4.4 Communities and Neighborhoods

This section is based on and summarizes the information presented in the Community and Neighborhoods Impacts Report, which is included in Appendix J of this Draft EIS/EIR.

4.4.1 Regulatory Framework and Methodology

4.4.1.1 Regulatory Framework

The applicable federal, state, and local regulations that are relevant to an analysis of the proposed project's communities and neighborhoods impacts are listed below. For additional information regarding these regulations, please see the Communities and Neighborhoods Impacts Report in Appendix J of this Draft EIS/EIR.

Federal

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- Civil Rights Act
- Executive Order 12898
- Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act)

State

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- California Relocation Act

Local

- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
- SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan
- Metro Complete Streets Policy
- County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan
- City of Los Angeles Great Streets Initiative
- City of Los Angeles 2010 Bicycle Plan
- City of Los Angeles Housing and Community Development Five-Year Consolidated Plan 2013–2017
- City of Los Angeles Land Use/Transportation Policy
- City of Los Angeles General Plan
- City of Los Angeles Special Districts and Overlay Zones
- Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan
- City of Los Angeles Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Pacoima/Panorama City Earthquake Disaster Assistance Project

- City of San Fernando General Plan
- The San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan
- City of San Fernando Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Overlay Zone (Proposed)
- City of San Fernando Pacoima Wash Greenway Master Plan
- City of San Fernando Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan

4.4.1.2 Methodology

This analysis has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and NEPA. The following five steps were used to assess potential impacts from the project on the existing communities and neighborhoods in the project study area:

- Communities, neighborhoods, and special districts in the project study area were identified, described, and visually represented on a map of the project study area.
- Community issues and attitudes were described.
- Demographic information for the census tracts within the project study area was collected and compared to the demographics for the City and County of Los Angeles.
- Transportation facilities and policies were identified and described in the project study area.
- An assessment of the project's impacts on communities and neighborhoods was conducted.

The methodology for assessing the project's impacts on communities and neighborhoods was modeled after guidelines provided in *Community Impact Assessment: A Quick Reference for Transportation*, published by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.[1] The reference guide lists several impacts to address in a community impact assessment:

Mobility and Access Impacts

- Changes in access to public transportation, businesses, and community resources
- Changes in pedestrian and bicycle access
- Changes in emergency access

Social and Economic Impacts

- Population, business, and employment growth
- Displacement of housing and people
- Changes in community cohesion and interaction
- Changes in quality of life or social values
- Short-term economic impacts from construction

[1] U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. 1996. *Community Impact Assessment: A Quick Reference for Transportation.* September. Available: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/cia/quick_reference. Accessed: March 7, 2013.

Physical Impacts

- Changes in land use patterns
- Changes in aesthetic character
- Safety impacts and other physical intrusions (e.g., dust, noise, and odors)
- Physical division of communities

4.4.1.3 CEQA Significance Thresholds

CEQA requires state and local government agencies to identify the significant environmental effects of proposed actions; however, CEQA does not describe specific significance thresholds. According to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), significance thresholds for a given environmental effect are at the discretion of the lead agency and are the levels at which the lead agency finds the effects of the project to be significant.[2]

An economic or social change by itself is not to be considered a significant effect on the environment under CEQA; however, if a social or economic change results in a physical change, then social or economic changes may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant. Because the project would result in physical changes to the environment, it is appropriate to consider changes to community character and cohesion in assessing the significance of the project's effects.

State CEQA Guidelines

The State CEQA Guidelines define "significant effect on the environment" as: "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance" (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15382).[3]

The State CEQA Guidelines do not describe specific significance thresholds. However, Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines lists a variety of potentially significant effects, which are often used as thresholds or guidance in developing thresholds for determining impact significance. Accordingly, for the purposes of this DEIS/DEIR, a project would normally have a significant effect on communities and neighborhoods if the project would:

- Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.
- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

[2] OPR (State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research). 1994. *Thresholds of Significance: Criteria for Defining Environmental Significance.* September. Available: <http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/more/tas/Threshold.html>. Accessed: February 12, 2013.

[3] California Natural Resources Agency. 2010c. *State CEQA Guidelines, 14 CCR Section 15382.* Available: <http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/guidelines/art20.html>. Accessed: February 15, 2013.

- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
- Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.
- Physically divide an established community.

L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide

The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* for Transportation, Population and Housing, Population and Housing Displacement, Aesthetics, Hazards, Noise, Air Quality, and Land Use Compatibility, states that a determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors: [4]

Transportation

- The amount of pedestrian activity at project access points.
- Design features/physical configurations that affect the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists to drivers entering and exiting the site, and the visibility of cars to pedestrians and bicyclists.
- The type of bicycle facility the project driveway(s) crosses and the level of utilization.
- The physical conditions of the site and surrounding area, such as curves, slopes, walls, landscaping or other barriers, that could result in vehicle/pedestrian, vehicle/ bicycle or vehicle/vehicle impacts.

Population and Housing

- The degree to which the project would cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds project/planned levels for the year of project occupancy/buildout and result in an adverse physical change in the environment.
- Whether the project would introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan.
- The extent to which growth would result without implementation of the project.

Population and Housing Displacement

- The total number of residential units to be demolished, converted to market rate, or removed through other means as a result of the proposed project, in terms of net loss of market-rate and affordable units.
- The current and anticipated housing demand and supply of market rate and affordable housing units in the project area.

[4] City of Los Angeles. 2006. *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*. Available: <http://environmentla.com/programs/table_of_contents.htm>. Accessed: February 13, 2013.

- The land use and demographic characteristics of the project area and the appropriateness of housing in the area.
- Whether the project is consistent with adopted City and regional housing policies such as the Framework and Housing Elements, Housing and Urban Development Consolidated Plan and Comprehensive Housing Affordability Study policies, redevelopment plan, Rent Stabilization Ordinance, and the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Aesthetics

- The amount or relative proportion of existing features or elements that substantially contribute to the valued visual character or image of a neighborhood, community, or localized area, which would be removed, altered, or demolished.
- The degree of contrast between proposed features and existing features that represent the area's valued aesthetic image.
- The degree to which the project would contribute to the area's aesthetic value.

Hazards

- The degree to which the project may require a new, or interfere with an existing, emergency response or evacuation plan, and the severity of the consequences.

Noise

- Construction activities lasting more than one day would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 10 A-weighted decibels (dBA) or more at a noise sensitive use.
- Construction activities lasting more than 10 days in a 3-month period would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA or more at a noise sensitive use.
- Construction activities would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at a noise sensitive use between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Monday through Friday, before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturday, or anytime on Sunday.

Air Quality

The City of Los Angeles has not adopted specific citywide significance thresholds for air quality impacts.

Land Use Compatibility

- The extent of the area that would be impacted, the nature and degree of impacts, and the type of land uses within that area.
- The extent to which existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses would be disrupted, divided or isolated, and the duration of the disruptions, which may include the loss of housing, businesses, or community resources.
- The number, degree, and type of secondary impacts to surrounding land uses that could result from implementation of the project.

4.4.2 Affected Environment/Existing Conditions

4.4.2.1 Study Area and Regional Setting

Study Area

A project study area encompasses the area in which direct, and/or indirect effects associated with a project are likely to result. Ideally, the project study area should include all land, buildings, roadways, and transit facilities that could be directly and/or indirectly affected by a project. In addition, identification of areas using U.S. Census Bureau information and/or municipal boundaries helps to clearly define the demographic characteristics of communities that may be affected by a project. Other somewhat less measurable elements can be considered, including subdivisions, ethnic regions, or shopping areas that give residents a sense of belonging to their neighborhoods.

The project study area is located in the San Fernando Valley area of the City of Los Angeles (see Figure 4.4-1). The San Fernando Valley is an area with flat topography consisting of approximately 260 square miles, and is bounded by the Santa Susana Mountains to the northwest, the Simi Hills to the west, the Santa Monica Mountains and Chalk Hills to the south, the Verdugo Mountains to the east, and the San Gabriel Mountains to the northeast.

The project study area for the Communities and Neighborhoods impacts analyses is generally bounded by the San Diego Freeway (Interstate 405 [I-405]) to the west, the Ventura Freeway (US-101) to the south, Fulton Avenue and the Los Angeles River to the east, and the Foothill Freeway (Interstate 210 [I-210]) to the north. The project study area lies within the jurisdiction of both the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando. The project study area includes residential areas, local community resources, such as local transit stops, schools, parks, and shopping centers, and public facilities, such as the Van Nuys Civic Center.

Regional Areas

A project study area is often compared with the surrounding region in order to gain perspective and identify similarities, differences, and relationships between the two areas. Generally, a region is defined as the jurisdiction that is larger than, but includes, the project study area, although some circumstances may dictate deviations from this standard. For the purpose of this Community and Neighborhood Impacts section, two regional comparisons are used: the County of Los Angeles and the City of Los Angeles. The City of San Fernando was not included as a regional area because the project study area is larger than the City of San Fernando; therefore, the City of San Fernando would not meet the definition of a regional area (i.e., an area that is larger than and includes the project study area).

Figure 4.4-1: City of Los Angeles Community Planning Areas in the Study Area



Source: Esri, 2013; City of Los Angeles, 2013.

4.4.2.2 Community and Neighborhood Setting

City of Los Angeles Community Planning Areas (CPAs)

Each neighborhood in the City of Los Angeles is grouped with other neighborhoods and included in a City of Los Angeles CPA. Thirty-five separate CPAs were developed to guide land use and design policies within specific portions of the City of Los Angeles. Because these development guidelines define the existing and planned characteristics of neighborhood groups, their boundaries are an important factor when assessing cohesion within the neighborhoods they include. The CPAs that apply to the project study area, which are depicted in Figure 4.4-1, are as follows:

- Van Nuys – North Sherman Oaks Community Plan[5]
- Mission Hills – Panorama City – North Hills Community Plan[6]
- Arleta – Pacoima Community Plan[7]
- Sylmar Community Plan[8]

Neighborhoods

Several City of Los Angeles Certified Neighborhood Councils (neighborhoods) lie in or adjacent to the project area.[9] Some of the neighborhoods in the project study area have not yet been certified; however, their boundaries have been formally established and are used for the purposes of this report.

The neighborhoods are identifiable by signage posted throughout the project study area; these neighborhood designations contribute to community identity and overall cohesion. Within each neighborhood, areas of residential, commercial, industrial, religious, academic, and recreational uses are present. These land uses contribute to the cohesive layout of each individual neighborhood. The following neighborhoods are within the project study area and are shown in Figure 4.4-2:

- Sherman Oaks
- Valley Glen
- Van Nuys
- Panorama City
- North Hills East
- Arleta
- Mission Hills
- Pacoima
- Sylmar

In addition to these City of Los Angeles neighborhoods, the City of San Fernando is included in the project study area.

[5] City of Los Angeles. 1998b. *Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan*. Adopted September 9. Available: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/pdf/vnycptxt.pdf>. Accessed: February 13, 2013.

[6] City of Los Angeles. 1999. *Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills Community Plan*. Adopted June 9. Available: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/pdf/msscptxt.pdf>. Accessed: February 13, 2013.

[7] City of Los Angeles. 1996. *Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan*. Approved November 6. Available: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/pdf/arlcptxt.pdf>. Accessed: February 13, 2013.

[8] City of Los Angeles. 1997. *Sylmar Community Plan.* Adopted August 8. Available: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/pdf/sylcptxt.pdf>. Accessed: February 16, 2013.

[9] City of Los Angeles Department of Neighborhood Development. n.d. *Neighborhood Council Map.* Available <www.lacityneighborhoods.com/map.htm>. Accessed: February 11, 2013.

Figure 4.4-2: Neighborhoods in the Study Area



Source: Esri, 2013; City of Los Angeles, 2013.

Special Districts

Within the City of Los Angeles CPA boundaries and the City of San Fernando, there are several special districts. These special districts are typically in areas that offer shopping and transportation opportunities in a central location to surrounding residential developments. The special districts that are critical to measuring community cohesion within the project study area are listed below and depicted in Figure 4.4-3. It is important to note that not all special districts within the project study area are listed because their primary purpose is to provide development design guidelines. The guidelines are discussed separately in the Land Use Impacts Report.

