td>38.44 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Change Both Directions</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.10 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRENTWOOD I-405 Fwy to Centinela Ave. (Santa Monica)</td>
<td>7.64 min</td>
<td>7.82 min</td>
<td>+0.18 min</td>
<td>18.53 min</td>
<td>20.38 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>3.91 min</td>
<td>4.31 min</td>
<td>+0.60 min</td>
<td>4.03 min</td>
<td>4.85 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Change Both Directions</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.39 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL ALIGNMENT (PROJECT ALT. A)</td>
<td>Mid-City + Westwood + Brentwood</td>
<td>30.35 min</td>
<td>34.03 min</td>
<td>52.31 min</td>
<td>59.36 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>29.66 min</td>
<td>34.25 min</td>
<td>+4.56 min</td>
<td>58.85 min</td>
<td>67.91 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Change Both Directions</td>
<td></td>
<td>+4.12 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assumptions/Conditions:

1. Current mixed flow travel time data was collected with floating car runs during last two weeks of Jan. 2011 (Tue, Wed, Thu, excluding holidays).
2. Calculations of travel time with bus lanes are based on a 15.33% overall travel time increase for mixed flow traffic on Wilshire Bl with bus lanes (from LADOT report to City Council 4/19/2007) except for increases in the eastbound Brentwood segment, which were adjusted downward by 1 min. to reflect additional roadway capacity from proposed widening of eastbound Wilshire Bl. between Barrington Ave. and Bonsall Ave.
3. Assumes inclusion of bus lanes between Veteran and I-405 Fwy (eliminated in Locally Preferred Alternative)
4. Assumes inclusion of bus lanes between Sett and Comstock in Westwood (bus lanes eliminated in this segment by Metro Board action Dec. 9, 2010)
5. Assumes 10% mode shift to transit or traffic diversion off of Wilshire Bl.
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit Project

April 2011
1.0 Introduction

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) completed the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (Final EIR/EA) for the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project in November 2010. LACMTA is the lead agency in the preparation of the EIR in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Subsequent to the release of the Final EIR/EA, the LACMTA Board of Directors, in its December 2010 meeting, directed staff to study an additional alternative that would reduce the length of the bus lanes by one mile between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue. This alternative is considered a refinement to Alternative A and, as such, is referred to in this document as Alternative A-1. In addition, on February 2, 2011, the Los Angeles City Council requested that staff also include a second additional alternative that would further reduce the length of the bus lanes west of the City of Beverly Hills so that the bus lanes would only extend from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard. This second additional alternative is a further refinement to Alternative A and is referred to in this document as Alternative A-2.

It should be noted that the Revised Final EIR/EA determined the refinements to Alternative A (Alternatives A-1 and A-2) to be equally feasible. Alternative A-2 was identified to be the environmentally superior alternative because it would have lesser overall impacts than Alternative A-1; however, Alternative A-1, would more fully meet the goals and objectives of the project and provide greater benefits than Alternative A-2. Accordingly, Alternative A-1 has been selected by the LACMTA Board as the preferred alternative. Because both Alternatives A-1 and A-2 are equally feasible, this Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been established for both of these alternatives and not on the project as originally proposed.

2.0 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CEQA requires agencies that adopt EIRs and mitigated negative declarations (MNDs) to take affirmative steps to determine that approved mitigation measures are implemented subsequent to project approval.

Effective January 1, 1989, CEQA was amended to add Section 21081.6, implementing Assembly Bill 3180. As part of CEQA’s (state-mandated) environmental review procedures, Section 21081.6 requires a public agency to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for assessing and ensuring efficacy of any mitigation measures applied to a proposed project. Specifically, the lead or responsible agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures incorporated into a project or imposed as conditions of approval. The program must be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. As stated in Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 (a) (1):

The public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. For those changes which have been required...
or incorporated into the project at the request of a responsible agency or a public agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project, that agency shall, if so requested by the lead agency or a responsible agency, prepare and submit a proposed reporting or monitoring program.

Assembly Bill 3180 provides general guidelines for implementing MMRPs. Specific reporting and/or monitoring requirements, which are to be enforced during project implementation, shall be defined prior to final approval of the proposal by the responsible decision maker(s). In response to established CEQA requirements and those of Assembly Bill 3180 (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), the proposed MMRP for the Wilshire BRT project shall be submitted for adoption by the decision makers prior to completion of the environmental review process. LACMTA, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) will use this MMRP to ensure compliance with mitigation measures associated with execution of the project.

Under each identified resource, the mitigation measure(s) identified in the Revised Final EIR/EA and the implementation and monitoring requirements are discussed. The implementation and monitoring requirements set forth in this MMRP are as follows:

- Party Responsible for Implementation of Mitigation;
- Implementation Phase;
- Party Responsible for Monitoring Activity;
- Monitoring Activity;
- Monitoring Period;
- Monitoring Frequency; and
- Outside Agency Coordination.

Mitigation is required to address significant or potentially significant impact(s) on the following issue areas:

- Traffic; and
- Construction.

Although impact(s) on the following resource areas are expected to be less than significant, mitigation is nonetheless proposed to ensure that any potential impact(s) remain less than significant:

- Air Quality; and
- Noise.

Table 1 presents the MMRP for the project under either Alternative A-1 – Truncated Project with Reduced Length Bus Lanes Between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue or Alternative A-2 – Truncated Project with Bus Lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard.
## Table 1: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Phase</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Period/Frequency</th>
<th>Outside Agency Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T-1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Barrington Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard (for Alternative A-1 only) – The traffic</td>
<td><strong>LADOT</strong></td>
<td>Prior to project</td>
<td><strong>LADOT</strong></td>
<td>- Check plans for intersection reconfiguration</td>
<td>Once at completion of</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signal at this intersection shall be modified to include a westbound “Protected</td>
<td></td>
<td>operation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Check that mitigation measures are implemented</td>
<td>construction and prior to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus Permitted” phase. By adding a “protected” left-turn phasing (a left-turn arrow),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project operation</td>
<td>project operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic operations can be improved and delay reduced, and the project impact at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this location would be eliminated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Westwood Boulevard/Santa Monica Blvdn (for Alternative A-1 only) – The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southbound approach shall be restriped to add a second left-turn lane, and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southbound left-turn signal phasing shall be modified to “Protected” phasing. By</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adding a “protected” left-turn phasing, traffic operations can be improved and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delay reduced, and the project impact at this location would be eliminated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bundy Drive/Olympic Boulevard (for Alternative A-2 only) – The southbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approach shall be re-striped to add a second left-turn lane. An additional signal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head shall be installed as required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fairfax Avenue/Olympic Boulevard – The traffic signal phasing shall be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modified to improve efficiency, and an Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall be installed at eight intersections on Olympic Boulevard between Fairfax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue and La Brea Avenue. The ATCS is a personal computer-based program that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides a fully responsive method to accommodate real-time (actual) traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 1: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Phase</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Period/Frequency</th>
<th>Outside Agency Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected benefit to traffic flow is a reduction in the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.03 at the eight upgraded intersections, which corresponds to a 7.5 second reduction in overall intersection delay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• La Brea Avenue/Olympic Boulevard – The traffic signal shall be modified to include an eastbound “Protected plus Permitted” phase. By adding a “Protected plus Permitted” left-turn phasing for heavy turning movements, traffic operations can be improved and delay reduced, and the project impact at this location would be eliminated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crenshaw Boulevard/Olympic Boulevard – ATCS shall be installed at six intersections along Olympic Boulevard between La Brea Avenue and Crenshaw Boulevard. The expected benefit to traffic flow is a reduction in the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.03 at the six upgraded intersections, which corresponds to a 7.5 second reduction in overall intersection delay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-1: To the extent applicable and practicable, minimize, reuse, and recycle construction-related waste.</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACPDW</td>
<td>• Ensure that mitigation measure is carried out by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Phase</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Period/Frequency</th>
<th>Outside Agency Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-2: Minimize grading, earth-moving, and other energy-intensive construction practices.</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>• Ensure that mitigation measure is carried out by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-3: To the extent applicable and practicable, replacement trees or landscaping shall be provided.</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>• Ensure that mitigation measure is carried out by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-4: To the extent applicable and practicable, use solar power or electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel power generators.</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>• Ensure that mitigation measure is carried out by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-1: To the extent applicable, practicable, and feasible, all noise-producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specification. Mobile or fixed “package” equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) may be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment.</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>• Ensure that mitigation measure is carried out by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Implementation Phase</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Activity</td>
<td>Monitoring Period/Frequency</td>
<td>Outside Agency Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-2: To the extent applicable, practicable, and feasible, electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment.</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>• Ensure that mitigation measure is carried out by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-3: The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only.</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>• Ensure that mitigation measure is carried out by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4: No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor.</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>• Ensure that mitigation measure is carried out by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1: The City and County of Los Angeles shall prepare a traffic management plan to facilitate the flow of traffic during construction. The plan shall include the following:</td>
<td>LACMTA, LADOT, and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>• Ensure that a traffic mitigation plan is completed and implemented by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public outreach/education program to be implemented by City and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Phase</th>
<th>Monitoring Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Period/Frequency</th>
<th>Outside Agency Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned construction process and encourage motorists to consider alternate travel routes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-2</strong>: The City and County of Los Angeles shall develop Worksite Traffic Control plans to accommodate required pedestrian and traffic movements. The plan shall include the following:</td>
<td>LADOT, and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>• Ensure that a worksite traffic control plan is completed and implemented by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Location of any roadway/lane or sidewalk closure;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic detours and haul routes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hours of operation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protective devices and warning signs; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to abutting properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-3</strong>: The City and County of Los Angeles shall develop a Construction Phasing and Staging Plan to minimize the inconvenience to businesses and motorists within the construction zones. The plan shall control the impacts of construction in any segment by limiting the areas that may be constructed at a particular time.</td>
<td>LADOT, and LACDPW</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>LADOT and LACDPW</td>
<td>• Ensure that a construction phasing and staging plan is completed and implemented by construction team/contractor</td>
<td>Throughout project construction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 Introduction

In September 2007, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) and the City of Los Angeles submitted a “Very Small Starts” funding application to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. In December 2007, FTA granted LACMTA pre-award authority to incur costs for project development activities prior to grant approval, including finalization of any necessary environmental analysis for the proposed project.

LACMTA, in coordination with the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County, began evaluating the proposed Wilshire BRT Project in November 2008, as part of preparing an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA). Between November 12, 2008 and November 19, 2008, four community meetings were held along the Wilshire corridor to present the Wilshire BRT Project and solicit any questions and/or comments for the technical team to incorporate. In response to the comments and input received at these community meetings, the environmental document was elevated to an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA), which was circulated for public review from June 10, 2010 through July 26, 2010.

LACMTA completed the Final EIR/EA for the Wilshire BRT Project in November 2010. In consideration of comments received during the public review of the Draft EIR/EA, LACMTA staff recommended adoption of Alternative A (Truncated Project Without Jut-Out Removal), instead of the proposed project, to the LACMTA Board. Subsequent to the release of the Final EIR/EA, the LACMTA Board of Directors, in its December 2010 meeting, directed staff to study an additional alternative that would reduce the length of the bus lanes by one mile between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue. This alternative is considered a refinement to Alternative A and, as such, has been referred to in the Revised Final EIR/EA as Alternative A-1. In addition, on February 2, 2011, the Los Angeles City Council requested that staff also include a second additional alternative that would further reduce the length of the bus lanes west of the City of Beverly Hills so that the bus lanes would only extend from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard. This second additional alternative is a further refinement to Alternative A and has been referred to in the Revised Final EIR/EA as Alternative A-2.

The Findings of Fact have been prepared to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)(Public Resources Code Section 21000) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 15000) and reflect the information obtained and analyses conducted in the Revised Final EIR/EA for the Wilshire BRT Project.

2.0 Project Description

2.1 Project History and Background

Wilshire Boulevard is the most heavily used transit corridor in Los Angeles County, with over 80,000 bus boardings taking place along the corridor each weekday. In addition to being the most heavily used transit corridor in the County, Wilshire Boulevard has the distinction of
having some of the highest average daily traffic (ADT) volumes in the City of Los Angeles. Approximately 110,000 automobiles pass through the intersections of Westwood Boulevard, Gayley Avenue, and Veteran Avenue each weekday in the Westwood area. While ADT volumes are lower along the eastern portion of the project area (e.g., the ADT volume at Fairfax Avenue is 62,000), the corridor’s average ADT volume is estimated at 80,000. Moreover, Wilshire Boulevard is an important strategic BRT corridor due to the following: (1) the Mid-City/Westside segment of Wilshire Boulevard is a highly significant origin and/or destination point for trips in southern California, especially for transit trips, over 41% of which either originate or terminate in the Wilshire corridor; (2) the Wilshire corridor has a significantly higher transit mode split (20%) than the City of Los Angeles as a whole (8%), and the trend is expected to increase from nearly 2.5 to 2.8 times the City mode split; and (3) the Wilshire corridor currently has very high internal trip retention (over half of all trips begin and end in the corridor), and despite growth in regional trips, the corridor is expected to maintain these high internal trip retention percentages.

With increasing ADT volumes on Wilshire Boulevard, demands for viable alternatives to the automobile have increased as congestion continues to slow automobile travel. This same congestion also slows buses, increasing travel time, and reducing schedule reliability for transit customers, while increasing operating costs for Metro. Average bus speeds, along with automobile speeds, have declined steadily over the past 20 years. The Wilshire BRT Project is intended to further improve bus passenger travel times, service reliability, ridership of the existing Wilshire BRT system, and encourage a shift from automobile use to public transit.

In March 2004, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) and LACMTA implemented peak period bus lanes along a one-mile segment of Wilshire Boulevard between Centinela Avenue and Federal Avenue in West Los Angeles, as part of a Bus Lane Demonstration Project. The purpose of this demonstration project was to test whether curbside, exclusive bus lanes operating in the a.m. and p.m. peak periods would significantly improve bus travel speeds and service on Wilshire Boulevard. This demonstration project resulted in improvements in bus speeds and reliability through the one-mile segment. Before and after data analysis indicated that this demonstration project resulted in a 14 percent bus speed improvement and up to a 32 percent improvement in bus schedule reliability.

In November 2006, LACMTA and LADOT began studying the feasibility of implementing end-to-end bus lanes on Wilshire Boulevard between downtown Los Angeles and the City of Santa Monica. The City of Los Angeles and LACMTA began the Wilshire Bus Speed Improvement Study. Three options were developed by LADOT, which are as follows:

- Peak period end-to-end bus lanes, which consists of the conversion of Wilshire Boulevard curb lanes from mixed flow to bus and right-turn only, and implementation of a number of engineering enhancements, including increased bus signal priority, bus stop relocations, pavement repair, and minor on-street parking space removal to improve bus speeds, schedule reliability, and overall bus travel times.

- All day mini bus lanes, which consist of implementation of “mini” bus lanes in selected segments, construction of a number of minor street improvements, and implementation of the engineering enhancements identified above.

- Implementation of engineering enhancements (e.g., traffic signal modifications/Transit Priority System) only.
In May 2007, the Los Angeles City Council was presented with the above options and made a decision to pursue the first option of constructing peak period end-to-end bus lanes, which clearly met the corridor objectives to improve schedule reliability, improve passenger travel times and average bus speeds, minimize parking space removal, and encourage a mode shift from automobile to bus.

In August 2007, the demonstration project was temporarily suspended by the Los Angeles City Council until the one-mile segment could be integrated into a larger bus lane project.

2.2 Project Goals and Objectives

The Wilshire BRT Project is intended to further improve bus passenger travel times, service reliability, ridership of the existing Wilshire BRT system, and encourage a shift from automobile use to public transit. When implemented, bus passenger travel times are expected to improve by an average of 24%. Up to a 10% mode shift from mixed flow to bus use is projected. Based on the bus travel time improvements and associated ridership increases experienced with the Metro Rapid Program to-date, transit ridership along the Wilshire corridor is anticipated to increase between 15% and 20%.

The goals and objectives for the project have been developed from the transportation and land use goals and objectives of local and regional agencies, including the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), who serves as the regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and are consistent with the other transit improvements currently planned in Los Angeles County. The following is a list of general project goals and objectives that have been developed for the project:

- Improve bus passenger travel times by allowing buses to travel in dedicated peak-period bus lanes for the majority of the alignment between Valencia Street to the east and Centinela Avenue to the west;
- Improve bus service reliability by separating buses from the already high levels of corridor traffic congestion;
- Improve traffic flow along Wilshire Boulevard;
- Repave the curb lanes along damaged portions of Wilshire Boulevard to allow their effective use by buses during peak periods and by both buses and automobiles during non-peak periods;
- Encourage shift from automobile use to public transit by continuing to attract new transit riders;
- Improve air quality in Los Angeles County with the reduction in mobile source emissions resulting from a mode shift from automobile use to bus use; and
- Minimize impacts to existing on-street parking.

2.3 Project Characteristics

In response to comments received during the public review of the Draft EIR/EA and public testimony during a LACMTA Board meeting in December 2010 and a Los Angeles City Council meeting in February 2011, the LACMTA Board has considered the two refinements
to Alternative A (i.e., Alternative A-1 – Truncated Project with Reduced Length Bus Lanes Between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue, and Alternative A-2 – Truncated Project with Bus Lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard), which have been addressed in the Revised Final EIR/EA. The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 was analyzed at the same level of detail as the proposed project in the Revised Final EIR/EA.

Under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, a variety of activities are proposed along the entire length of the project corridor. Much of the existing curb lanes on Wilshire Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles would be “converted” to a bus and right-turn only operation in the peak periods (7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.) on weekdays. In these segments, curb lanes would be repaired or reconstructed, where necessary, and restriped and signed as peak period bus lanes. In other areas, curbside bus lanes would be added as new lanes to Wilshire Boulevard by widening (Alternative A-1 only). Upgrades to the transit signal priority system (TPS) would also be implemented, including (1) addition of bus signal priority at intersections with near-side bus stops, (2) increase in maximum available time for transit signal priority from 10 percent to 15 percent of the traffic signal cycle at minor intersections, and (3) reduction in the number of traffic signal recovery cycles from two to one at key intersections along the corridor. In areas along Wilshire Boulevard where no bus lanes are implemented, the buses would operate with mixed-flow traffic.

Under Alternative A-1 only, a portion of the project is under County jurisdiction, between Veteran Avenue and Federal Avenue (approximately 0.8 mile) near the Veterans Administration facilities. Key elements of the County’s project scope include widening Wilshire Boulevard between Bonsall Avenue and Federal Avenue, reduction of adjacent sidewalks to a uniform width, traffic lane restriping, adjustments to geometrics and traffic signals, signage and markings, and a 470-foot extension of an eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda Boulevard.

The key elements of the project as proposed under Alternative A-1 are summarized from east to west, as follows:

- 7.7 miles of bus lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard (5.4 miles), the western border of the City of Beverly Hills to Comstock Avenue (0.5 mile), Selby Avenue to mid-block Gayley/Veteran Avenue (0.5 mile), and Bonsall Avenue to Centinela Avenue (1.3 miles);
- 3.6 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing between Western Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard;
- Retention of the jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue (1.0 mile);
- Lengthen the eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda Boulevard by approximately 470 feet;
- Widen Wilshire Boulevard between Bonsall Avenue and Barrington Avenue to accommodate bus lanes (0.7 mile); and
- TPS communication system upgrade, TPS enhancements, signage, and restriping for bus lanes, as necessary, along the project corridor.
The key elements of the project as proposed under Alternative A-2 are summarized from east to west, as follows:

- 5.4 miles of bus lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard;
- 3.6 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing between Western Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard;
- Retention of the jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue (1.0 mile);
- TPS enhancements, signage, and restriping for bus lanes, as necessary, along the project corridor; and
- Inclusion of several design options that include (1) an additional 1.4 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing between Hoover Street and Western Avenue; and (2) a TPS communication system upgrade.