The following special districts are located within the project study area:

- Van Nuys Auto Row Business Improvement District (BID)[10]
- Van Nuys CBD Special Planning Area (SPA)
- Van Nuys Central Business District (CBD) Community Design Overlay District (CDO)[11]
- Panorama City CDO[12]
- Panorama City BID[13]
- Pacoima CDO[14]
- San Fernando Corridors SPA
- Sylmar BID[15]

Targeted Neighborhood Initiatives (TNI)

Several TNIs are included in the project study area, as shown on Figure 4.4-3. These initiatives strategically revitalize Los Angeles neighborhoods through several community-driven neighborhood improvement programs, including transportation and pedestrian corridor improvements that provide street trees, street lights, benches, and bus shelters. There are four TNIs within the project study area:

- Van Nuys Boulevard TNI[16]
- Van Nuys TNI II[17]
- Pacoima Town Center TNI[18]
- Osborne Corridor TNI[19]

---

[10] City of Los Angeles. 2000. *Van Nuys Auto Row Business Improvement District*. March. Available: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/rproginfo/BID/bidmap/vnyauto.pdf>. Accessed: February 15, 2013.

[11] City of Los Angeles. 2004. *Van Nuys Central Business District Community Design Overlay District (CDO) Design Guidelines and Standards.* Revised August 16. Available: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/othrplan/pdf/vnycbdcdotxt.pdf>. Accessed: February 13, 2013.

[12] City of Los Angeles. 2003b. *Panorama City Community Design Overlay (CDO) Design Guidelines and Standards.* Approved March 27. Available: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/othrplan/pdf/PanoramaCityCDO_guidelines.pdf>. Accessed: February 15, 2013.

[13] City of Los Angeles. 2009. *Panorama City Business Improvement District*. Approved March.

[14] City of Los Angeles. 2003a. *Pacoima Community Design Overlay (CDO) Design Guidelines and Standards*. Approved May 22. Available: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/othrplan/pdf/PacoimaCDOGuidelines.pdf>. Accessed: February 13, 2013.

[15] Sylmar Chamber of Commerce. 2012. *The Vista at Sylmar.* Available: <http://www.sylmarchamber.com/sylmarbid.html>. Accessed: November 10, 2014.

[16] City of Los Angeles. 2002. *Van Nuys Boulevard Targeted Neighborhood Initiative (TNI)*. Available: <http://planning.lacity.org/complan/rproginfo/TNI/tniarea/vannuystni.htm>. Accessed: November 18, 2011.

[17] City of Los Angeles. 2001b. *Van Nuys Targeted Neighborhood Initiative (TNI II)*. Available: <http://planning.lacity.org/complan/rproginfo/TNI/tniarea/vannuys2.htm>. Accessed: February 13, 2013.

[18] City of Los Angeles. 1998a. *Pacoima Town Center Targeted Neighborhood Initiative.* Available: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/rproginfo/TNI/tnimap/tni-paco.pdf>. Accessed: February 13, 2013.

[19] City of Los Angeles. 2001a. *Osborne Corridor Targeted Neighborhood Initiative (TNI).* Available: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/rproginfo/TNI/tnimap/osborncor.pdf>. Accessed: February 14, 2013.

Figure 4.4-3: Special Districts, TNIs, and Special Zones in the Study Area

Source: Esri, 2013; City of Los Angeles, 2013.

Special Zones

There are two special zones within the project study area (see Figure 4.4-3):

- **Van Nuys Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ):** Within the Van Nuys HPOZ, lots are categorized by whether they have contributing features, non-contributing features, or if the parcel is undeveloped. The Van Nuys HPOZ Preservation Plan includes guidelines to preserve the historic character of the streetscape, including paving and curbs, signage, street furniture, utilities, street lights, and sidewalks.
- **Whiteman Airport Zone:** Whiteman Airport is outside of the project corridor, but is within the project study area, just 0.5 mile southeast of the project corridor; therefore, many parcels within the project study area fall within the Whiteman Airport Zone. To avoid the construction of hazards to air navigation, Los Angeles County's Aviation Division requests that parcels within this zone report projects to the department to ensure compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements.[20]

Businesses and Community Resources

Several businesses and community resources are located along the length of the project corridor, as discussed in the sections below.

Businesses and Shopping Centers

The following businesses and shopping centers are located in the project study area:

- **Van Nuys Boulevard**
  - Near Van Nuys Boulevard and Covello Street, there are variety of businesses, including night clubs, restaurants, pharmacies, and sporting goods stores.
  - Near Van Nuys Boulevard and Keswick Street, there are furniture stores, restaurants, body shops, and car washes.
  - Near Van Nuys Boulevard and Vesper Boulevard, there are several major businesses, including Wells Fargo, Chase, Denny's, IHOP, and Pep Boys.
  - Near Van Nuys Boulevard and Lev Avenue, businesses include car dealerships, markets, phone retailers, and clothing stores.
  - Near Van Nuys Boulevard and Haddon Avenue, there are a number of used car dealerships, restaurants, CitiBank, a pawn shop, discount stores, dentists and clinics, liquor stores, and body shops.
- **San Fernando Road**
  - Near San Fernando Road and Paxton Avenue, there is a shopping mall, Plaza Pacoima, which includes major businesses such as a Costco, Best Buy, Subway, Panda Express, and Wells Fargo. In addition, there are a number of car-related businesses, such as several used car dealerships, tire shops, a few mechanics, and a car accessory shop. Other businesses include a family pool hall, a market, a uniform and safety supply shop, and a towing business.

[20] City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. 2011. *Zoning Information File #2418*. Effective July 25.

- Near San Fernando Road and San Fernando Mission Boulevard, there is the San Fernando Mall, which includes several businesses such as clothing stores, a party supply store, a few eateries, a night club, jewelry stores, bridal shops, beauty salons, a dentist, and a T-Mobile and Verizon retailer.
- Near San Fernando Road and Paddock Street, there are several small shopping centers that include a variety of businesses, such as restaurants, a meat market, a beauty salon, and a barber shop.

- **Truman Street**
  - Near Truman Street and San Fernando Mission Boulevard, there is a shopping center, Mission Plaza, which contains a number of different restaurants, such as El Pollo Loco, IHOP, Starbucks, and Menchie's Frozen Yogurt, as well as a gym, a shoe store, several clothing stores, and an AT&T retailer.

Schools

Los Angeles Unified School District

Public educational services in the project study area are provided by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The LAUSD comprises eight local districts with 219 year-round schools and 439 schools on the traditional school calendar (with a summer break). For some school facilities, the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks has a joint use agreement with LAUSD, which allows use of recreational facilities after school hours. In addition, the LAUSD issues Civic Center permits that allow public use of school facilities for supervised not-for-profit recreational activities, meetings, and public discussions during non-school hours.

The following schools are located in the project study area and illustrated in the figures in the Parklands and Community Facilitates Impacts Report:

Elementary Schools

- Van Nuys Elementary School, serving 550 students, 6464 Sylmar Avenue, Van Nuys;
- Burton Street Elementary School, serving 690 students, 8111 Calhoun Avenue, Panorama City;
- Panorama City Elementary School, serving 761 students, 8600 Kester Avenue, Panorama City;
- Primary Academy for Success, serving 300 students, 9075 Willis Avenue, Panorama City;
- Liggett Street Elementary School, serving 786 students, 9373 Moonbeam Avenue, Panorama City;
- Beachy Avenue Elementary School, serving 645 students, 9757 Beachy Avenue, Arleta;
- Sharp Avenue Elementary School, serving 900 students, 13800 Pierce Street, Arleta;
- Telfair Avenue Elementary School, serving 1,100 students, 10975 Telfair Avenue, Pacoima;
- Osceola Elementary School, serving 450 students, 14940 Osceola Street, Sylmar; and
- Dyer Street Elementary School, serving 830 students, 14500 Dyer Street, Sylmar.

Middle Schools

- Pacoima Middle School, serving 1,600 students, 9919 Laurel Canyon Boulevard, Pacoima; and
- San Fernando Valley Middle School, serving 1,553 students, 130 North Brand Boulevard, San Fernando.

High Schools

- Van Nuys High School, serving 2,946 students, 6535 Cedros Avenue, Van Nuys;
- Will Rogers Continuation High School, serving 160 students, 14711 Gilmore Street, Van Nuys;
- Panorama High School, serving 2,210 students, 8015 Van Nuys Boulevard, Panorama City; and
- Arleta High School, serving 2,000 students, 14200 Van Nuys Boulevard, Pacoima.

Other Schools

- Pacoima Skills Center (adult), 13545 Van Nuys Boulevard, Pacoima.

Private Educational Facilities

In addition to public school facilities in the project study area, there are several other private educational facilities. The following schools are in the project study area and illustrated in the figures in the Parklands and Community Facilitates Impacts Report:

Elementary Schools

- Ararat Charter School, serving 312 students, 6555 Sylmar Avenue and 13400 Erwin Street, Van Nuys;
- Saint Ferdinand's School (preschool–8th), serving 266 students, 1012 Coronel Street, San Fernando; and
- Santa Rosa School (preschool–8th), serving 248 students, 668 S. Workman Street, San Fernando.

Middle Schools

- Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy, serving 210 students, 1218 North 4th Street, San Fernando.

High Schools

- Champs Charter High School (of the arts), serving 910 students, 6952 Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys;
- Soledad Enrichment School (charter), number of students unavailable, 13452 Van Nuys Boulevard, Pacoima; and
- Lakeview Charter Academy, serving 215 students, 1445 Celis Street, San Fernando.

Other Schools

- Los Angeles ORT College, 14519 Sylvan Street, Van Nuys; and
- American Nursing School, 14545 Victory Boulevard, Van Nuys.

Libraries

City of Los Angeles Public Library System

The majority of the project study area is serviced by branches of the LAPL system. The LAPL comprises six service areas, including the Central Southern Area, the Northeast Area, the East Valley Area, the West Valley Area, the Hollywood Area, and the Western Area. The project study area is in the limits of the East Valley Area.

The following City of Los Angeles libraries are in the project study area and illustrated in the figures in the Parklands and Community Facilitates Impacts Report:

- Van Nuys Branch Library, 6250 Sylmar Avenue, Van Nuys;
- Panorama City Branch Library, 14345 Roscoe Boulevard, Panorama City; and
- Pacoima Branch Library, 13605 Van Nuys Boulevard, Pacoima.

County of Los Angeles Public Library System

The City of San Fernando is serviced by the County of Los Angeles Public Library System. This county system provides service to unincorporated areas and 51 of the 88 cities of the County of Los Angeles. There is one county branch located in the project study area, as illustrated in the figures in the Parklands and Community Facilitates Impacts Report:

- San Fernando Branch Library, 217 North Maclay Avenue, San Fernando.

Religious Facilities

The following religious facilities are in the project study area and illustrated in the figures in the Parklands and Community Facilitates Impacts Report:

- Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses, 14659 Erwin Street, Van Nuys;
- Iglesia De Dios Fuente, 14520 Friar Street, Van Nuys;
- First Presbyterian Church of Van Nuys, 14701 Friar Street, Van Nuys;
- Central Lutheran Church of Van Nuys, 6425 Tyrone Ave, Van Nuys;
- Christian Science Church, 14654 Hamlin Street, Van Nuys;
- Faith Compassion Ministry, 6518 Cedros Avenue, Van Nuys;
- God Answers Prayer Ministry, 14541 Hamlin Street, Van Nuys;
- Church of the Valley, 6565 Vesper Avenue, Van Nuys;
- Saint Elizabeth's Church, 6635 Tobias Avenue, Van Nuys;
- Kingdom of Jesus Christ, 14424 Vanowen Street, Van Nuys;
- First Lutheran Church, 6952 Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys;
- Church on the Way, 6952 Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys;
- Mark's Episcopal Church, 14646 Sherman Way, Van Nuys;
- Seventh-Day Adventist Church, 14615 Sherman Way, Van Nuys;
- Van Nuys Church of Christ, 14655 Sherman Way, Van Nuys;
- Sunrise Japanese Foursquare Church, 14705 Wyandotte Street, Van Nuys;
- Panorama Presbyterian Church, 14201 Roscoe Boulevard, Panorama City;
- Imam Bukhari Masjid, 8741 Van Nuys Boulevard, Panorama City;
- San Fernando Valley Interfaith, 14555 Osborne Street, Panorama City;
- Panorama SDA Church, 14517 Osborne Street, Panorama City;
- Panorama City Four Square Church, 14320 Nordhoff Street, Panorama City;

- Iglesia Ni Cristo (Church of Christ), 14308 Nordhoff St, Panorama City;
- Valley Church, 14301 Nordhoff Street, Panorama City;
- Ministerios Rhema Inc., 14246 Nordhoff Street, Panorama City;
- Universal Church, 9110 Van Nuys Boulevard, Panorama City;
- Iglesia Del Nazareno, 9260 Van Nuys Boulevard, Panorama City;
- Iglesia De Restauracion, 9936 Beachy Avenue, Arleta;
- Bible Baptist Church, 14101 Van Nuys Boulevard, Arleta;
- San Fernando Valley Southern Baptist, 10135 Arleta Avenue, Arleta;
- Greater Missionary Baptist Church, 13451 Vaughn Street, San Fernando;
- St. Alphonsa Syro-Malabar Catholic Church, 607 4th Street, San Fernando;
- First Church of Christ, 606 Chatsworth Drive, San Fernando ;
- Living Hope Community Church, 214 N Maclay Avenue, San Fernando;
- Saint Ferdinand Church, 1109 Coronel Street, San Fernando;
- Park Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church, 1102 4th Street, San Fernando ;
- Calvary United Pentecostal Church, 1119 3rd Street, San Fernando;
- Lighthouse Christian Center, 1231 1st Street, San Fernando;
- Church of the Nazarene, 1420 4th Street, San Fernando;
- Liberty Missionary Baptist Church, 511 North Workman Street, San Fernando ;
- Santa Rosa Catholic Church, 668 Workman Street, San Fernando; and
- First Baptist Church of San Fernando, 215 Macneil Street, San Fernando.

Hospitals and Medical Facilities

The following hospitals and medical facilities are located in the project study area and illustrated in the figures in the Parklands and Community Facilitates Impacts Report:

- San Fernando Valley Community Mental Health Center, 14660 Oxnard Street, Van Nuys;
- Valley Community Counseling, 6201 Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys;
- Expert Care Health Group, 14532 Friar Street, Van Nuys;
- Victoria Medical Clinic, 14614 Victory Boulevard, Van Nuys;
- Family Medical Center, 14547 Victory Boulevard, Van Nuys;
- Cedars Health Clinic, 14649 Victory Boulevard, Van Nuys;
- Northeast Valley Health Corporation, 6551 Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys;
- University Medical Care, 14600 Sherman Way #100, Van Nuys;
- Kidney Center of Van Nuys, 14624 West Sherman Way, Van Nuys;
- Mission Community Hospital, 14860 Roscoe Boulevard, Panorama City;
- Clinica Latino Americano, 8727 Van Nuys Boulevard, Panorama City;

- UCLA Early Head Start, 14423 Van Nuys Boulevard, Arleta;
- San Fernando Acupuncture Clinic, 820 San Fernando Road, San Fernando;
- Valley Family Center, 302 South Brand Boulevard, San Fernando;
- San Fernando Dental Center, 125 South Brand Boulevard, San Fernando;
- San Fernando Medical Center, 501 North Maclay Avenue, San Fernando;
- Aurora Medical Center, 405 North Maclay Avenue, San Fernando;
- Maya Chiropractic Center, 321 N Maclay Avenue, San Fernando Valley;
- Western Dental Center, 1101 Truman Street, San Fernando;
- Valley Care San Fernando Clinic, 1212 Pico Street, San Fernando;
- Santa Maria Dental Center, 1230 San Fernando Road, San Fernando; and
- Northeast Valley Health Corporation, 1600 San Fernando Road, San Fernando.

Community Issues and Concerns

Community Outreach Meetings

A series of community outreach meetings were held in order to gauge community concerns and potential issues that could arise within the project study area. Mobility, access, and traffic issues and concerns related to community and neighborhood impacts were expressed (please see the Community and Neighborhood Impacts Report in Appendix J for further details on these issues).

Outreach to the community, through public scoping meetings and other methods, will continue throughout the environmental review process. Community input is critical in assessing potential issues within the project study area; therefore, any additional information that is made available from future community outreach efforts will be taken into consideration in project development.

City of Los Angeles Community Plans

In addition to community outreach efforts, issues and opportunities have been identified in City of Los Angeles community plan documents for each respective CPA (see the Community and Neighborhood Impacts Report in Appendix J for further details on these issues). The initial formation of these community plans involved community members who helped identify and define the needs, desires, resources, and unique nature of their communities. For this reason, the topics in the plans indicate what the citizens of each CPA value within their communities.

The City of San Fernando General Plan also contains information related to community issues.[21] A primary focus of the general plan is to involve a citizen's advisory committee to examine issues and patterns within the City of San Fernando limits.

[21] City of San Fernando. 1987. *City of San Fernando Revised General Plan.* Prepared by Castaneda & Associates. Available: <http://www.ci.san-fernando.ca.us/city_government/departments/comdev/forms_docs/General%20Plan%20-%20Complete.pdf>. Accessed: February 21, 2013.

4.4.2.3 Demographics

The discussion and tables/figures included in this section are based on the 2000 Census, 2010 Census, and 2006–2010 American Community Survey and intended to provide a thorough overview of the project study area characteristics compared to the City and County of Los Angeles. More detailed discussion of the content in the tables and figures is provided in the Community and Neighborhood Impacts Report, included as Appendix J to this DEIS/DEIR.

The official census is taken every 10 years, so the next census is scheduled for 2020. However, to validate the 2010 information with the most recent demographic information available, the 2010 information was checked for changes using 2016 estimates of population provided by SCAG or the U.S. Census Bureau. A spot check review of this data showed that for the total study area, the population changes were relatively small at 1.9 percent over the 2010-2016 period, compared to 6 percent for the 2000–2010 period. Los Angeles County by comparison shows very minor changes (3.2 percent population increase in 2016, compared to 3.1 in 2010), while the City of Los Angeles shows a 4.8 percent increase in population in 2016, compared to a 2.7 percent change in 2010.

Given the very minor changes in population estimates (ranging from 0.1 percent to 4.8 percent) in the study area, City, and County, the data below is still representative of the general demographic conditions in the project study area.

Table 4.4-1: Population Change (2000 to 2010)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent Change	Number	Percent Change	Number	Percent Change
Total Population 2000	419,075	N/A	3,694,686	N/A	9,519,338	N/A
Total Population 2010	444,378	6.0	3,792,621	2.7	9,818,605	3.1

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000; 2010b

Table 4.4-2: Racial and Ethnic Characteristics (2000)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population
Total Population	419,075	100.0	3,694,820	100.0	9,519,338	100.0
White (NH)	82,735	19.7	1,099,188	29.7	2,959,614	31.1
African American (NH)	18,818	4.5	401,986	10.9	901,472	9.5
American Indian/ Alaska Native (NH)	1,112	0.3	8,897	0.2	25,609	0.3
Asian (NH)	27,441	6.5	364,850	9.9	1,124,569	11.8
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander (NH)	376	0.1	4,484	0.1	23,265	0.2
Some Other Race	673	0.2	9,065	0.2	19,935	0.2
Two or More Races	7,872	1.9	87,277	2.4	222,661	2.3
Hispanic or Latino*	280,049	66.8	1,719,073	46.5	4,242,213	44.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000
* Because Hispanic or Latino populations are reported as an ethnic group and calculated as a percentage of all races, there is a slight margin of error. Total numbers may not always add up to 100 percent of the total population.

Table 4.4-3: Racial and Ethnic Characteristics (2010)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population
Total Population	444,378	100.0	3,792,621	100.0	9,818,605	100.0
White (NH)	71,259	16.0	1,086,908	28.7	2,728,321	27.8
African American (NH)	15,420	3.5	347,380	9.2	815,086	8.3
American Indian/ Alaska Native (NH)	785	0.2	6,589	0.2	18,886	0.2
Asian (NH)	31,662	7.1	420,212	11.1	1,325,671	13.5
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander (NH)	378	0.1	4,300	0.1	22,464	0.2
Some Other Race	1,186	0.3	12,057	0.3	25,367	0.3
Two or More Races	5,152	1.2	76,353	2.0	194,921	2.0
Hispanic or Latino*	318,536	71.7	1,838,822	48.5	4,687,889	47.7

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b
* Because Hispanic or Latino populations are reported as an ethnic group and calculated as a percentage of all races, there is a slight margin of error. Total numbers may not always add up to 100 percent of the total population.

Table 4.4-4: Age Characteristics (2000)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population
Total Population	419,075	100.0	3,694,820	100.0	9,519,338	100.0
Under 19 Years	146,481	35.0	1,091,049	29.5	2,946,796	31.0
20 to 34 Years	110,104	26.3	974,004	26.4	2,283,559	24.0
35 to 64 Years	130,801	31.2	1,272,638	34.4	3,362,310	35.3
65 Years +	31,689	7.6	357,129	9.7	926,673	9.7

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Table 4.4-5: Age Characteristics (2010)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population
Total Population	444,378	100.0	3,792,621	100.0	9,818,605	100.0
Under 19 Years	138,990	31.3	994,460	26.2	2,711,958	27.6
20 to 34 Years	108,875	24.5	953,443	25.1	2,228,519	22.7
35 to 64 Years	159,937	36.0	1,448,022	38.2	3,812,429	38.8
65 Years +	36,576	8.2	396,696	10.5	1,065,699	10.9

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b

Table 4.4-6: Sex Characteristics (2000)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population
Total Population	419,075	100.0	3,694,820	100.0	9,519,338	100.0
Male	210,811	50.3	1,841,805	49.8	4,704,105	49.4
Female	208,264	49.7	1,853,015	50.2	4,815,233	50.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Table 4.4-7: Sex Characteristics (2010)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population
Total Population	444,378	100.0	3,792,621	100.0	9,818,605	100.0
Male	222,474	50.1	1,889,064	49.8	4,839,654	49.3
Female	221,904	49.9	1,903,557	50.2	4,978,951	50.7

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b

Table 4.4-8: Median Household Income (2000)

	Study Area	City of Los Angeles	County of Los Angeles
Median Household Income in the Past 12 Months*	$39,727	$36,687	$42,189

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000
* Census question asks for income in the past 12 months of the year taken, in this case, 2000.

Table 4.4-9: Median Household Income (2010)

	Study Area	City of Los Angeles	County of Los Angeles
Median Household Income in the Past 12 Months*	$48,706	$49,138	$55,476

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010a
* Census question asks for income in the past 12 months of the year taken, in this case, 2010.