2.4 Other Alternatives to the Proposed Project

No Project Alternative

This alternative is required by Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines and assumes that the proposed project would not occur. Under the No Project Alternative, proposed improvements to 9.9 miles of the Wilshire Corridor included under the proposed project would not be implemented. Specifically, the proposed restriping and widening of some existing portions of the Wilshire corridor would not occur. The No Project Alternative would not include the conversion of existing curb lanes to bus lanes in each direction during peak periods; upgrade of the existing transit signal priority system; selective street widening; reconstruction/resurfacing of curb lanes in select areas; and, installation of traffic/transit signage and pavement markings, as necessary, to implement dedicated peak period bus lanes. Existing conditions of the Wilshire Corridor would remain under this alternative. Consequently, the No Project Alternative would not achieve or fulfill any of the goals and objectives of the proposed project.

Alternative A: Truncated Project Without Jut-Out Removal

Alternative A – Truncated Project Without Jut-Out Removal would include the development of 8.7 miles of bus lanes from the Wilshire Boulevard/South Park View Street intersection to the Wilshire Boulevard/Centinela Avenue intersection. This alternative would reduce the length of the bus lanes to 8.7 miles from the 9.7 miles under the proposed project. Additionally, unlike the proposed project, this alternative would retain the existing jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue (1.0 mile). The existing traffic lane would be converted to a bus lane in each direction between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue. Under Alternative A, compared to the proposed project, an additional 1.8 miles of curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing would occur between Fairfax Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard (0.6 miles) and between the western border of the City of Beverly Hills and Westholme Avenue (1.2 miles). In areas along Wilshire Boulevard where no bus lanes are implemented, the buses would operate with mixed-flow traffic.
The key features of this alternative are summarized from east to west, as follows:

- 8.7 miles of bus lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard (5.4 miles), the western border of the City of Beverly Hills to mid-block Gayley/Veteran Avenue (2.0 miles), and Bonsall Avenue to Centinela Avenue (1.3 miles);
- 4.8 miles of curbed lane reconstruction/resurfacing between Western Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard (3.6 miles) and between the western border of the City of Beverly Hills and Westholme Avenue (1.2 miles);
- Retention of the jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue (1.0 mile);
- Lengthen the eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda Boulevard by approximately 470 feet;
- Widen Wilshire Boulevard between Bonsall Avenue and Barrington Avenue to accommodate bus lanes (0.7 mile); and
- TPS enhancements, signage, and restriping for bus lanes, as necessary, along the project corridor.

**Alternative B: Truncated Project**

Alternative B – Truncated Project includes the development of 8.7 miles of bus lanes within the 12.5-mile project corridor, compared to the 9.7 miles of bus lanes under the proposed project. This alternative would reduce the length of the bus lanes by 1.0 mile by not implementing the bus lanes from Valencia Street to South Park View Street (0.7 mile) and from mid-block Gayley Avenue/Veteran Avenue to Sepulveda Boulevard (0.3 mile). Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would remove the jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue.

Although this project would meet the project’s objectives, this alternative is not being evaluated further because it would neither avoid nor substantially lessen any of the significant and unavoidable effects identified for the proposed project. In addition, there is strong community opposition to the removal of the jut-outs between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue and the associated impacts to access to residential buildings along Wilshire Boulevard, on-street parking, and street trees. As such, this project alternative was considered infeasible and eliminated from further analysis in this EIR/EA.

**Alternative C: Mini-Bus Lanes**

The Mini-Bus Lanes Alternative would include a 2.5-mile bus lane compared to the 9.7 miles that would be included under the proposed project. This alternative would include bus lanes in selected segments plus street improvements and engineering enhancements. This alternative is not being evaluated further because, while it would improve bus travel time through several congested locations, it would not substantially improve schedule reliability and reduce bus "bunching" due to congested conditions elsewhere in the corridor. One of the goals of the project is to increase transit ridership by providing more reliable bus service, and this alternative would not meet that goal. This alternative would also be very difficult to enforce because of the intermittent nature of the bus lanes, as well as their short length, and would require an intensive enforcement approach. Additionally, this alternative would require physical widening of Wilshire Boulevard within the Wilshire Community Plan Area.
which the Community Plan prohibits. As such, this project alternative was considered infeasible and eliminated from further analysis in this EIR/EA.

3.0 Record of Proceedings

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

- Notice of Preparation, Notice of Completion, and Notice of Availability and all other public notices issued by the LACMTA in conjunction with the project;
- Wilshire BRT Project Draft EIR/EA;
- Wilshire BRT Project Final EIR/EA;
- Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the LACMTA Board in connection with the project and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- Any documents expressly cited in the foregoing documents, in addition to the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations; and
- Any other materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6, Subdivision (e).

The custodian of the documents comprising the record of proceedings is Ms. Martha Butler, LACMTA, One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

4.0 Findings Required Under CEQA

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

The mandate and principles stated above are implemented, in part, through the CEQA requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required (PRC Section 21081(a) and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15096(h)). For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions as follows (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)):

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

For purposes of these findings, the term “avoid” refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less-than-significant level. In contrast, the term “substantially lessen” refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a less-than-significant level. Although CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is avoided or substantially lessened, these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been reduced to a less-than-significant level or has simply been substantially lessened but remains significant.

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened either through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or a feasible environmentally superior alternative, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project’s economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits rendered acceptable its unavoidable adverse environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043(b) and 15093).

These findings constitute LACMTA’s best efforts to set forth the rationales and support for its decision under the requirements of CEQA. It should be noted that the Revised Final EIR/EA determined the refinements to Alternative A, Alternatives A-1 and A-2, to be equally feasible. Alternative A-2 was identified to be the environmentally superior alternative because it would have lesser overall impacts than Alternative A-1; however, Alternative A-1, would more fully meet the goals and objectives of the project and provide greater benefits than Alternative A-2. Accordingly, Alternative A-1 has been selected by the LACMTA Board as the preferred alternative. Because both Alternatives A-1 and A-2 are equally feasible, these findings are focused on both of these alternatives and not on the project as originally proposed.

5.0 Legal Effect of Findings

To the extent that these findings conclude that various proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Revised Final EIR/EA are feasible and have not been modified, superseded, or withdrawn, LACMTA, in conjunction with the City and County of Los Angeles, hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when the LACMTA Board decision makers formally approve the project as proposed under Alternative A-1 (Truncated Project with Reduced Length Bus Lanes Between Comstock Avenue and Selby Avenue).

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

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the Wilshire BRT Project and has been adopted concurrently with these findings. LACMTA, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), and the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works will use the MMRP to track compliance with project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period.

7.0 Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures

The Revised Final EIR/EA identified several significant environmental effects (or "impacts") that the project will cause. Some of these significant effects are lessened or made not significant by implementation of feasible mitigation measures. Others cannot be avoided by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternatives (Alternative A-2 – Truncated Project with Bus Lanes from South Park View Street to San Vicente Boulevard). The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would only result in significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to localized traffic impacts at certain intersections; however, these effects are outweighed by overriding considerations set forth in Section 8.0 below. This section (Section 7.0) presents in greater detail the LACMTA’s findings with respect to the environmental effects of the project (i.e., Alternative A-1 as the preferred alternative and Alternative A-2 as the environmentally superior alternative).

For each of the significant or cumulative impacts associated with the project, the following information is provided:

- **Description of Project Impacts** – A specific description of each significant environmental impact identified in the Draft or Revised Final EIR/EA.

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

- **Finding** – The findings made are those allowed by Section 21081 of the California PRC. The findings are made in two parts. In the first part, a judgment is made regarding the significance of the impact or effect. In the second part, which pertains only to impacts found to be significant, one of three specific findings is made, in accordance with the statement of acceptable findings provided in Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines.

- **Rationale** – A summary of the reasons for the decision.

- **Reference** – A notation on the specific section in the Draft or Revised Final EIR/EA that includes the evidence and discussion of the identified impact.
7.1 Traffic, Circulation, and Parking

1) Impact T1: Exceed LOS Criteria under projected 2012 and 2020 Levels of Service.

a. Description of Project Impacts – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in significant impacts related to the exceedance of level-of-service (LOS) criteria for multiple intersections in both 2012 and 2020 project years.

b. Proposed Mitigation – At some of the intersections at which the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would have a significant impact on traffic operations, the following mitigation measures would improve traffic operations and reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels:

T-1:

- Barrington Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard (for Alternative A-1 only) – The traffic signal at this intersection shall be modified to include a westbound “Protected plus Permitted” phase. By adding a “protected” left-turn phasing (a left-turn arrow), traffic operations can be improved and delay reduced, and the project impact at this location would be eliminated.

- Westwood Boulevard/Santa Monica Boulevard (for Alternative A-1 only) – The southbound approach shall be restriped to add a second left-turn lane, and the southbound left-turn signal phasing shall be modified to “Protected” phasing. By adding a “protected” left-turn phasing, traffic operations can be improved and delay reduced, and the project impact at this location would be eliminated.

- Bundy Drive/Olympic Boulevard (for Alternative A-2 only) – The southbound approach shall be restriped to add a second left-turn lane. An additional signal head shall be installed as required.

- Fairfax Avenue/Olympic Boulevard – The traffic signal phasing shall be modified to improve efficiency, and an Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) shall be installed at eight intersections on Olympic Boulevard between Fairfax Avenue and La Brea Avenue. The ATCS is a personal computer-based program that provides a fully responsive method to accommodate real-time (actual) traffic conditions. The expected benefit to traffic flow is a reduction in the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.03 at the eight upgraded intersections, which corresponds to a 7.5 second reduction in overall intersection delay.

- La Brea Avenue/Olympic Boulevard – The traffic signal shall be modified to include an eastbound “Protected plus Permitted” phase. By adding a “Protected plus Permitted” left-turn phasing for heavy turning movements, traffic operations can be improved and delay reduced, and the project impact at this location would be eliminated.