Table 4.4-10: Housing Units (2000)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Housing Units	Number	Percent of Housing Units	Number	Percent of Housing Units
Total Housing Units	122,204	100.0	1,337,706	100.0	3,270,909	100.0
Occupied Units	118,353	96.8	1,275,412	95.3	3,133,774	95.8
Vacant Units	3,850	3.2	62,294	4.7	137,135	4.2
	Number	Percent of Occupied Units	Number	Percent of Occupied Units	Number	Percent of Occupied Units
Owner-Occupied	53,076	44.8	491,882	38.6	1,499,744	47.9
Renter-Occupied	65,278	55.2	783,530	61.4	1,634,030	52.1

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Table 4.4-11: Housing Units (2010)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Housing Units	Number	Percent of Housing Units	Number	Percent of Housing Units
Total Housing Units	131,012	100.0	1,413,995	100.0	3,445,076	100.0
Occupied Units	123,381	94.2	1,318,168	93.2	3,241,204	94.1
Vacant Units	7,631	5.8	95,827	6.8	203,872	5.9
	Number	Percent of Occupied Units	Number	Percent of Occupied Units	Number	Percent of Occupied Units
Owner-Occupied	53,201	40.6	503,863	38.2	1,544,749	47.7
Renter-Occupied	70,179	53.6	814,305	61.8	1,696,455	52.3

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b

Table 4.4-12: Household Size (2000)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Households	Number	Percent of Households	Number	Percent of Households
Total Households	118,353	100.0	1,275,412	100.0	3,133,774	100.0
1-Person Households	22,567	19.1	363,457	28.5	771,854	24.6
2-Person Households	25,131	21.2	339,493	26.6	820,368	26.2
3-Person Households	18,637	15.7	190,933	15.0	494,369	15.8
4-Person Households	19,143	16.2	167,395	13.1	465,159	14.8
5-Person Households	13,777	11.6	100,303	7.9	277,327	8.8
6-Person Households	8,313	7.0	53,993	4.2	146,730	4.7
7+-Person Households	10,765	9.1	59,838	4.7	157,967	5.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Table 4.4-13: Household Size (2010)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Households	Number	Percent of Households	Number	Percent of Households
Total Households	128,586	100.0	1,318,168	100.0	3,241,204	100.0
1-Person Households	23,231	18.1	373,529	28.3	784,928	24.2
2-Person Households	26,751	20.8	356,194	27.0	853,003	26.3
3-Person Households	20,679	16.1	200,443	15.2	526,937	16.3
4-Person Households	21,336	16.6	174,043	13.2	486,027	15.0
5-Person Households	15,497	12.1	101,385	7.7	283,566	8.8
6-Person Households	8,837	6.9	52,087	4.0	144,956	4.5
7+-Person Households	12,254	9.5	60,487	4.6	161,787	5.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b

Table 4.4-14: Mode of Transportation to Work (2000)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Estimated Workers	Number	Percent of Estimated Workers	Number	Percent of Estimated Workers
Total Estimated Workers	156,400	100.0	1,494,895	100.0	3,858,750	100.0
Car, Truck, or Van (alone)	98,751	63.1	982,735	65.7	2,714,944	70.4
Car, Truck, or Van (carpool)	32,255	20.6	220,408	14.7	582,020	15.1
Public Transportation (excludes taxis)	12,881	8.2	150,697	10.1	250,834	6.5
Bicycle	802	0.5	9,052	0.6	24,015	0.6
Taxi, Motorcycle, Other	2,782	1.8	53,386	3.6	113,004	2.9
Walk	4,413	2.8	16,922	1.1	39,290	1.0
Work at Home	4,515	2.9	61,695	4.1	134,643	3.5

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Table 4.4-15: Mode of Transportation to Work (2010)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Estimated Workers	Number	Percent of Estimated Workers	Number	Percent of Estimated Workers
Total Estimated Workers	192,413	100.0	1,747,957	100.0	4,399,339	100.0
Car, Truck, or Van (alone)	131,142	68.2	1,175,818	67.3	3,173,055	72.1
Car, Truck, or Van (carpool)	32,218	16.7	188,666	10.8	497,964	11.3
Public Transportation (excludes taxis)	15,315	8.0	192,261	11.0	311,701	7.1
Bicycle	989	0.5	14,710	0.8	32,423	0.7
Taxi, Motorcycle, Other	2,052	1.1	24,630	1.4	57,930	1.3
Walk	4,409	2.3	61,811	3.5	125,816	2.9
Work at Home	6,290	3.3	90,061	5.2	200,450	4.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010a

Table 4.4-16: Transportation Dependency by Age (2000)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population
Total Population	419,075	100.0	3,694,820	100.0	9,519,338	100.0
Under 5 Years (not dependent)	39,453	9.4	285,976	7.7	737,631	7.7
5 to 17 Years (dependent)	93,905	22.4	695,335	18.8	1,930,345	20.3
18 to 64 Years (not dependent)	254,028	60.6	2,356,380	63.8	5,924,689	62.2
65 Years + (dependent)	31,689	7.6	357,129	9.7	926,673	9.7
Total Dependent Population	125,594	30.0	1,052,464	28.5	2,857,018	30.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Table 4.4-17: Transportation Dependency by Age (2010)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population	Number	Percent of Population
Total Population	444,378	100.0	3,792,621	100.0	9,818,605	100.0
Under 5 Years (not dependent)	35,548	8.0	251,097	6.6	645,793	6.6
5 to 17 Years (dependent)	88,696	20.0	623,428	16.4	1,756,415	17.9
18 to 64 Years (not dependent)	283,558	63.8	2,521,400	66.5	6,350,698	64.7
65 Years + (dependent)	36,576	8.2	396,696	10.5	1,065,699	10.9
Total Dependent Population	125,272	28.2	1,020,124	26.9	2,822,114	28.7

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b

Table 4.4-18: Transportation Dependency by Vehicle Ownership (2000)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Estimated Households	Number	Percent of Estimated Households	Number	Percent of Estimated Households
Total Estimated Households	118,321	100.0	1,337,668	100.0	3,270,909	100.0
No Vehicle Available	15,254	12.9	210,770	15.8	393,309	12.0
1 or More Vehicles	103,067	87.1	1,064,588	79.6	2,740,465	83.8

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

Table 4.4-19: Transportation Dependency by Vehicle Ownership (2010)

	Study Area		City of Los Angeles		County of Los Angeles	
	Number	Percent of Individuals over Age 16	Number	Percent of Individuals over Age 16	Number	Percent of Individuals over Age 16
Total Individuals over Age 16	190,521	100.0	1,726,583	100.0	4,355,343	100.0
No Vehicle Available	9,737	5.1	126,225	7.3	207,074	4.8
1 or More Vehicles	180,784	94.9	1,600,358	92.7	4,148,269	95.2

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010a

Figure 4.4-4: Median Household Income in the Study Area



Source: Esri, 2013; U.S. Census Bureau 2010

Figure 4.4-5: Transportation Dependency by Age in the Study Area



Source: Esri, 2013; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b

4.4.2.4 Transportation Facilities and Policies

Highway Facilities

Several main highway facilities border and traverse the project study area, including the U.S. 101, I-405, I-5, SR-118, and the I-210 freeways. The SR-170 freeway is approximately two miles to the east of the project study area. Highway facilities may serve to naturally delineate community areas or create boundaries. Highway facilities in the project study area provide regional access to and from Van Nuys Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, San Fernando Road, and the transit facilities within the project corridor.

Public Transportation

The project study area also includes several mass-transit service facilities used by local populations, including:

- Van Nuys Boulevard Metro Rapid Bus
- Sepulveda Boulevard Metro Rapid Bus
- San Fernando Road Metro Rapid Bus
- Metro Orange Line
- Metrolink service to the Van Nuys station on the Ventura county Line
- Metrolink service to the Sylmar/San Fernando station on the Antelope Valley line
- Amtrak service between Santa Barbara/San Luis Obispo and Los Angeles Union Station/San Diego

Many of the transit routes have a direct relationship with the project study area because they cross over Van Nuys Boulevard or San Fernando Road, or they include stations along the project corridor.

Transportation Development Policies

According to the City of Los Angeles General Plan, transportation improvements within the greater Los Angeles area are focused on re-working the existing system, and transitioning to a more transit-based system that will encourage transit-oriented development and improve area circulation and health for area residents. Van Nuys Boulevard, in conjunction with other roadways within the project corridor, is part of a larger traffic congestion-relief plan for public transportation within the project study area and within the region.

4.4.3 Environmental Consequences, Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.4.3.1 No-Build Alternative

Construction Impacts

The No-Build Alternative would not involve new transportation or infrastructure improvements beyond those projects currently under construction or projects that are funded for future construction. Therefore, the No-Build Alternative would result in no construction impacts on communities and neighborhoods.

Operational Impacts

Mobility and Access Impacts

The No-Build Alternative does not include any transportation or other proposed improvements, and therefore would not result in changes to existing mobility and access in the project study area. This alternative would not involve any new transportation infrastructure, construction, or major service changes beyond what is identified in Metro's 2009 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS. Existing Metro Rapid and local bus service would continue to operate along the project corridor and existing or planned pedestrian and bicycle projects would continue to be implemented on Van Nuys Boulevard and connecting east/west facilities. Therefore, the No-Build Alternative would not result in changes to existing or planned pedestrian and bicycle access, access to public transportation, or vehicular access to businesses and community resources, such as schools, school bus routes, shopping centers, libraries, churches, and hospitals, within the communities and neighborhoods in the project study area.

This alternative, however, would not achieve the improvements to mobility within the existing community that would result from the proposed build alternatives. Community mobility would continue to deteriorate with the increased regional traffic congestion that is expected between now and 2040, resulting in a long-term reduction in access to public transportation, businesses, and community resources, as well as reduced emergency vehicle access. In addition, this alternative would not result in any actions to implement Metro's Complete Streets Policy.

Social and Economic Impacts

The No-Build Alternative would not result in changes to existing social and economic conditions in the study area. This alternative would not induce population growth, result in changes to businesses or employment rates, displace housing or people, result in urban decay impacts, or result in changes to community cohesion, interaction, quality of life, or social values. More information on economic impacts is provided in the Economic and Fiscal Impacts Report prepared for the project (Appendix V).

This alternative would not achieve the improvements to mobility within the existing community that would result from the proposed build alternatives. Under this alternative, worsening regional traffic congestion that is expected between now and 2040 may result in reduced access to local businesses, which could hinder local economic growth.

Physical Impacts

The No-Build Alternative would not result in changes to the physical environment, including changes in aesthetic character or land use patterns, and would not result in safety impacts or introduce physical intrusions to communities and neighborhoods in the project study area. Under this alternative, transportation facilities would operate entirely within existing transportation corridors, and no physical barriers would be introduced that would divide the existing communities surrounding the project corridor. However, the No-Build Alternative would not achieve the improvements in circulation within the existing community that would result from the proposed build alternatives.

Cumulative Impacts

Per CEQA Section 15130 (b), the cumulative impacts analysis can consider either a "list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts" or "a summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional, or statewide plan, or related planning

document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect." The cumulative impacts analysis below and for the other alternatives evaluated in this section are based on the approach that considers the cumulative projects, which are listed in Table 2-3 in Chapter 2.

The study area for the cumulative impacts analysis for all of the alternatives in this section consists of the communities and neighborhoods that would be affected by the proposed project. In general, the cumulative impacts study area encompasses the neighborhoods and communities adjacent to the project corridor.

Under the No-Build Alternative, there would be no impacts on communities and neighborhoods, and therefore, this alternative would not contribute to cumulative communities and neighborhoods impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Construction Mitigation Measures

No construction mitigation measures are required.

Operational Mitigation Measures

No operational mitigation measures are required.

Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

NEPA Finding

No adverse effects under NEPA would occur.

CEQA Determination

No impacts under CEQA would occur.

4.4.3.2 TSM Alternative

Construction Impacts

The TSM Alternative may include minor bus stop and roadway improvements as well as operational enhancements to the existing bus system. Given the very limited extent of potential physical improvements, construction activities would likely have no or very minimal impacts on any nearby communities and neighborhoods.

Operational Impacts

Mobility and Access Impacts

The TSM Alternative is expected to result in beneficial changes to existing mobility and access in the project study area. This alternative includes enhanced bus frequencies for the existing Metro Rapid Bus 761 and the local 233 lines, which would provide additional mobility and access benefits for the communities and neighborhoods in the project study area. The existing bus stops along San Fernando Road would remain unchanged under the TSM Alternative. The TSM Alternative would maintain pedestrian and bicycle access, enhance access to public transportation through increased bus frequencies, and result in improved access to businesses and community resources, such as schools, school bus routes, shopping centers, libraries, churches, and hospitals, within the

communities and neighborhoods in the project study area. In addition, this alternative could also result in beneficial changes to emergency vehicle access by reducing traffic congestion, as compared to the No-Build Alternative, facilitating faster response times for emergency services. However, given the limited extent of physical and operational improvements proposed under the TSM Alternative, substantial improvement in regional mobility would not occur. Therefore, notwithstanding the mobility improvements proposed under the TSM Alternative, community mobility would likely continue to deteriorate due to increased traffic congestion from regional growth and development between now and 2040. In addition, this alternative would not result in any actions to implement Metro's Complete Streets Policy.

Social and Economic Impacts

More information on economic impacts is provided in the Economic and Fiscal Impacts Report prepared for the project, and included as Appendix V of this DEIS/DEIR. Implementation of the TSM Alternative is not expected to result in substantial social and economic changes in the project study area. More frequent bus service may require additional drivers, providing employment opportunities. However, given the small number of jobs that would be created and the existing substantial employment base and residential population in the San Fernando Valley, the TSM Alternative would not induce substantial population growth in the project study area. In addition, the proposed improvements under this alternative would not displace housing or people, and are not expected to result in substantial changes to community cohesion, interaction, quality of life, or social values.

Under the TSM Alternative, enhanced bus frequencies would increase the availability of transit service, which could stimulate the local economy by facilitating access to local businesses. However, this alternative would not substantially improve regional mobility, and community access would most likely continue to deteriorate. with increasing regional traffic congestion expected between now and 2040. Therefore, any social or economic benefits resulting from the TSM Alternative could eventually be negated by increased traffic congestion, which could result in a long-term reduction in access to local businesses.

Physical Impacts

The TSM Alternative would include traffic signalization improvements, bus stop amenities and improvements, and bus schedule restructuring. This alternative would not be expected to result in substantial changes to the physical environment, including changes in aesthetic character and land use patterns, and would not result in safety impacts, or introduce substantial physical intrusions to communities and neighborhoods in the project study area. Minor modifications to the roadway network would be expected to enhance the existing transportation network, would comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and would not be expected to result in pedestrian, bicycle, and/or vehicle safety impacts. In addition, the TSM Alternative would operate entirely within existing transportation corridors, and would not introduce physical barriers that would divide the existing communities surrounding the project corridor. This alternative, however, would not achieve the improvements in transit service within the existing community that would result from the proposed build alternatives.

Cumulative Impacts

The TSM Alternative would result in minor or beneficial impacts on communities and neighborhoods. Therefore, it would not contribute in any appreciable way to cumulative impacts that could occur due to implementation of other projects in the study area. Consequently, the TSM Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

Mitigation Measures

Construction Mitigation Measures

No construction mitigation measures are required.

Operational Mitigation Measures

No operational mitigation measures are required.

Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

NEPA Finding

Effects under NEPA would not be adverse or would be beneficial.

CEQA Determination

Impacts under CEQA would be less than significant or beneficial.

4.4.3.3 BRT Alternatives (Build Alternatives 1 and 2)

Alternative 1 – Curb-Running BRT

Construction Impacts

Mobility and Access Impacts

Under Alternative 1, the Curb-Running BRT Alternative, construction of stations and the alignment would require temporary sidewalk, lane, and possibly road closures, and temporary removal of parking on Van Nuys Boulevard, San Fernando Road, Truman Street, and their cross streets. These closures could reduce pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle mobility between communities and neighborhoods along the project corridor during construction and could also affect access to businesses and community resources, such as schools, school bus routes, shopping centers, libraries, churches, and hospitals.

Road and sidewalk closures, along with the addition of construction vehicles and equipment on primary streets in the City of Los Angeles and San Fernando, could also reduce public access to annual festivals and events in the various communities along the alignment. In addition, construction could disrupt traffic patterns and make public access to businesses and community resources more difficult. Lane closures, traffic detours, and designated truck routes associated with construction could also result in decreased access for emergency vehicles and delayed response times for emergency services.

Lane and/or road closures would be scheduled to minimize disruptions, and a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) would be approved in coordination with both the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando prior to construction. Therefore, mobility and access impacts during construction would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Social and Economic Impacts

Construction of Alternative 1 would not be expected to result in substantial changes to the existing population in the project study area. Because of the temporary nature of construction jobs and given that a substantial employment base currently exists in the San Fernando Valley within commuting distance of the project corridor, employment opportunities that could occur due to construction of

this alternative would not result in the migration of a substantial number of residents to the project study area and would not induce permanent substantial population growth in communities and neighborhoods in the project study area.

Construction activities would likely result in a decrease in accessibility to many businesses and result in the loss of on-street or off-street parking within construction zones. This could negatively affect business activity levels because the number of customers may temporarily decline. All attempts would be made to provide adequate detours and to minimize road closures; however, some consumers may avoid the area altogether, which could have an indirect effect on businesses within the project area. However, these impacts would be temporary, and after construction the project would provide improved mobility for more transit riders. The proposed project would also not be expected to result in urban decay impacts, as the project is a transit improvement project and not a development project that would displace several small businesses and other storefronts for the opening of a big box retailer or other development that would drastically change the character of the businesses and storefronts along Van Nuys Boulevard.

The required construction easements (i.e., the areas needed temporarily during construction in addition to the actual project footprint) would vary along the alignment, depending on the type of construction and the adjacent land use. Storage areas for construction equipment and materials would be established near the project alignment and used for equipment and material storage. The storage areas would be located within the right-of-way, parking lots, or vacant lands. No parcels would be acquired for Alternative 1, and no businesses would be displaced for the construction of this alternative. Therefore, social and economic impacts during construction would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Physical Impacts

Construction of Alternative 1 would not likely result in changes to land use patterns or physical division of communities because construction would be short-term and would not affect land use designations or introduce barriers that would divide communities. However, construction activities would result in a number of other physical impacts and intrusions, including noise, dust, odors, and traffic delays resulting from haul trucks and construction equipment located on public streets and staging areas. Local neighborhoods, businesses, and community facilities, such as schools, school bus routes, shopping centers, libraries, churches, and hospitals, may be inconvenienced temporarily, and community activities could be disrupted by these activities. However, because these impacts would be temporary and would be avoided or minimized with implementation of mitigation measures, these impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Construction of Alternative 1 may also result in several visual impacts on viewers within and surrounding the project corridor, which would temporarily change the aesthetic and visual setting of communities and neighborhoods along the project alignment. Construction areas could be visible from residential land uses on some of the adjacent parcels, either directly through fencing, through entrance gates, or over fencing from second story and higher windows. Construction activities may include the use of considerable heavy equipment such as cranes and associated vehicles, including bulldozers, backhoes, graders, scrapers, and trucks, which could be visible from public streets, sidewalks, and adjacent properties. Viewers in the construction area may be affected by the presence of this equipment, as well as stockpiled construction-related materials. In addition, mature vegetation, including trees, could be temporarily removed from some areas. Construction impacts associated with noise, air quality, visual quality/aesthetics, and traffic could be reduced or minimized through construction management and abatement measures. Because these impacts would be temporary and would be avoided or minimized with implementation of mitigation measures, these impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Construction of Alternative 1 could also have temporary effects on public safety and security within the communities and neighborhoods along the proposed project alignment. During construction, motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists would be exposed to additional safety hazards because of proximity to construction activities. The potential for safety and security impacts would be minimized by compliance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA), and Metro safety and security programs, which are designed to reduce potential construction impacts. In addition, an adequate level of signage, construction barriers, and supervision of trained safety personnel would be implemented during the construction phase to ensure that pedestrian and motorist safety is maintained during construction. Because these impacts would be temporary and would be avoided or minimized with implementation of mitigation measures, these impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Incidents of crime adjacent to the project alignment would not likely increase during construction of Alternative 1. Theft of construction machinery and materials could occur at construction sites, but these incidents would be minimized through implementation of standard site security practices. Because these impacts would be temporary and would be avoided or minimized with implementation of mitigation measures, these impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

During construction, Alternative 1 would result in significant impacts under CEQA on air quality in the neighborhoods and communities along the project alignment, due to increased pollutants and emissions during construction. The reader is referred to the air quality section of this chapter for more information on the significance and extent of these potential physical impacts.

Operational Impacts

Mobility and Access Impacts

Changes in Access to Public Transportation, Businesses, and Community Resources

Under Alternative 1, the Curb-Running BRT line would enhance connections to public transportation within the project study area and across the region, in compliance with Metro's Complete Streets Policy. Although motorists would experience additional traffic congestion and delay (see Chapter 3) due to the reduction in the number of mixed-flow travel lanes along the project corridor, the dedication of the curb lanes to BRT service would improve access for transit riders to local businesses and community resources, such as schools, school bus routes, shopping centers, libraries, churches, and hospitals.

All curbside parking would be prohibited on Van Nuys Boulevard and San Fernando Road from the early morning to early evening, which could require vehicles to park further away from businesses and community resources. On-street parking would still be available on all connecting streets where parking is currently permitted, and many businesses and community resources may have dedicated parking lots that would provide sufficient off-street parking. In addition, more people may use transit as a result of the project, which could reduce the need for parking.

ADA regulations and California state law guarantee the civil rights of individuals with disabilities to receive equal access to all public transportation services. These laws require that transit services and vehicles be readily accessible to, and usable by, individuals with a wide range of disabilities and who use mobility aids, wheelchairs, attendants, service animals, and respirators or portable oxygen supplies.

Under this alternative, accommodations would be provided to ensure that stations and vehicles are accessible to all customers, including those with disabilities, in compliance with ADA guidelines. Designated areas for wheelchairs would be provided on transit vehicles with appropriate securement devices (tie-downs) and occupant restraints (seat belts). To ease boarding and exiting, customers with a disability and/or those who use a wheelchair would be allowed to board first and exit first. Transit operators would be responsible to use lift ramps appropriately, assist the customer in reaching the designated securement area, and apply the wheelchair securements, including the use of lap and shoulder belts (upon the request of the customer). Additional designated seating areas would be available for seniors and people with disabilities away from the wheelchair securement area. The provision of these accommodations would result in improved mobility and access for individuals with disabilities, which would be a minor beneficial impact under NEPA and a beneficial and less-than-significant impact under CEQA.

Access impacts would be minor and adverse under NEPA and less than significant under CEQA.

Changes in Pedestrian and Bicycle Access

Alternative 1 would retain pedestrian access on sidewalks along the project corridor, in compliance with Metro's Complete Streets Policy. However, some pedestrian routes may be re-routed and would require additional walking distance because minor intersections would be permanently closed as part of project implementation. However, the increase in walking distances is not expected to be substantial because of the proximity of nearby alternative routes for pedestrians where minor intersection closures would occur. All existing Metro Rapid bus stops would be upgraded with ADA-compliant features. Other modifications required to accommodate the BRT improvements would also comply with ADA guidelines. Impacts on pedestrian access would be minor and adverse under NEPA and less than significant under CEQA.

The City's Bicycle Plan designates Van Nuys Boulevard as part of the "Backbone Bicycle Network," which plans an interconnected system facilitating mobility on key arterials. In addition, the City's Mobility Plans calls for dedicated bicycle lanes along the entire length of Van Nuys Boulevard. Under Alternative 1, the existing Class II bike lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard north of Parthenia Street would be removed to make room for the dedicated transit lanes. These changes would conflict with the City's Bicycle Plan and Mobility Plan because designated bicycle lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard would not be feasible with implementation of this alternative. An existing bikeway designated as part of the County's Master Bicycle Plan, located along the Metro-owned railroad right-of-way in the City of San Fernando, would remain under this alternative.

The City's Bicycle Plan and Mobility Plan include planned bicycle lanes on Woodman Avenue (one mile east of and parallel to Van Nuys Boulevard) between Ventura Boulevard and the Osborne Street and Nordhoff Street corridors. Bicycle lanes are also planned to connect the Osborne Street corridor to San Fernando Road. To use the planned bicycle lanes on Woodman Avenue, bicyclists would need to travel one mile to the east of Van Nuys Boulevard, which may be an inconvenience for some bicyclists depending on their final destination. In addition, under this alternative, bicycles would need to share a lane with other vehicles along the project corridor, which could result in safety impacts from the increased potential for bicycle collisions. Therefore, the removal of the Class II bike lanes and the decreased safety for bicyclists could substantially affect bicycle access along the project corridor. This would be an adverse effect under NEPA and significant impact under CEQA on bicycle access in adjacent communities and neighborhoods.