- Crenshaw Boulevard/Olympic Boulevard – ATCS shall be installed at six intersections along Olympic Boulevard between La Brea Avenue and Crenshaw Boulevard. The expected benefit to traffic flow is a reduction in the
volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.03 at the six upgraded intersections, which corresponds to a 7.5 second reduction in overall intersection delay.

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

- [X] Significant  
- [ ] Not Significant

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

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

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

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

- [X] Significant  
- [ ] Not Significant

**Rationale** – For Years 2012 and 2020, a total of eight intersections are forecast to remain significantly affected after mitigation under Alternative A-1 because no feasible mitigation measures could be identified for the following locations:

- Veteran Avenue/Sunset Boulevard;
- Bundy Drive/Wilshire Boulevard;
- Overland Avenue/Santa Monica Boulevard;
- Beverly Glen Boulevard/Santa Monica Boulevard;
- Westwood Boulevard/Pico Boulevard;
- Overland Avenue/Pico Boulevard;
- Fairfax Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard; and
- La Brea Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard.

The following six intersections are forecast to remain significantly impacted in either year 2012 or year 2020 under Alternative A-2 since no feasible mitigation measures that fully mitigate impacts at these intersections could be identified:

- Veteran Avenue/Sunset Boulevard;
- Overland Avenue/Santa Monica Boulevard;
- Westwood Boulevard/Pico Boulevard;
- Overland Avenue/Pico Boulevard;
- Fairfax Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard; and
- La Brea Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard.
The unmitigated impacts at the intersections identified above under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would remain significant and unavoidable.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

2) Impact T2: Exceed Significance Criteria for Local Residential Streets.

a. Description of Project Impacts – Impacts to local residential streets along the Wilshire corridor caused by potential traffic diversion during bus lane operations could occur.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant ❌ Not Significant

d. Rationale – Along the project corridor, Goshen Avenue between Bundy Drive and San Vicente Boulevard, and Lindbrook Drive and Ashton Avenue between Malcolm Avenue and Comstock Avenue, in the western part of the study area, are local residential streets adjacent and run parallel to Wilshire Boulevard. Texas Avenue, in the western part of the study area, also runs parallel to Wilshire Boulevard but is designated as a collector street and, therefore, not subject to a local residential street analysis. Additionally, 6th Street, 7th Street, and 8th Street, adjacent and parallel to Wilshire Boulevard in the eastern part of the study area, are designated as either collector or secondary streets between Fairfax Avenue and Lucas Avenue and, therefore, are not subject to a local residential street analysis.

Under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, study intersections on Wilshire Boulevard in the vicinity of Lindbrook Drive and Ashton Avenue operate at LOS D or better in 2012 and 2020. Therefore, it is not expected that a significant amount of traffic would divert from Wilshire Boulevard to these local residential streets. In the vicinity of Goshen Avenue, the Bundy Drive/Wilshire Boulevard and Federal Avenue-San Vicente Boulevard/Wilshire Boulevard intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or F in 2012 and 2020. However, traffic diversion onto Goshen Avenue is unlikely since Goshen Avenue runs for only a short distance, eastbound left-turn movements from Wilshire Boulevard to Bundy Drive are relatively high-delay movements during peak hours, and northbound left-turn movements from San Vicente Boulevard to Goshen Avenue are prohibited. Therefore, no significant impacts to local residential streets are expected.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

3) Impact T3: Exceed parking requirements or result in inadequate parking supply.

a. Description of Project Impacts – Under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, approximately 11 parking spaces between South Park View Street and Fairfax Avenue (a distance of approximately 4.8 miles) would be removed to accommodate larger or relocated bus stops in order to facilitate bus movements in and out of stops. However, under either alternative, parking supply would be unchanged between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue since jut-outs in
this area would be retained (Alternative A-1) or no bus lane would be implemented (Alternative A-2). Therefore, no change in parking would occur in this area, and no impact would occur.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant  ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – The removed parking spaces between South Park View Street and Fairfax Avenue would be spread throughout this segment of the project, with no more than three spaces being removed on any single block. The removed parking spaces would have a small effect on parking supply during off-peak hours. During peak periods, parking is prohibited under current conditions, so the removal of these parking spaces would not affect parking supply at all. Therefore, the removal or restriction of parking spaces on Wilshire Boulevard would result in less-than-significant impacts.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

4) Impact T4: Result in Auto/Bus transition conflicts at certain locations.

a. Description of Project Impacts – Along the Wilshire Boulevard BRT route, Metro buses would transition into and out of mixed-flow travel lanes at certain locations, depending on downstream roadway capacity changes and jurisdictional boundaries.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None Required.

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

☐ Significant  ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – In order to reduce or avoid automobile and bus transition conflicts, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would include installation of appropriate signage along Wilshire Boulevard adjacent to each of the areas of potential conflict, in order to inform motorists of bus lane operation during peak hours. For potential traffic conflicts in both eastbound and westbound directions along Wilshire Boulevard, the installation of appropriate signage would ensure that the project as proposed under either alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts related to automobile/bus transition conflicts. No mitigation measures are required.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

5) Impact T5: Result in inadequate emergency access.

a. Description of Project Impacts – Construction and operation of the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 could interfere with emergency vehicle access due to construction activities and bus lane restrictions.
b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant  ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – Emergency vehicles would be permitted to use the bus lanes when they are in operation. Because these lanes would be free of most other vehicular traffic, emergency response time would likely improve during peak periods. During construction activities, alternative access routes would be utilized, and local emergency access would be retained at all times. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

7.2 Air Quality

1) Impact AQ1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality management plan.

   a. Description of Project Impacts – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would be consistent with the projections in the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).

   b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

      ☐ Significant  ☒ Not Significant

   d. Rationale – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would be consistent with all local general plans and compatible with the surrounding uses. Because the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would be consistent with the local general plan, pursuant to SCAQMD guidelines, the project would be considered consistent with the region's AQMP. As such, regional operations emissions for either alternative would be accounted for in the AQMP. In addition, project construction would comply with AQMP emissions control strategies such as Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), Rule 1108 (Cutback Asphalt), and Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings), among other control strategies. Accordingly, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would be consistent with the projections in the AQMP, thereby resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

   e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

2) Impact AQ2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

   a. Description of Project Impacts – Criteria pollutant emissions for both construction and operation of the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in a less-than-significant regional air quality impact.
b. **Proposed Mitigation** – None required.

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

   - [ ] Significant
   - [x] Not Significant

d. **Rationale** – Construction of the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 has the potential to create air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the project site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from demolition and construction activities. Mobile-source emissions, primarily NOX, would result from the use of construction equipment. However, criteria pollutant emissions would be less than the applicable SCAQMD significance thresholds, and as such, would result in a less-than-significant regional air quality impact.

   Regional air pollutant emissions associated with project operations would be generated by operation of on-road vehicles. Mobile-source emissions are proportional to the vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which are proportional to new vehicle trips. The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not generate new trips; instead, the project would facilitate the movement of existing traffic through the study corridor, as well as other traffic generated by new development in the area. Consequently, the project may result in local traffic redistribution. However, the project itself would not result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or project air quality violation.

e. **Reference** – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

3) **Impact AQ3: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.**

   a. **Description of Project Impacts** – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in less-than-significant impacts in exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

   b. **Proposed Mitigation** – None required.

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

      - [ ] Significant
      - [x] Not Significant

   d. **Rationale** – A conservative estimate of the project’s construction-period on-site mass emissions showed that the worst-case maximum emissions for all criteria pollutants would remain below their respective SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (LST). As such, localized impacts that may result from construction-period air pollutant emissions would be less than significant. With regard to regional construction-period impacts under Alternative A-2, impacts would be less than those disclosed for Alternative A-1 since the construction activity under Alternative A-2 would be limited to the project alignment east of the City of Beverly Hills. There would be no jut-out removal between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue, and there would be no bus lane-related construction from the western boundary of the City of Beverly Hills to Centinela Avenue on the western
end of the project corridor. However, there would be up to 2.0 miles of additional
curb lane reconstruction/resurfacing between Hoover Avenue and Western
Avenue and between Fairfax Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard. The greatest
potential for toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions would be related to diesel
particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during site
grading activities. The SCAQMD does not consider diesel-related cancer risks
from construction equipment to be an issue due to the short-term nature of
construction activities.

Since the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would continue
to operate compressed natural gas (CNG) buses rather than diesel buses and
would not result in the emission of acute and/or chronically hazardous TAC
pollutants, potential project-generated air toxic impacts on surrounding land uses
would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

4) Impact AQ4: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

a. Description of Project Impacts – No construction activities or materials are
proposed which would create a significant level of objectionable odors. As such,
potential impacts during construction would be less than significant.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant  ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook (South
Coast Air Quality Management District 1993), land uses associated with odor
complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food
processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and
fiberglass molding. The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2
would not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with
odors and, therefore, would not produce objectionable odors. As such, potential
impacts would be less than significant with respect to objectionable odors.

Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include
asphalt paving. SCAQMD Rule 1108 limits the amount of volatile organic
compounds from cutback asphalt. Via mandatory compliance with SCAQMD
Rules, no construction activities or materials are proposed which would create a
significant level of objectionable odors. As such, potential impacts during
construction would be less than significant.

c. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

5) Impact AQ5: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that
may have a significant impact on the environment.

a. Description of Project Impacts – The relative amounts of GHG emissions
associated with the project are negligible. The amount of emissions from the
project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, without considering other cumulative global emissions, would not be enough to cause substantial climate change directly. Thus, project emissions, in isolation, are considered less than significant. However, climate change is a global cumulative impact, and the proper context for analysis of this issue is not a project’s emissions in isolation but, rather, its contribution to cumulative GHG emissions. Nevertheless, during operation of the project, it would be expected that a beneficial impact on GHG emissions would occur due to decreased traffic congestion along the Wilshire corridor, increased efficiency and use of the CNG-fueled Wilshire BRT, and decreased personal vehicle VMTs.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required. Nevertheless, mitigation measures to reduce project-related GHG emissions by the greatest extent feasible are prescribed.