The City's General Plan Transportation Element designates Van Nuys Boulevard as a primary transit priority street, and the transit accommodations under this alternative would only be feasible with the removal of the bicycle lanes. In addition, as stated in Metro's Complete Streets Policy, a number of

streets might not provide accommodations for all modes of transportation due to physical right-of-way constraints, which is the case for this alternative. The project would be consistent with Metro's Complete Streets Policy to prioritize public transit modes based on the transportation needs of the community, as designated in the City's General Plan Transportation Element. While public transit would be a priority along the corridor with project implementation, the project would also facilitate bicycle access in surrounding areas by providing bicycle accommodations at BRT stations and on buses, including bicycle racks, so that passengers may leave their bicycles at the stations or bring them onto buses.

The City of Los Angeles Great Streets Initiative proposes streetscape improvements to strengthen connections and improve walkability and bikeability along portions of Van Nuys Boulevard within the project corridor. The initiative includes creating plazas and parklets, implementing improvements to curbs, and installing street lighting, street trees, and street furniture. The City of Los Angeles Great Streets Initiative is being implemented in anticipation of the project; therefore, the project would not interfere with improvements associated with the initiative.

Changes in Emergency Access

Although Alternative 1 would result in additional congestion and delay for motorists along the corridor due to the reduction in the number of mixed-flow lanes to accommodate the dedicated BRT lanes, emergency vehicles would be permitted to enter the BRT lanes to avoid congestion in the mixed-flow lanes. In addition, with enhanced transit services, Alternative 1 may result in higher transit ridership, which could reduce traffic congestion over the long-term operation of the project and facilitate faster response times for police and fire protection services. Therefore, the impacts on emergency access would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under NEPA.

Social and Economic Impacts

Population, Business, and Employment Growth

Alternative 1 is not expected to result in substantial changes to the existing population in the project study area. This alternative would not include the development of new housing or businesses that would directly induce population growth. Alternative 1 would include additional bus service and would therefore generate additional employment opportunities for bus drivers; however, there is currently a substantial employment base and residential population in the San Fernando Valley, and the employment opportunities would not be expected to result in substantial migration of additional residents to the project study area. Therefore, this alternative would not be expected to induce substantial population growth in existing communities and neighborhoods.

Alternative 1 could indirectly affect growth and development in the project study area by promoting planned development and redevelopment near station areas. The type of development expected around station areas would most likely include TOD, which is mixed-use residential and commercial development designed to maximize access to public transport. Alternative 1 may also attract businesses from other areas of the region to the immediate areas surrounding the proposed stations. However, because this alternative would be located in an urban area containing a limited number of vacant or underutilized parcels, it's not expected that this alternative would substantially change existing growth and development patterns. In addition, Alternative 1 would accommodate projected population growth for the region, and any development that could result around station areas is anticipated to be consistent with these current growth projections. TOD near station areas would also be consistent with the proposed City of San Fernando TOD Overlay Zone.

Under Alternative 1, enhanced transit service could stimulate the local economy by facilitating access to local businesses. In addition, business viability could improve because increased pedestrian traffic near the proposed stations would provide new customers. Therefore, this alternative would be expected to result in improved economic conditions for local businesses, and impacts would be minor and beneficial under NEPA. CEQA does not include significance thresholds for economic impacts, and therefore, no CEQA determination can be made for this impact. More information on economic impacts is provided in the Economic and Fiscal Impacts Report prepared for the project (see Appendix V).

Displacement of Housing and People

Alternative 1 would be constructed within the curb lanes of an existing roadway, and would not result in the displacement of any housing, people, or businesses. This alternative would not require any right-of-way acquisitions for the proposed alignment. In addition, this alternative would not require the construction or expansion of an MSF; therefore, no right-of-way acquisitions associated with an MSF would be required. No displacement impacts would result from this alternative.

Changes in Community Cohesion and Interaction

Alternative 1 would increase connectivity within the eastern San Fernando Valley area, and would result in more unified communities within the project study area, by providing additional transit services connecting these areas. Therefore, this alternative would be expected to enhance community cohesion and interaction. This impact would not be adverse or would be considered beneficial under NEPA. Under CEQA, this alternative would not divide an established community, and therefore, no impact would occur.

Changes in Quality of Life or Social Values

Alternative 1 would be expected to result in a long-term overall improved quality of life for the communities and neighborhoods in the project study area resulting from the availability of enhanced transit access to businesses and between communities. Alternative 1 would permanently improve community mobility by providing a new means of access that does not rely solely on driving, however, increased congestion for motorists could occur due to reduction in roadway capacity for mixed-flow traffic. The Curb-Running BRT line would be expected to enhance connections to other neighborhoods within the project study area and across the region. These enhancements could increase pedestrian traffic near the proposed stations, which would provide new potential customers and improve business viability. Therefore, this alternative would be expected to result in social and economic benefits for the communities and neighborhoods in the project study area. Impacts would not be adverse or would be considered beneficial under NEPA; and beneficial or less than significant under CEQA.

Physical Impacts

Changes in Land Use Patterns

Alternative 1 would not be expected to result in substantial changes in land use patterns. While there would be some modifications to the project corridor (e.g., changes in bicycle lanes and loss of curbside parking), the project corridor is an existing transportation route with ongoing bus transit service; therefore, the proposed Curb-Running BRT operations would be consistent with existing bus operations and land use patterns.

Alternative 1 could indirectly affect development in the project study area by encouraging housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of the proposed transit stations along the project corridor. TOD near station areas would be consistent with the proposed City of San

Fernando TOD Overlay Zone, and would enhance the City's downtown area. In addition, because this alternative would be located in an urban area containing a limited number of vacant or underutilized parcels, it's not expected that this alternative would substantially change existing growth and development patterns. No adverse impacts would occur under NEPA or CEQA.

Changes in Aesthetic Character

This alternative would include new and upgraded bus stations, and the installation of dedicated BRT lanes. Because the City of Los Angeles has a contract with CBS Decaux for bus station design, Metro would confirm their legal ability to upgrade the stations with the City of Los Angeles. The proposed Curb-Running BRT vehicles would be similar to existing Metro buses. The project corridor is an existing transportation route with ongoing bus transit service; therefore, the proposed Curb-Running BRT operations would be consistent with existing bus operations, and no substantial changes in aesthetic character would result from this alternative. In addition, stations would include aesthetic enhancements, such as landscaping and canopies, which would be compatible with the existing character of surrounding communities and neighborhoods. No adverse effects or impacts would occur under NEPA or CEQA.

Safety Impacts and Other Physical Intrusions

Alternative 1 would not be expected to result in substantial physical intrusions (e.g., noise, dust, or odors) to the project corridor. While there would be some modifications to the project corridor (e.g., changes in bicycle lanes and loss of curbside parking), the project corridor is an existing transportation route with ongoing bus transit service; therefore, the proposed BRT operations would be consistent with existing bus operations and physical conditions. Impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Safety concerns at proposed BRT stations would be addressed both through design considerations (e.g., security cameras in station areas) and coordination with law enforcement personnel, including the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Transit Services Bureau. In addition, potential bus improvements under this alternative would follow the requirements of Metro's System Safety Program Plan, which would ensure worker and passenger safety, prevent crime, and allow for adequate emergency response. Therefore, Alternative 1 is not expected to result in a substantial increase in security risks in the project study area, as detailed in the Safety and Security Impacts Report prepared for the project. Impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Alternative 1 would run in mixed-flow curb lanes along San Fernando Road and Truman Streets, and would therefore result in the potential for conflicts with mixed-flow street traffic and other Metro bus operations. The potential for accidents could be highest initially, but would stabilize as people become accustomed to the new alignment. In addition, because existing bus service in the corridor operates in mixed-flow traffic, a substantial increase in accidents or collisions between buses and other motor vehicles is not anticipated to result from this alternative. Impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Alternative 1 would be designed in compliance with Metro design guidelines to ensure pedestrian, motorist, and bicyclist safety; however, the removal of approximately two miles of existing Class II bike lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard from Parthenia Street to Beachy Avenue would increase the potential for conflicts between bicyclists and buses in the proposed shared lane. Therefore, this alternative could result in safety impacts within the communities and neighborhoods in the project study area from the increased potential for bicycle collisions. This impact would be adverse under NEPA and potentially significant under CEQA.

Physical Division of Communities

Alternative 1 would operate entirely within existing transportation corridors, and would not introduce physical barriers that would divide existing communities in the project study area. No impacts would occur under NEPA or CEQA.

Cumulative Impacts

Other present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the area, including the cumulative projects in Table 2-3, could result in temporary impacts from construction activities, and impacts from past projects may also have resulted in temporary impacts. However, because these impacts are temporary, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. During construction, Alternative 1 could result in temporary adverse effects and significant impacts on mobility, access, bicycle and pedestrian safety, emergency response, visual character and quality, noise, and air quality on communities and neighborhoods along the project corridor. Construction impacts would be reduced or minimized through construction management and abatement measures, as detailed below (Mitigation Measures) and described in Section 4.5-Visual Quality and Aesthetics, Section 4.6-Air Quality; Section 4.8-Noise and Vibration, Section 4.14-Safety and Security, and Chapter 2-Transportation, Transit, Circulation, and Parking. Because construction impacts under Alternative 1 would also be temporary, and impacts would be minimized or mitigated through mitigation measures, the alternative's contribution to cumulative impacts during construction would be less than cumulatively considerable.

During operation, Alternative 1 would have some beneficial long-term effects under NEPA, and impacts would be beneficial and less than significant under CEQA, related to regional mobility, access, and social and economic conditions because this alternative would improve connections to public transportation, improve access to businesses and community resources, and increase community cohesion and interaction. By increasing transit ridership, Alternative 1 would reduce traffic congestion over the long-term operation of the project and would consequently facilitate response times for police and fire protection services. These community and neighborhood benefits would be beneficial under NEPA and CEQA. However, as discussed in Chapter 2, the reduction in roadway capacity due to conversion of the curb lanes to dedicated BRT lanes would result in significant traffic impacts at local intersections. Past projects have resulted in localized traffic impacts, and other present or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the area could further degrade traffic conditions in the area Therefore, cumulative impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects are significant. As a result, any adverse impacts from Alternative 1 would be considered cumulatively considerable.

Past projects have resulted in access and safety impacts, and other present or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the area, including the cumulative projects in Table 2-3, could further degrade access and safety in the study area. Therefore, cumulative impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects are significant. Alternative 1 would also result in a substantial adverse effect under NEPA and potentially significant impact under CEQA related to access and safety from the potential for bicycle and vehicle collisions, which would remain after implementation of proposed mitigation measures. As a result, any adverse impacts from Alternative 1 would be considered cumulatively considerable. Because the access and safety impacts to bicyclists in the communities and neighborhoods of the study area would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of mitigation measures, the alternative's contribution to cumulative impacts would remain cumulatively considerable after mitigation.

Mitigation Measures

The reader is referred to the following mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potential construction and operational impacts on communities and neighborhoods: MM-TRA-1 through MM-TRA-3 in Table ES-1 and Chapter 3, Transportation, Transit, Circulation, and Parking; MM-VIS-1 through MM-VIS-5 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.5, Visual Quality and Aesthetics; MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-7 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.6, Air Quality; MM-NOI-1a though MM-NOI-1d and MM-VIB-1 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.8, Noise and Vibration; and MM-SS-3 and MM-SS-8 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.14, Safety and Security. These measures include requirements to maintain access to businesses and residences within the adjacent neighborhoods and communities, detours, design and location of project elements to avoid obstructing views to and from the community, requirements for use of equipment and methods to reduce air quality emissions, attenuation of noise and vibration impacts to the extent feasible by use of alternate equipment or methods, or use of noise and vibration reducing track, and coordination with public safety and transit providers to ensure adequate access for emergency response to these communities and neighborhoods. During project operation and construction, these measures would minimize direct impacts that could adversely affect the quality of the human environment within the communities and neighborhoods of the study area.

Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

NEPA Finding

The potential operational effects on bicycle access and safety would be adverse after mitigation. All other effects would not be considered adverse.

CEQA Determination

The potential operational impacts on bicycle access and safety would be significant after implementation of proposed mitigation measures. All other impacts would be less than significant.

Alternative 2 – Median-Running BRT

Construction Impacts

Construction impacts would be the same as those described above for Alternative 1.