AQ-1 To the extent applicable and practicable, minimize, reuse, and recycle construction-related waste.

AQ-2 To the extent applicable and practicable, minimize grading, earth-moving, and other energy-intensive construction practices.

AQ-3 To the extent applicable and practicable, replacement trees or landscaping shall be provided.

AQ-4 To the extent applicable and practicable, use solar power or electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel power generators.

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

☐ Significant  ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would reduce GHG emissions, compared with existing conditions, by improving traffic circulation and relieving local congestion. Implementation of prescribed mitigation measures during construction would further reduce the project’s GHG emissions. As such, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not conflict with the state’s goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Project impacts relative to GHG emissions and climate change would be less than significant.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

7.3 Cultural Resources

1) Impact CRI1: Potential Impacts on Archaeological Resources.

a. Description of Project Impacts – The curb lanes on Wilshire Boulevard in the area near the La Brea Tar Pits are in extremely poor condition and are not used by buses and other vehicles to a high degree. Reconstruction of the roadway base (i.e., below the surface of the pavement) as well as curbs and gutters, where damaged, are proposed for this segment of the alignment. Despite heavy urbanization, buried cultural resources have been identified in the vicinity of the
proposed construction zone. There is the potential for buried archaeological deposits to exist beneath previously disturbed and developed land surfaces in the project area.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – None required.

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

- ☑ Not Significant

   d. *Rationale* – The bulk of the project involves activities, such as sidewalk removal (Alternative A-1 only), pavement replacement, or restriping, which are not ground disturbing. For purposes of this project, pavement replacement is not considered a ground-disturbing activity. Therefore, the proposed improvements would have no direct or indirect impact on archaeological resources.

e. *Reference* – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

2) **Impact CR2: Impacts on Historic Resources.**

a. *Description of Project Impacts* – The project as proposed under Alternative A-1 would reduce the sidewalk widths on the north and south sides of Wilshire Boulevard between Federal Avenue and Barrington Avenue, as well as on both sides of Wilshire Boulevard between Bonsall Avenue and Federal Avenue; these reductions are not included under Alternative A-2. Of the eight buildings that were identified as historical resources under the CEQA Guidelines, none were found to be affected by the project as proposed under Alternative A-1; since Alternative A-2 would limit physical changes between South Park View Street and San Vicente Boulevard, no impacts to the identified historical resources would occur under this alternative.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – None required.

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

- ☑ Not Significant

   d. *Rationale* – The project would convert existing curb lanes on Wilshire Boulevard to bus and right-turn only operation in the peak periods on weekdays. To implement the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, curb lanes would be repaired or reconstructed, where necessary, and restriped and signed as peak period bus lanes. In other areas, curbside bus lanes would be added as new lanes to Wilshire Boulevard by widening and restriping (under Alternative A-1 only). As a result of consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on April 3, 2008, for the purposes of the built environment survey, only those areas where changes would occur to curbs and sidewalks would be included in the Area of Potential Effects (APE). This area is bounded by Bonsall Avenue to the east to Barrington Avenue to the west, extending one parcel on each side of Wilshire Boulevard excluding the north side of Wilshire between Bonsall Avenue and Federal Avenue. The remainder of the project alignment involves lane repaving and/or restriping, would not involve any physical changes to any architectural resources or sidewalk, has no potential to
affect historic properties, and is excluded from the APE. Of the eight buildings that were identified as historical resources under the CEQA Guidelines, none were found to be affected by the project as proposed under Alternative A-1; since Alternative A-2 would limit physical changes between South Park View Street and San Vicente Boulevard, no impacts to the identified historical resources would occur under this alternative. Although an identified resource located at 1250 Federal Avenue (United States Army Reserve Center/Sadao Munemori Hall) is located immediately adjacent to where the widening would occur, the improvements proposed under Alternative A-1 would not have a direct or indirect impact on the historic resource. As a result, based on field observations and a review of the proposed improvements under Alternative A-1, modifications to the sidewalks adjacent to the eight historic resources would have no direct or indirect impact on the characteristics that qualify those resources for inclusion in the National Register or the California Register.

e. Reference—Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

3) Impact CR3: Impacts on Paleontological Resources.

a. Description of Project Impacts—Construction of the project under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would include surface changes to pavement, sidewalks, and/or curbs. However, there is little potential to affect previously undisturbed paleontological resources. In those instances where sidewalk widths would be reduced (under Alternative A-1 only), roadway base or curb lanes reconstructed, or turn pockets altered, the projected depths of subsurface work are anticipated to be very shallow with no excavation or disturbance of sub-grade below two feet. Given that the shallowest depth where significant fossil vertebrate remains may be encountered is six feet, it is anticipated that the proposed project would result in no direct or indirect impacts on paleontological resources.

b. Proposed Mitigation—None required.

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

☐ Significant  ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale—A thorough examination of paleontological locality and specimen data of the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum’s Vertebrate Paleontology Section reveal that several fossil vertebrate localities lie directly along the project route area, and there are other localities nearby that occur in the same sedimentary deposits as are exposed or occur at depth in the proposed project route area. Excavations in the older Quaternary deposits throughout the entire project route area, at depths as shallow as six feet, have a good chance of uncovering significant fossil vertebrate remains. Due to previous complications of encountering tar seepage during construction related activities in portions of the project corridor, the ground disturbance proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 is not anticipated to go beyond two feet below the surface. Therefore, no impacts would be anticipated to occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

e. Reference—Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4
7.4 Noise

1) Impact N1: Exposure to noise levels in excess of applicable standards and to substantial permanent increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity.

   a. Description of Project Impacts – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would increase noise temporarily along the corridor during construction. Noise during construction would primarily be generated from construction equipment. Although a less-than-significant impact would occur, noise control measures are recommended during construction to reduce the noise levels to the extent practicable in order to minimize the impact on nearby sensitive receptors. According to the traffic noise modeling results during project operation, the project would not cause an exceedance of City of Los Angeles or County of Los Angeles noise standards or materially worsen an existing standard violation. “With Project” noise levels in both the opening year and horizon year are predicted to decrease from what they would be “Without Project” at most locations, and increase only slightly in others. Therefore, traffic noise associated with the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would be considered a less-than-significant impact.

   b. Proposed Mitigation – Although construction noise impacts would be less than significant, construction noise could adversely affect nearby residents. However, the noise would be temporary and limited to the duration of the construction. Nonetheless, the following recommended measures may be incorporated into the project contract specifications to minimize construction noise impacts:

   N-1 To the extent applicable, practicable, and feasible, all noise-producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specification. Mobile or fixed “package” equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) may be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment.

   N-2 To the extent applicable, practicable, and feasible, electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment.

   N-3 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only.

   N-4 No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor.

   The noise control measures listed above would help in reducing the annoyance of high noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive land uses to the extent practicable during construction.
c. **Finding** – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

- [ ] Significant  
- ☒ Not Significant


d. **Rationale** – Under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, assuming an average noise level of 89 dBA (at 50 feet distance from roadway centerline) during excavation activities for roadway reconstruction of the curb lanes, noise levels would temporarily increase by more than 15 decibels from the typical ambient daytime noise levels measured in the project area. Under Alternative A-2, construction noise impacts would not occur west of the City of Beverly Hills since the bus lanes would only extend between South Park View Street and San Vicente Boulevard. However, noise impacts from Western Avenue to Fairfax Avenue would be extended from Western Avenue to San Vicente Boulevard and from Western Avenue to Hoover Street under Alternative A-2 due to the additional resurfacing/reconstruction of the curb lanes. Although the increases in noise levels would be substantial, the increases would be intermittent and temporary during daytime hours as permitted by the City’s Noise Ordinance (i.e., 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. during weekdays, and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays). Therefore, it is unlikely that significant impacts on noise-sensitive uses or activities would occur.

Under both Opening Year With Project conditions and under Horizon Year With Project conditions, predicted traffic noise levels during project operation would range from approximately 67 dBA CNEL to 71 dBA CNEL at selected locations along the Wilshire corridor at a distance of 75 feet.

e. **Reference** – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

2) **Impact N2: Exposure to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.**

a. **Description of Project Impacts** – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in groundborne vibration or groundborne noise impacts as a result of construction activities and projected operational conditions. Vibratory compactors or rollers, pile drivers and pavement breakers can generate perceptible vibration. Heavy trucks can also generate groundborne vibration, which vary depending on vehicle type, weight, and pavement conditions. With regards to operational impacts under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, groundborne vibration in the project vicinity would continue to be generated by vehicles traveling along the local roadways, as they do in the existing condition.

b. **Proposed Mitigation** – None required.

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

- [ ] Significant  
- ☒ Not Significant

d. **Rationale** – Vibration levels due to construction activity at nearby sensitive receptors would be temporary and would be well below the significance criteria of 0.2 inches per second Peak Particle Velocity; thus, construction vibration and groundborne noise impacts would be less than significant. Under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, groundborne vibration in the project vicinity would
continue to be generated by vehicles traveling along the local roadways, as they do in the existing condition.

For Alternative A-1, only the segments of the project corridor from Bonsall Avenue to Federal Avenue and from Federal Avenue to Barrington Avenue would result in a change in the distance from the nearest travel lanes to the adjacent land uses. There are no sensitive-receptors adjacent to the south side of Wilshire Boulevard between Sepulveda Boulevard and Federal Avenue. There are also no sensitive receptors adjacent to either side of Wilshire Boulevard between Federal Avenue and Barrington Avenue. Therefore, Alternative A-1 would result in less-than-significant operational vibration impacts, and no mitigation would be required.

For Alternative A-2, there would be no change in the distance from the nearest travel lanes to the adjacent land uses along the alignment. Therefore, Alternative A-2 would result in less-than-significant operational vibration impacts, and no mitigation would be required.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

7.5 Land Use

1) Impact LU1: Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses

a. Description of Project Impacts – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would include general improvements to portions of Wilshire Boulevard. Proposed improvements would include restriping of traffic lanes, as necessary; conversion of existing curb lanes to bus lanes in each direction during peak periods; upgrade of the existing transit signal priority system; selective street widening; reconstruction/resurfacing of curb lanes in select areas; and installation of traffic/transit signage and pavement markings, as necessary, to implement dedicated peak period bus lanes. The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not result in any impacts related to compatibility with surrounding land uses.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – No properties would be acquired, and no land use changes would occur under either Alternative A-1 or A-2. The project components described above would occur within the Wilshire Boulevard right-of-way. The existing transportation use of the corridor would remain under either Alternative A-1 or A-2. Therefore, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 is not anticipated to result in impacts related to incompatibility with surrounding land uses.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4
2) Impact LU2: Division of Existing Neighborhood

a. Description of Project Impacts – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would consist of dedicated weekday peak period bus lanes in both the eastbound and westbound directions to be achieved primarily through the conversion of existing curb lanes to peak period bus lanes. Throughout the corridor, Wilshire Boulevard is designated and zoned for transportation uses. As the project would be limited to within the public rights-of-way, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not result in an impact related to division of an existing neighborhood.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant     ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – All proposed improvements would occur along Wilshire Boulevard and would not divide neighborhoods located along the corridor. No impact is anticipated to occur under project implementation.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

3) Impact LU3: Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies

a. Description of Project Impacts – The project consists of dedicated weekday peak period bus lanes in both the eastbound and westbound directions to be achieved primarily through the conversion of existing curb lanes to peak period bus lanes. The project would also include the restriping and widening of some existing portions of the Wilshire corridor. However, it would not result in new land uses that would affect land use plans, policies, and regulations. The proposed project or either Alternative A-1 or A-2 is anticipated to be consistent with all the local, regional, state, and federal jurisdictions and their plans for the project area.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant     ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 is anticipated to be consistent with all the local, regional, state, and federal jurisdictions and their plans for the project area, including the Westlake Community Plan and Wilshire Community Plan. In addition, Alternative A-1 is also anticipated to be consistent with the Westwood Community Plan, West Los Angeles Community Plan Area, and Brentwood-Pacific Palisades Community Plan; Alternative A-2 would not extend into these community plan areas. Furthermore, the project would not conflict with any Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan goals or policies. Therefore, no impacts related to consistency are anticipated.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4
7.6 Aesthetics

1) Impact A1: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

a. Description of Project Impacts – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would convert existing curb lanes on Wilshire Boulevard to bus and right-turn only operation in the peak periods on weekdays. The project under either alternative would not include structures or other elements that would potentially obstruct views of far-off scenic features or structures and places that contribute to the visual character of the corridor, such as potentially historic or historically significant cultural resources. In addition, the jut-outs would not be removed between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue, and, therefore, no trees would be removed in this area.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant  ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – Alternative A-1 would involve the extension of the eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda Boulevard and street widening between Bonsall and Federal Avenues, which would affect the existing median, resulting in the removal of a number of small jacaranda trees. However, Alternative A-1 would comply with all local construction standards and guidelines, including design guidelines for roadways, streetscape, and landscaping. This alternative would not result in a substantial new amount of lighting, or shadow effects, along Wilshire Boulevard. Because this alternative involves a smaller project area and does not include the removal of jut-outs and street trees, fewer visual changes would occur than under the proposed project. Therefore, less-than-significant visual impacts would result under Alternative A-1.

Since Alternative A-2 would not involve any activities related to the implementation of bus lanes west of the City of Beverly Hills, no street widening or extension of the eastbound left-turn pocket at Sepulveda Boulevard would occur. Accordingly, this alternative would not affect the existing median or result in the removal of a number of small jacaranda trees. This alternative would comply with all local construction standards and guidelines, and as such, would not significantly affect the visual integrity of the surrounding neighborhood and streetscape/landscape along Wilshire Boulevard. Alternative A-2 would not result in a substantial new amount of lighting, or shadow effects, along Wilshire Boulevard. Because this alternative involves a smaller project area and does not include the removal of jut-outs and street trees, fewer visual changes would occur than under the proposed project. Therefore, less-than-significant visual impacts would result under Alternative A-2.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4
7.7 Biological Resources

1) Impact BR1: Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive or special-status species.

a. Description of Project Impacts – Project operation under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not create any new impacts related to ecologically sensitive areas and endangered species beyond existing conditions. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact related to sensitive or special status plant and animal species would occur.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – Implementation of the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, which would involve improvements to an existing transportation corridor already used by buses and other vehicles to create peak period curbside bus lanes to accommodate existing buses, would not create any new impacts to existing biological resources, including sensitive or special-status species, in the project corridor and vicinity.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

2) Impact BR2: Interfere with wildlife movement.

a. Description of Project Impacts – During project construction, there is a moderate potential for violation of the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and similar laws in the California Fish and Game Code protecting native birds, if any tree removal or other construction-related activities were to occur during the nesting season.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – Alternative A-1 would avoid impacts to existing street trees on the jut-out sidewalk areas between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue that have been identified as potential migratory bird nesting habitat. The segment of the proposed project, where an existing eastbound left-turn pocket would be extended and the street widened between Bonsall and Federal Avenues, would involve the removal of a maximum of 30 small jacaranda trees between I-405 and Federal Avenue. However, these trees are ornamental and would not provide suitable habitat for migratory birds. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur under Alternative A-1. Since the bus lanes under Alternative A-2 would only extend to San Vicente Boulevard, this alternative would avoid impacts to existing street trees on the jut-out sidewalk areas between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue that have been identified as potential migratory bird nesting habitat and
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3) Impact BR3: Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

a. Description of Project Impacts – Alternative A-1 would result in the removal of up to 30 small jacaranda trees between I-405 and Federal Avenue. This would potentially conflict with City of Los Angeles requirements for the preservation or replacement of street trees.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required

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

☐ Significant   ☑ Not Significant

d. Rationale – Under Alternative A-1, the segment of the project, where an existing eastbound left-turn pocket would be extended and the street widened between Bonsall and Federal Avenues, would involve the removal of a maximum of 30 small jacaranda trees between I-405 and Federal Avenue. However, these trees are ornamental and would not provide suitable habitat for migratory birds. Therefore, no impacts related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances would occur. Since the bus lanes under Alternative A-2 would only extend to San Vicente Boulevard, this alternative would avoid impacts to existing street trees on the jut-out sidewalk areas between Comstock Avenue and Malcolm Avenue that have been identified as potential migratory bird nesting habitat and to the small jacaranda trees in the existing median west of Sepulveda Boulevard. Therefore, no impacts related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances would occur.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

7.8 Construction

1) Impact C1: Have a substantial adverse effect on traffic circulation during project construction.

a. Description of Project Impacts – Construction vehicles would be used along the alignment to implement the project improvements identified above and would possibly impede traffic mobility in areas of construction. Traffic detours and truck routes would be required during construction. Traffic disruptions would likely occur and result in adverse effects to local traffic circulation.

b. Proposed Mitigation – Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-3 below would ensure that construction-related traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

C-1 The City and County of Los Angeles shall prepare a traffic management plan to facilitate the flow of traffic during construction. The plan shall include the following:
- Implement diversions/detours to facilitate traffic flow throughout the construction zones;
- Implement traffic control devices and flagmen/traffic officers, if possible, to maintain traffic flow throughout the construction zones; and
- Implement a public outreach/education program to inform the public about the planned construction process and encourage motorists to consider alternate travel routes.

C-2 The City and County of Los Angeles shall develop Worksite Traffic Control plans to accommodate required pedestrian and traffic movements. The plan shall include the following:

- Location of any roadway/lane or sidewalk closure;
- Traffic detours and haul routes;
- Hours of operation;
- Protective devices and warning signs; and
- Access to abutting properties.

C-3 The City and County of Los Angeles shall develop a Construction Phasing and Staging Plan to minimize the inconvenience to businesses and motorists within the construction zones. The plan shall control the impacts of construction in any segment by limiting the areas that may be constructed at a particular time.

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

- [X] Significant  □ Not Significant

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

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

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

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

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

- □ Significant  [X] Not Significant

d. Rationale – It is anticipated that construction work may temporarily reduce the capacity of, and cause delays to, the traffic flow along Wilshire Boulevard. The City and County of Los Angeles would be required to prepare and implement a
Traffic Management Plan that would best serve the mobility and safety needs of the motoring public, construction workers, businesses, and community, as well as facilitate the flow of automobile and pedestrian traffic during construction. The plan would consist of a temporary traffic control plan that addresses both the transportation operations and public information components. In order to minimize the traffic impacts to the extent possible, several mitigation measures will need to be implemented along the project corridor to help mitigate the temporary construction impact to traffic and the adjacent businesses. Some of these measures include traffic control devices and possibly flagmen and/or traffic officers, frequent street sweeping, and the implementation of diversions/detours to facilitate traffic flow throughout the construction zones. In addition, a Construction Phasing and Staging Plan would be required to control the impacts of construction in any segment by limiting the areas that may be constructed at a particular time. The goal of the construction phasing plan would be to maximize the work area under construction while minimizing the inconvenience to the businesses and motoring public. The project would be required to comply with the Holiday Moratorium, which prohibits construction work from November 15 through January 2.

A minimum of one-week advance notice would be provided to individual owners (businesses and residences), owner’s agents, and tenants of buildings adjacent to work-site before impairing access to those buildings and use of adjacent public ways or prohibiting stopping and parking of vehicles. Additionally, temporary special signs would be used to mitigate the effects of construction on businesses by informing customers that merchants and other businesses are open and to provide special access directions if warranted. A minimum 3-foot pedestrian access along sidewalks would be maintained at all times.