Operational Impacts

Operational impacts would be the same as those described above for Alternative 1, with the exceptions noted below.

Mobility and Access Impacts

Changes in Access to Public Transportation, Businesses, and Community Resources

Implementation of Alternative 2, the Median-Running BRT Alternative, would require restrictions on motor vehicle movements, which would be required to accommodate the Median-Running BRT facilities in an effort to eliminate vehicle conflicts. Left turns from Van Nuys Boulevard onto cross streets would be maintained at most of the currently signalized intersections; however, the dual left-turn lanes on northbound and southbound Van Nuys Boulevard at Sherman Way and at Roscoe Boulevard would be reduced to a single left-turn lane, and several left-turns in the Van Nuys Civic Center, between Calvert Street and Hartland Street, would be prohibited in order to accommodate median bus stop platforms. Unless otherwise prohibited, U-turns would be allowed from signalized

left-turn lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard; therefore, vehicles that need to turn left to access businesses and community resources would continue to have access through U-turns from signalized left-turn lanes. This impact would not be considered adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Changes in Pedestrian and Bicycle Access

Alternative 2 would still allow pedestrians and bicyclists to access areas in the project corridor, in compliance with Metro's Complete Streets Policy, although minor changes would occur to pedestrian and bicycle circulation to allow for the proposed improvements. Current pedestrian movements across roadways at existing signal-controlled crosswalks would be maintained; however, other pedestrian crossings on Van Nuys Boulevard at unsignalized intersections would be prohibited to avoid potential conflicts between pedestrians and BRT vehicles. In addition, under this alternative, a barrier would be installed along the length of the alignment to prevent illegal pedestrian crossings of the BRT guideway. However, access to existing sidewalks on both sides of the roadway and connections at signalized crosswalks would be maintained.

These modifications to pedestrian movements and sidewalk widths would not be expected to substantially interfere with pedestrian access along the project corridor because adequate pedestrian facilities, sidewalks, and crosswalks, would be provided to ensure pedestrian access and safety. In addition, all Metro Rapid bus stops would include design elements that would be ADA compliant. Other modifications to the curb lanes to accommodate the Median-Running BRT improvements would also comply with ADA guidelines. Alternative 2 would result in bicycle access and safety impacts within the communities and neighborhoods in the project study area from the increased potential for bicycle collisions due to the removal of Class II bike lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard. This impact would be adverse under NEPA and significant under CEQA.

Physical Impacts

Physical Division of Communities

Under this alternative, a barrier along the length of the alignment would be installed to prevent illegal pedestrian crossings of the BRT guideway. However, designated pedestrian walkways would also be installed to ensure that pedestrian access is maintained along both sides of the barrier, and that the barrier would not encroach on residential properties. The installation of barriers and fencing could be considered a physical intrusion by members of the communities and neighborhoods in the project study area. However, the Median-Running BRT Alternative would operate entirely within existing transportation corridors, and would not introduce physical barriers that would substantially affect access between the existing communities and neighborhoods in the project study area. Therefore, impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts that could occur due to implementation of Alternative 2 would be the same as those described above for Alternative 1.

Mitigation Measures

The reader is referred to the following mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potential construction and operational impacts on communities and neighborhoods: MM-TRA-1 through MM-TRA-5 in Table ES-1 and Chapter 3, Transportation, Transit, Circulation, and Parking; MM-VIS-1 through MM-

VIS-5 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.5, Visual Quality and Aesthetics; MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-7 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.6, Air Quality; MM-NOI-1a though MM-NOI-1d and MM-VIB-1 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.8, Noise and Vibration; and MM-SS-3 and MM-SS-8 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.14, Safety and Security. The applicable measures from those sections are briefly summarized for Alternative 1 above.

Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

NEPA Finding

The potential operational effects on bicycle access and safety would be adverse, even after implementation of mitigation measures described in Chapter 3-Transportation, Transit, Circulation, and Parking; Section 4.5-Visual Quality and Aesthetics; Section 4.6-Air Quality; Section 4.8-Noise and Vibration; and Section 4.14-Safety and Security of this DEIS/DEIR. All other effects would not be considered adverse.

CEQA Determination

The potential operational impacts on bicycle access and safety would be significant even after implementation of proposed mitigation measures described in Chapter 3-Transportation, Transit, Circulation, and Parking; Section 4.5-Visual Quality and Aesthetics; Section 4.6-Air Quality; Section 4.8-Noise and Vibration; and Section 4.14-Safety and Security of this DEIS/DEIR. All other impacts would be less than significant.

4.4.3.4 Rail Alternatives (Alternatives 3 and 4)

Alternative 3 – Low-Floor LRT/Tram

Construction Impacts

More extensive construction would be required to construct Alternative 3 facilities, which would include the OCS, TPSSs, and an MSF, than would be required for the BRT alternatives.

During construction, the construction contractor would choose staging locations among the parcels along the alignment to be acquired as needed for construction of Alternative 3. However, construction may require additional permanent right-of-way acquisitions and the permanent displacement of businesses.

Because it is anticipated that most businesses displaced during construction of Alternative 3 would be relocated to nearby properties, construction of this alternative would not be expected to result in substantial changes to the local economic conditions in the project study area. Local business viability may be temporarily affected by the relocations; however, after the businesses become established in their new sites and customers become accustomed to accessing businesses at their new locations, business viability would be expected to return to existing conditions.

Business displacements required for construction of Alternative 3 could result in substantial changes to the local neighborhood character, and potentially to the social fabric of the local community. Neighborhood residents or visitors may be accustomed to accessing businesses in their existing locations, and the displacement of those businesses could potentially be psychologically or socially disruptive, which could affect professional and social interactions. If relocation sites are available within proximity to the existing businesses, the disruptions to professional and social interactions may be temporary as residents become accustomed to accessing the displaced

businesses at their new locations. However, this impact could be substantial and adverse under NEPA. Under CEQA, this alternative would not divide an established community, and therefore, no impact would occur.

Public controversy among community members and business owners could result from business displacements; therefore, early and ongoing public outreach is required to discuss potential concerns and communicate with property owners and community members. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts on community cohesion and interaction could remain adverse under NEPA.

Operational Impacts

The operational impacts of Alternative 3 would be the same as those described above for Alternatives 1 and 2, with the exceptions noted below.

Mobility and Access Impacts

Changes in Access to Public Transportation, Businesses, and Community Resources

Implementation of Alternative 3 would require restrictions on motor vehicle movements (left-turns) at unsignalized intersections, which would be required to accommodate the Low-Floor LRT/Tram facilities in an effort to eliminate vehicle conflicts. Unless otherwise prohibited, U-turns would be allowed from signalized left-turn lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard; therefore, vehicles that need to turn left to access businesses and community resources would continue to have access through U-turns from signalized left-turn lanes.

Most of the left turns from San Fernando Road would be prohibited through the City of San Fernando where a median dedicated guideway for the Low-Floor LRT/Tram vehicle is proposed between the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station and Wolfskill Street. In addition, in an effort to maintain the pedestrian-oriented retail character of San Fernando Road between San Fernando Mission Boulevard and Chatsworth Drive, a possible option for operation in this location would redirect through traffic off San Fernando Road along one block between Maclay Avenue and Brand Boulevard by means of turn restrictions. All existing turning movements would be maintained on San Fernando Road between Wolfskill Street and Van Nuys Boulevard where the Low-Floor LRT/Tram would share travel lanes with motor vehicles.

While restrictions on vehicle movements and loss of parking would present an inconvenience for vehicles traveling along the project corridor, vehicles would continue to have access to either side of the roadway at signalized intersections, and mobility and access by public transit would be enhanced under Alternative 3. On-street parking would still be available on all connecting streets where parking is currently permitted, and many businesses and community resources may have dedicated parking lots that would provide sufficient off-street parking. In addition, more people may use transit as a result of the project, which could reduce the need for parking; therefore, since access to businesses and community resources would be maintained, and access would be improved for transit users under this alternative, impacts would not be considered adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

According to Metro fare policies, additional fares would not be required to transfer from existing Metro Rapid and local buses to Alternative 3. Therefore, the Low-Floor LRT/Tram service would not be cost-prohibitive and would comply with Metro fare policies. Public outreach will be conducted to ensure that community and neighborhood concerns, including fare policies, are addressed.

Changes in Pedestrian and Bicycle Access

Alternative 3 would maintain the ability for pedestrians and bicyclists to access areas in the project corridor, in compliance with Metro's Complete Streets Policy, although minor changes to pedestrian and bicycle circulation to allow for the proposed improvements would be required. Current pedestrian movements across roadways at existing signal-controlled crosswalks would be maintained; however, other pedestrian crossings on Van Nuys Boulevard at unsignalized intersections would be prohibited to avoid potential conflicts between pedestrians and Low-Floor LRT/Tram vehicles. In addition, on Van Nuys Boulevard from the Metro Orange Line to El Dorado Avenue in Pacoima, the existing 13-foot-wide sidewalks on each side of the roadway would be narrowed to 10 feet to accommodate the installation of the Low-Floor LRT/Tram facilities while providing two travel lanes in each direction.

These modifications to pedestrian movements and sidewalk widths would not be expected to substantially interfere with pedestrian access along the project corridor. In addition, all stops would include design elements that would be ADA compliant. A pedestrian bridge would also be provided at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station from the Low-Floor LRT/Tram platform to the parking lot. However, this alternative would result in bicycle access and safety impacts within the communities and neighborhoods in the project study area from the increased potential for bicycle collisions due to the removal of Class II bike lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard. This impact would be adverse under NEPA and significant under CEQA.

Social and Economic Impacts

Displacement of Housing and People

To assess the types of potential displacement from Alternative 3, conceptual engineering plans for the proposed alignment, station options, and rights-of-way were reviewed. When an acquisition is required, it typically results in either a partial or full acquisition of a parcel. A partial acquisition would result if a portion of the parcel is necessary to accommodate the project. A full acquisition would result under two circumstances: (1) when the majority of the property is required for the horizontal alignment because of insufficient right-of-way or the need to construct storage or maintenance facilities, and (2) when a severe loss of access reduces the useful operation of the property.

The majority of the Low-Floor LRT/Tram alignment would be constructed in the median of an existing roadway and would not require the displacement of businesses or residences along the majority of the project corridor. However, some areas of the project alignment would require commercial property acquisitions to accommodate the Low-Floor LRT/Tram facilities, including at Van Nuys Boulevard and Bessemer Street, the Van Nuys/San Fernando Station at Van Nuys Boulevard and El Dorado Avenue, at San Fernando Road and Pinney Street, and at the Paxton Station at San Fernando Road and Weidner Street. No residential properties would be displaced to accommodate the Low-Floor LRT/Tram alignment.

Alternative 3 would also require full right-of-way acquisitions for the construction of the MSF. The exact location of the proposed Low-Floor LRT/Tram MSF has yet to be determined; however, three potential locations have been selected for consideration along Van Nuys Boulevard at Aetna, Keswick, and Arminta Streets.

The MSF site at Aetna Street would require 60 full property acquisitions, which includes one parcel for a connection to the Low-Floor LRT/Tram alignment. The MSF site at Arminta Street would require 37 full property acquisitions, and the MSF site at Keswick Street would require 42 full property acquisitions; these MSF sites do not require any parcels for connections to the Low-Floor LRT/Tram alignment.

The potential MSF sites are primarily located on properties zoned as limited manufacturing, light manufacturing, commercial manufacturing, general commercial, and regional commercial. Three parcels zoned as medium residential would be acquired for the MSF site at Aetna Street; however, these parcels are developed with a single parking lot serving an adjacent warehouse business. The displacement of businesses would be required to construct the MSF sites. In addition, for the MSF site at Aetna Street, the displacement of four residential units on a parcel zoned for light manufacturing use would be required.

In addition to these full property acquisitions, partial property acquisitions would be required for TPSSs, which would be located near potential stations or at the MSF site, mostly in vacant lots, parking lots, and commercial sites. These partial acquisitions would not be expected to require the displacement or relocations of businesses.