Public awareness strategies include various methods to educate and reach out to the public, businesses, and the community concerning the project and work zone. The public component piece of the Traffic Management Plan may include organizing and hosting project briefings for area residents, local workforce, commuters and business owners; consultation with area homeowner associations, neighborhood councils, and Business Improvement Districts (BID); responding to telephone calls and e-mails; design and distribution of a project brochure; issuing construction notices to inform public of construction schedules; attending weekly construction progress meetings and reporting community concerns; working closely with affected Council Districts, as well as the Mayor’s Los Angeles Business Team to mitigate concerns; issuing news releases to local media to inform public of traffic impacts: and, developing and managing a project website and/or telephone hotline.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

2) Impact C2: Exposure to air pollutant emissions during project construction.

a. Description of Project Impacts – Criteria pollutant emissions during project construction would result in a less-than-significant regional air quality impact.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.
c. **Finding** – The impact(s) prior to mitigation is/are found to be:

- [ ] Significant  
- [x] Not Significant

d. **Rationale** – Construction of the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 has the potential to create air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the project site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from demolition and construction activities. Mobile-source emissions, primarily NOx, would result from the use of construction equipment. However, criteria pollutant emissions would be less than the applicable SCAQMD significance thresholds, and as such, would result in a less-than-significant regional air quality impact.

e. **Reference** – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

3) **Impact C3**: Exposure to noise levels in excess of applicable standards during project construction.

a. **Description of Project Impacts** – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would increase noise temporarily along the corridor during construction. Noise during construction would primarily be generated from construction equipment. Although a less-than-significant impact would occur, noise control measures are recommended during construction to reduce the noise levels to the extent practicable in order to minimize the impact on nearby sensitive receptors.

b. **Proposed Mitigation** – Although construction noise would be temporary and limited to the duration of project construction, Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-4 identified in Section 7.4 above may be incorporated into the project contract specifications to minimize construction noise impacts. These noise control measures would help in reducing the annoyance of high noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive land uses to the extent practicable during construction.

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

- [ ] Significant  
- [x] Not Significant

d. **Rationale** – As discussed in Section 7.4 above, under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, assuming an average noise level of 89 dBA (at 50 feet distance from roadway centerline) during excavation activities for roadway reconstruction of the curb lanes, noise levels would temporarily increase by more than 15 decibels from the typical ambient daytime noise levels measured in the project area. Under Alternative A-2, construction noise impacts would not occur west of the City of Beverly Hills since the bus lanes would only extend between South Park View Street and San Vicente Boulevard. However, noise impacts from Western Avenue to Fairfax Avenue would be extended from Western Avenue to San Vicente Boulevard and from Western Avenue to Hoover Street under Alternative A-2 due to the additional resurfacing/reconstruction of the curb lanes. Although the increases in noise levels would be substantial, the increases would be intermittent and temporary during daytime hours as permitted by the City’s Noise Ordinance (i.e., 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. during weekdays, and 8:00 a.m. to
6:00 p.m. on Saturdays). Therefore, it is unlikely that significant impacts on noise-sensitive uses or activities would occur.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

4) Impact C4: Exposure to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during project construction.

a. Description of Project Impacts – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in groundborne vibration or groundborne noise impacts as a result of construction activities and projected operational conditions. Vibratory compactors or rollers, pile drivers and pavement breakers can generate perceptible vibration. Heavy trucks can also generate groundborne vibration, which vary depending on vehicle type, weight, and pavement conditions.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant  ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – Vibration levels due to construction activity at nearby sensitive receptors would be temporary and would be well below the significance criteria of 0.2 inches per second Peak Particle Velocity; thus, construction vibration and groundborne noise impacts would be less than significant.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4

7.9 Cumulative Effects

1) Impact CE1: Cumulative impacts related to traffic.

a. Description of Project Impacts – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in regionally beneficial cumulative impacts on traffic circulation. However, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would also result in cumulatively significant localized traffic impacts under CEQA.

b. Proposed Mitigation – Please refer to Mitigation Measure T-1 identified in Section 7.1 above.

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

☒ Significant  ☐ Not Significant

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

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

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

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

- Significant
- Not Significant

d. **Rationale** – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to the exceedance of LOS criteria for multiple intersections in both years 2012 and 2020. Under Alternative A-1, six intersections within the project study area are forecast to remain significantly affected under 2012 project conditions because no feasible mitigation measures could be identified. In addition, seven intersections are forecast to remain significantly affected under 2020 project conditions because no feasible mitigation measures could be identified. Under Alternative A-2, four intersections within the project study area are forecast to remain significantly affected under 2012 project conditions because no feasible mitigation measures could be identified. In addition, five intersections are forecast to remain significantly affected under 2020 project conditions because no feasible mitigation measures could be identified. As a result of the significant and unavoidable impacts to these local intersections, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would also result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts in terms of localized traffic circulation at these intersections.

e. **Reference** – Revised Final EIR/EA Section 6.1

2) **Impact CE2: Cumulative impacts related to air quality.**

a. **Description of Project Impacts** – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in cumulatively beneficial air quality impacts. Less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to criteria pollutants and GHGs would result.

b. **Proposed Mitigation** – Please refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 identified in Section 7.2 above.

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

- Significant
- Not Significant

d. **Rationale** – The implementation of public transit projects, such as the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, would enhance the efficiency of existing transit services and help to remove vehicles from roadways and freeways, decreasing the VMT and the usage of fuels. Lower automobile VMT corresponds to a reduction of criteria pollutant emissions from the vehicles. The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in a net cumulative beneficial effect to regional air quality resulting from the increased transit ridership and the anticipated reduction in automobile use.
The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would contribute to the implementation of the adopted Air Quality Management Plan. The SCAQMD's approach for assessing cumulative impacts is based on the AQMP forecasts of attainment of ambient air quality standards in accordance with the requirements of the federal and State Clean Air Acts. The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would be consistent with the AQMP, which is intended to bring the Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants.

In addition, the mass regional emissions calculated for the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not exceed applicable SCAQMD daily significance thresholds, which are designed to assist the region in attaining the applicable state and national ambient air quality standards. As such, cumulative impacts with respect to criteria pollutant emissions would be less than significant.

Moreover, the project as proposed under Alternatives A-1 and A-2 would serve to reduce GHG emissions, in comparison to existing conditions, by improving existing traffic circulation and relieving existing local congestion. Implementation of prescribed mitigation measures during construction would further reduce GHG emissions under either Alternative A-1 or A-2. As such, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not conflict with the State's goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Impacts relative to GHG emissions and climate change would be less than significant. Accordingly, the contribution of the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 to climate change/worldwide GHG emissions would be less than significant.

**e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Section 6.1**

3) **Impact CE3: Cumulative impacts related to cultural resources.**

a. **Description of Project Impacts** – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not require construction activities that would result in the potential for subsurface cultural resources to be disturbed. Accordingly, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in less-than-significant impacts.

b. **Proposed Mitigation** – None required.

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

- [ ] Significant
- [x] Not Significant

d. **Rationale** – No surficial prehistoric or historic archaeological sites or features were identified in the study area. Further, no impacts on historic properties or historical resources were identified. Therefore, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not contribute to cumulative impacts in these categories.

e. **Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Section 6.1**
4) **Impact CE4: Cumulative impacts related to noise.**
   
a. *Description of Project Impacts* – To implement the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, curb lanes would be repaired or reconstructed, where necessary, and restriped and signed as peak period bus lanes. In other areas, curbside bus lanes would be added as new lanes to Wilshire Boulevard by street widening. These project elements, however, would not require major construction work, and construction vibration and groundborne noise impacts would be less than significant.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – Please refer to Mitigation Measure N-1 through N-4 identified in Section 7.4 above.

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

   - [ ] Significant
   - [x] Not Significant

d. *Rationale* – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would increase noise temporarily along the corridor during construction. Noise during construction would primarily be generated from construction equipment. Although a less-than-significant impact would occur, noise control measures are recommended during construction to reduce the noise levels to the extent practicable in order to minimize the impact on nearby sensitive receptors. According to the traffic noise modeling results during project operation, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not cause an exceedance of City of Los Angeles or County of Los Angeles noise standards or materially worsen an existing standard violation and, as such, would not result in a significant cumulative noise impact.

e. *Reference* – Revised Final EIR/EA Section 6.1

5) **Impact CE5: Cumulative impacts related to land use.**
   
a. *Description of Project Impacts* – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would include general improvements to portions of Wilshire Boulevard. Proposed improvements under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would include restriping of traffic lanes, as necessary; conversion of existing curb lanes to bus lanes in each direction during peak periods; upgrade of the existing transit signal priority system; selective street widening; reconstruction/resurfacing of curb lanes in select areas; and installation of traffic/transit signage and pavement markings, as necessary, to implement dedicated peak period bus lanes. The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not result in any land use impacts.

b. *Proposed Mitigation* – None required.

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

   - [ ] Significant
   - [x] Not Significant

d. *Rationale* – A series of general improvements would be made to Wilshire Boulevard, including the conversion of existing curb lanes to bus lanes and the
upgrading of the existing transit signal priority system. These project elements, however, would not require major construction work. The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not result in divisions of existing communities or significant conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, regulation, habitat conservation plan, or natural community conservation plan. In addition, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not result in any land use compatibility conflicts, which could have the potential to result in significant changes to the existing land use pattern. Therefore, there are no cumulative impacts to local land use plans or policies resulting from the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Section 6.1

6) Impact CE6: Cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, particularly regarding the loss of trees.

a. Description of Project Impacts – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would convert existing curb lanes on Wilshire Boulevard to bus and right-turn only operation in the peak periods on weekdays. The segment of the proposed project, where an existing eastbound left-turn pocket would be extended and the street widened between Bonsall and Federal Avenues under Alternative A-1, would involve the removal of a maximum of 30 small jacaranda trees between I-405 and Federal Avenue. However, these trees are ornamental and would not provide suitable habitat for migratory birds. Since the bus lanes under Alternative A-2 would only extend to San Vicente Boulevard, this alternative would avoid impacts to the jacaranda trees in the existing median west of Sepulveda Boulevard.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant  ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – The proposed improvements under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would comply with all local construction standards and guidelines, including design guidelines for roadways, streetscape, and landscaping. This would ensure a less-than-significant cumulative impact would occur relative to potential impacts to the visual character of the project site.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Section 6.1

7) Impact CE7: Cumulative impacts related to biological resources, particularly regarding the loss of trees.

a. Description of Project Impacts – The segment of the proposed project, where an existing eastbound left-turn pocket would be extended and the street widened between Bonsall and Federal Avenues under Alternative A-1, would involve the removal of a maximum of 30 small jacaranda trees between I-405 and Federal Avenue. Since the bus lanes under Alternative A-2 would only extend to San Vicente Boulevard, this alternative would avoid impacts to the jacaranda trees in the existing median west of Sepulveda Boulevard.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant  ☐ Not Significant

d. Rationale – The proposed improvements under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would comply with all local construction standards and guidelines, including design guidelines for roadways, streetscape, and landscaping. This would ensure a less-than-significant cumulative impact would occur relative to potential impacts to the visual character of the project site.
b. **Proposed Mitigation** – None required.

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. **Rationale** – The jacaranda trees between Bonsall and Federal Avenues are ornamental and would not provide suitable habitat for migratory birds. Therefore, no cumulative impacts related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances would occur.

e. **Reference** – Revised Final EIR/EA Section 6.1

### 7.10 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources Effects

a. **Description of Project Impacts** – The construction and implementation of the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would entail the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of some energy and human resources, including labor required for the planning, design, construction and operation of the project.

b. **Proposed Mitigation** – None required.

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. **Rationale** – The construction and implementation of the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would entail the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of the following resources:

- Consumption of nonrenewable energy resources as a result of operation and maintenance of the proposed transportation improvements, even if energy rates do not exceed existing use rates;

- Commitment of natural resources during minor construction activities associated with the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, including the consumption of fossil fuels and the use of construction materials, and

- Removal of a maximum of 30 small jacaranda trees in the median of Wilshire Boulevard between I-405 and Federal Avenue during construction of the project under Alternative A-1. However, Alternative A-1 would comply with all local construction standards and guidelines, including design guidelines for roadways, streetscape, and landscaping to ensure that new street trees are planted, wherever feasible, to replace those removed during construction.

However, implementation of public transit improvement projects, such as the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, would help remove vehicles from roadways and freeways, easing the increase in vehicle miles...
traveled (VMT) and the usage of fuels. The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in less energy consumption and, as such, would result in a beneficial energy impact.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Section 6.3

7.11 Growth Inducement Effects

a. Description of Project Impacts – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would not spur new regional growth in terms of population or employment and would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

b. Proposed Mitigation – None required.

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

☐ Significant ☒ Not Significant

d. Rationale – The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 is a transportation enhancement project aimed at improving the efficiency of an existing transit system; it is not a significant new development project. In addition, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 involves minimal construction activities and is not anticipated to create a significant number of permanent jobs. Accordingly, the project would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

e. Reference – Revised Final EIR/EA Section 6.4

8.0 Statement of Overriding Considerations

This section provides the rationale to support a determination by LACMTA, as lead agency under CEQA, that the benefits of the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 outweigh the significant unavoidable environmental effects that have been anticipated to occur. This discussion, which is required by Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, is organized into two subsections. In the first subsection, the significant unavoidable effects are identified, and in the second subsection, the reasons in support of the determination are presented.

8.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would result in adverse traffic impacts that may not be avoided or mitigated. These significant unavoidable traffic impacts are identified below.

As discussed in Section 5.2.3 of the Revised Final EIR/EA, the following six intersections are forecast to remain significantly affected under 2012 project conditions under Alternative A-1 because no feasible mitigation measures that would fully reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels could be identified:
Los Angeles County Metropolitan
Transportation Authority
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- Bundy Drive/Wilshire Boulevard;
- Overland Avenue/Santa Monica Boulevard;
- Beverly Glen Boulevard/Santa Monica Boulevard;
- Westwood Boulevard/Pico Boulevard;
- Fairfax Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard; and
- La Brea Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard.

The following seven intersections are forecast to remain significantly affected under 2020 project conditions under Alternative A-1 because no feasible mitigation measures that would fully reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels could be identified:

- Veteran Avenue/Sunset Boulevard;
- Bundy Drive/Wilshire Boulevard;
- Overland Avenue/Santa Monica Boulevard;
- Westwood Boulevard/Pico Boulevard;
- Overland Avenue/Pico Boulevard;
- Fairfax Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard; and
- La Brea Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard.

As discussed in Section 5.2.4 of the Revised Final EIR/EA, the following five intersections are forecast to remain significantly affected under 2012 project conditions under Alternative A-2 because no feasible mitigation measures that would fully reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels could be identified:

- Veteran Avenue/Sunset Boulevard;
- Overland Avenue/Santa Monica Boulevard;
- Westwood Boulevard/Pico Boulevard;
- Fairfax Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard; and
- La Brea Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard.

The following three intersections are forecast to remain significantly affected under 2020 project conditions under Alternative A-2 because no feasible mitigation measures that would fully reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels could be identified:

- Overland Avenue/Pico Boulevard;
- Fairfax Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard; and
- La Brea Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard.

For Years 2012 and 2020, a total of eight intersections are forecast to remain significantly affected after mitigation under Alternative A-1, and a total of six intersections are forecast to remain significantly affected after mitigation under Alternative A-2. As a result of the significant and unavoidable impacts to these local intersections within the project study area, the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 would also result in significant
and unavoidable cumulative impacts in terms of localized traffic circulation at these intersections.

8.2 Determination

The LACMTA has determined that the overall benefits of the Wilshire BRT Project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 outweigh and override the significant unavoidable traffic impacts at the intersections identified above. It should be noted that most of the delays at the intersections would be 15 seconds or less, but because the intersections are already operating at unacceptable levels of service, the established local threshold is very low and triggers a significant local impact resulting from delays as low as 2.5 seconds. Under Alternative A-1, delays of over 15 seconds would occur at only 2 of the 74 intersections in 2012 and 2020 (Bundy Drive at Wilshire Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue at Wilshire Boulevard). Under Alternative A-2, a delay of over 15 seconds would occur at only 1 of the 74 intersections in 2012 and 2020 (Fairfax Avenue at Wilshire Boulevard).

As stated previously, the Revised Final EIR/EA determined the refinements to Alternative A, Alternatives A-1 and A-2, to be equally feasible. Also, the project, as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2, would only result in significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to localized traffic impacts at certain intersections. Alternative A-2 was identified as the environmentally superior alternative because it would have lesser overall impacts than Alternative A-1; however, Alternative A-1, would more fully meet the goals and objectives of the project and provide greater benefits than Alternative A-2. Accordingly, Alternative A-1 has been selected by the LACMTA Board as the preferred alternative.

The reasons supporting this determination are as follows:

- Bus lanes are a key attribute of Bus Rapid Transit. Bus lanes make transit usage more attractive by reducing transit travel times, increasing service reliability, and improving safety.

- The Wilshire BRT Project would improve bus passenger travel times by allowing buses to travel in dedicated peak-period bus lanes for the majority of the alignment between South Park View Street to the east and Centinela Avenue to the west.

- The Wilshire BRT Project would improve bus service reliability by separating buses from the already high levels of traffic congestion and intersection delays experienced along the corridor. By providing bus lanes during the peak periods when traffic is at its worst, travel times would remain relatively constant due to the bus lanes' separation from mixed-flow traffic.

- The Wilshire BRT Project would improve traffic flow along Wilshire Boulevard.

- Reconstruction of the curb lanes along damaged portions of Wilshire Boulevard would allow their effective use by buses during peak periods and by both buses and automobiles during non-peak periods to improve traffic flow along Wilshire Boulevard. This improvement would allow the curb lanes to be better utilized, help keep buses and autos moving along the corridor without the need to slow down significantly for large potholes, improve safety by reducing the need for vehicles to change lanes, avoid damage to transit vehicles and autos, and provide Metro riders with a much more pleasant transit.
experience. This improvement, in combination with the other project improvements, would assure the corridor’s immediate and long-term success as a major transit facility.

- The improved bus passenger travel times and bus service reliability would encourage a shift from automobile use to public transit by continuing to attract new transit riders.

- The Wilshire BRT Project would improve air quality in Los Angeles County with the reduction in mobile source emissions resulting from a mode shift from automobile use to bus use.

- Beyond the Wilshire corridor, the Wilshire BRT Project would be expected to result in a beneficial effect on traffic in the metropolitan Los Angeles, particularly within the Mid-City and Westside areas, through the increased efficiency and public utilization of the Wilshire BRT system.

- The Wilshire BRT Project would increase person-throughput with the implementation of bus lanes as compared to mixed-flow curb lanes. Currently, the curb lanes can carry a maximum of 800 cars per lane per hour. With the correct average occupancy of 1.32 persons per car, the existing total person throughput with cars is 1,056 persons per lane per hour. When converted to bus lanes, the curb lanes would carry approximately 30 buses per lane per hour. The average passenger load is approximately 50 persons per bus during peak hours for the popular Metro Rapid Lines 720 and Local Line 20 on Wilshire Boulevard. This would yield 1,500 persons per lane per hour for buses in each curbside bus lane. The person throughput with bus lanes (1,500) is, therefore, superior to that of mixed-flow lanes (1,056) during peak hours. This does not incorporate expected increases in bus ridership on Wilshire Boulevard after the bus lanes are implemented, which would further improve the bus lanes’ person throughput. Person throughput could potentially increase anywhere from 1,725 to 1,800 persons per lane per hour for buses in each curbside bus lane.

- The Wilshire BRT Project would improve safety by reducing merge conflicts between buses and mixed-flow vehicles and by reducing the two highest causes of accidents, which involve cars hitting buses while at a bus stop or while trying to get around them.

Therefore, despite localized traffic impacts, within the larger context of the Wilshire corridor and the City of Los Angeles, the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the project as proposed under either Alternative A-1 or A-2 outweigh its significant unavoidable environmental effects.