Right-of-way acquisitions are discussed in further detail in the Real Estate and Acquisitions Impacts Report prepared for the project (see Appendix I). Each business and residence displaced by Alternative 3 would be given advance written notice and would be informed of their eligibility for relocation assistance and payments under the Uniform Act. Relocation assistance for the residents of the four residential units may not be required because these units are rental housing and would likely be vacated in advance of right-of-way acquisitions.

Although displaced businesses and residences required for the Low-Floor LRT/Tram facilities and MSF site may need to be relocated, a review of online commercial real estate listings revealed that there were several available properties within a short distance (1.5 miles) of the study area to accommodate the displaced businesses or residents.[22] Therefore, it is assumed that replacement buildings for displaced businesses and residences would be available within a reasonable distance from their existing locations, and the displacement would not necessitate the construction of a substantial number of additional buildings on properties that are currently undeveloped. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not be expected to result in substantial changes to existing population and housing characteristics in the project study area, or result in substantial development impacts to accommodate business or residential displacements. Furthermore, other businesses adjacent to the project corridor would be affected due to construction activities and, while access would be maintained, these businesses would likely experience loss of patronage due to the proximity of heavy construction near their storefronts. However, thee effects on the businesses would be temporary, and Metro has a business assistance program to provide direct assistance for businesses affected by construction. Once construction has been completed, businesses would operate as before and with improved transit, would be more accessible to more transit riders. While there may be some businesses that close or relocate due to the effects during construction, urban decay impacts are not anticipated because of the temporary nature of these impacts, and the improved access and visibility for these businesses during operations. Additionally, large-scale displacement of small businesses to develop the site with new businesses or residential properties would not occur as part of the proposed project. The proposed project would consist of improvements to existing transit service along the Van Nuys Boulevard and San Fernando Boulevard corridors.

[22] Loopnet.com property search by map area. Available: http://www.loopnet.com. Accessed October 5, 2016.

The economic impacts related to business displacements and relocations are discussed in further detail in the Economic and Fiscal Impacts Report (see Appendix V). Because it is anticipated that most displaced businesses would be relocated to nearby properties, Alternative 3 would not be expected to result in substantial changes to the local economic conditions in the project study area by the displacements. Local business viability may be temporarily affected by the relocations as customers become accustomed to accessing businesses at their new locations; however, after the businesses become established in their new sites, business viability would be expected to return to existing conditions. It is anticipated that where relocation would be required, it would result in the relocation of most of the jobs that would be potentially displaced. Therefore, there would be no net loss of jobs overall.

Public controversy among community members and business owners could result from business displacements; therefore, early and ongoing public outreach would be required to discuss potential concerns and communicate with property owners and community members. With the implementation of mitigation measures, displacement impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Changes in Community Cohesion and Interaction

Business displacements required for the Low-Floor LRT/Tram alignment and MSF site could result in substantial changes to local neighborhood character, and potentially the social fabric of the local community. Neighborhood residents or visitors may be accustomed to accessing businesses in their existing locations, and the displacement of those businesses could be psychologically or socially disruptive, and could affect professional and social interactions. If relocation sites are available within proximity to the existing business sites, the disruptions to professional and social interactions may be temporary as residents become accustomed to accessing the displaced businesses at their new locations. However, this impact would be adverse under NEPA. Under CEQA, this alternative would not divide an established community, and therefore, no impact would occur.

Public controversy among community members and business owners could result from business displacements; therefore, early and ongoing public outreach is required to discuss potential concerns and communicate with property owners and community members. With the implementation of mitigation measures, impacts on community cohesion and interaction could remain adverse under NEPA.

Physical Impacts

Changes in Aesthetic Character

The project corridor is an existing transportation route in an urbanized area with ongoing bus transit service; therefore, the proposed Low-Floor LRT/Tram operations would be consistent with existing transportation uses, and no substantial changes in aesthetic character would result from this alternative along the majority of the project corridor. In addition, stations would include aesthetic enhancements, such as landscaping and canopies, which would be compatible with the existing character of surrounding communities and neighborhoods.

This alternative would require a number of elements to support vehicle operations, including median fences, an OCS, TPSSs, signaling, a pedestrian bridge at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station, and an MSF. These additional elements would result in substantial changes to the aesthetic character of some areas along the project corridor, especially in residential and recreational areas, and along the San Fernando Mall on San Fernando Road between Kittridge Street and San Fernando Mission

Boulevard. In the San Fernando Mall area, San Fernando Road narrows from a four-lane roadway (two lanes in each direction) to a two-lane roadway (one lane in each direction), and businesses are located relatively close to the roadway, making this area more pedestrian-oriented than other areas along the project corridor.

The following parks are also in proximity to the proposed improvements and could be affected by visual changes from this alternative:

- Blythe Street Park, 14740 Blythe Street, Van Nuys: This park is in proximity to the proposed MSF site at Arminta Street.
- Tobias Avenue Park, 9122 Tobias Avenue, Panorama City: This park is adjacent to the project corridor on Van Nuys Boulevard to the north of Nordhoff Street.
- Pacoima Wash Greenway: This greenway is a future proposed project that crosses under the project corridor south of Van Nuys Boulevard and Arleta Avenue, and at San Fernando Road to the south of La Rue Street in San Fernando.

Residential areas adjacent to the project corridor are in the following locations:

- Low-density residential areas are located adjacent to and south of the proposed MSF site at Aetna Street.
- Medium-density residential areas are located adjacent to and north of the proposed MSF site at Arminta Street.
- Medium-density residential areas are located adjacent to Van Nuys Boulevard between Parthenia Street and Plummer Street in Panorama City.
- Medium-, low-medium-, and low-density residential areas are located adjacent to Van Nuys Boulevard between just south of Woodman Avenue and Remick Avenue in Arleta.
- Low-medium density residential areas are located adjacent to and north/northeast of the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station.

The median fences, OCS, and pedestrian bridge, in particular, would introduce additional vertical elements that could substantially change the existing visual character and quality in these areas of the project corridor, especially for residents, pedestrians, and bicyclists, who would be expected to have high viewer sensitivity to their surroundings. Therefore, changes in aesthetic character due to Alternative 3 could be substantial in areas where sensitive viewers are located. As a result, the visual impacts on sensitive viewers in residential and recreational areas could be adverse under NEPA and significant under CEQA. Alternative 3's potential impacts on aesthetic character are also addressed in more detail in Section 4.5 of this DEIS/DEIR and in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Impacts Report (see Appendix K).

Safety Impacts and Other Physical Intrusions

Alternative 3 would not be expected to introduce substantial physical intrusions (e.g., noise, dust, or odors) to the project corridor. While there would be some modifications to the project corridor (e.g., changes in bicycle lanes and turning movements, the loss of curbside parking, and the addition of an OCS and TPSSs, median fences, a pedestrian bridge at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station, and an MSF site), the project corridor is an existing transportation route in an urbanized area with ongoing bus transit service, and therefore, the proposed Low-Floor LRT/Tram operations would be consistent with existing transportation uses.

The Low-Floor LRT/Tram would run in mixed-flow lanes along San Fernando Road just north of Wolfskill Street, and would therefore result in the potential for conflicts with street traffic and Low-Floor LRT/Tram operations. The potential for accidents would be highest initially, but would stabilize as people become accustomed to the new alignment. In addition, potential Low-Floor LRT/Tram improvements under this alternative would be subject to Metro's System Safety Program Plan.

Low-Floor LRT/tram vehicles would not exceed the posted adjacent roadway speed limit, which is typically 35 miles per hour (mph). In addition, Metro would prepare grade crossing applications in coordination with local public agencies to further increase safety and reduce the potential for conflicts, accidents, and collisions.

Alternative 3 could result in several pedestrian safety concerns. Stations could present safety hazards if pedestrian traffic and movement are not considered, resulting in potential for collisions between pedestrians and Low-Floor LRT/Tram vehicles. In addition, the introduction of Low-Floor LRT/Tram vehicles in mixed-flow traffic lanes on San Fernando Road, just north of Wolfskill Street, would create a safety concern for pedestrians at intersection crossings where pedestrians would cross over the tracks. Similarly, a potential safety hazard could result if pedestrians attempt to cross streets and tracks illegally.

Pedestrian traffic control and channelization techniques (e.g., barriers and designated walkways) would be used to control pedestrian movements at intersections and encourage the use of designated pedestrian crossings. A pedestrian bridge would also be provided at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station from the Low-Floor LRT/Tram platform to the parking lot. Photo 4.4-1 is an example of a typical pedestrian bridge that may be considered at this location, though details of the design would be finalized in the final design phase should this alternative be the selected alternative for construction. Metro would prepare grade crossing applications in coordination with local public agencies to further increase safety and reduce the potential for conflicts, accidents, and collisions.

While the proposed changes to the roadway network would be designed in compliance with Metro design guidelines to ensure pedestrian, motorist, and bicyclist safety, the removal of Class II bike lanes or replacement with shared bike lanes would increase the potential for conflicts between bicyclists and motor vehicles, reducing safety. Therefore, Alternative 3 could result in safety impacts within the communities and neighborhoods in the project study area from the potential for bicycle collisions. This potential impact could be adverse under NEPA and significant under CEQA.

Photo 4.4-1: Example of a Typical Pedestrian Bridge

Source: Metro, 2016.

Cumulative Impacts

Past projects have resulted in community and visual impacts, and other present or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the area, including the cumulative projects in Table 2-3, could further degrade social and community interactions, and visual conditions in the area. Therefore, cumulative impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects are significant. As a result, any adverse impacts from Alternative 3 would be considered cumulatively considerable. The cumulative impacts that could occur due to implementation of Alternative 3 would be the same as those described above for Alternative 1, with the exception that Alternative 3 would result in potentially significant operational impacts on social and community interactions due to business displacements, and potentially significant operational visual impacts on sensitive viewers in the community. Because impacts from Alternative 3 would remain significant after implementation of mitigation measures, the alternative's contribution to cumulative community and visual impacts during operation remain cumulatively considerable, unlike the BRT alternatives.

Mitigation Measures

The reader is referred to the following mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potential construction and operational impacts on communities and neighborhoods: MM-TRA-1 through MM-TRA-3 in Table ES-1 and Chapter 3, Transportation, Transit, Circulation, and Parking; MM-VIS-1 though MM-VIS-5 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.5, Visual Quality and Aesthetics; MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-7 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.6, Air Quality; MM-NOI-1a through MM-NOI-4b and MM-VIB-1 and MM-VIB-2 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.8, Noise and Vibration; and MM-SS-3 and MM-SS-8 in Table ES-1 and Section 4.14, Safety and Security. These measures include measures to maintain access to the local communities and neighborhoods in the study area, detours, design and location of project elements to avoid obstructing views to and from these communities, requirements for use of equipment and methods to reduce air quality emissions, attenuation of noise and vibration impacts to the extent feasible by use of alternate equipment or methods, or use of noise and vibration reducing track, and coordination with public safety and transit providers to ensure adequate access to communities and neighborhoods along the project corridor. During project operation and construction, these measures would minimize direct impacts that could adversely affect the quality of the human environment within the communities and neighborhoods in the study area.

In addition, the following measure is proposed:

> **MM-CN-1**: A formal educational and public outreach campaign shall be implemented to discuss potential community and neighborhood concerns, including relocations, visual/aesthetics changes, and fare policies, and to communicate information about the project with property owners and community members.

Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

NEPA Finding

The potential operational effects on bicycle access and safety, construction and operational effects on social and community interactions from business displacements, and operational visual impacts on sensitive viewers in communities and neighborhoods would be adverse after mitigation. All other effects would not be considered adverse.

CEQA Determination

The potential operational impacts on bicycle access and safety, construction and operational impacts on social and community interactions from business displacements, and operational visual impacts on sensitive viewers would be significant after implementation of proposed mitigation measures. All other impacts would be less than significant.

Alternative 4 – LRT

Construction Impacts

Alternative 4, the LRT Alternative, would require the most extensive construction of the four build alternatives because of the subway portion of the alignment. Alternative 4 would also include construction of OCS, TPSSs, and MSF structures. Those structures or facilities would not be required for the BRT alternatives. As a consequence, Alternative 4 would result in greater construction impacts, compared to the BRT alternatives.

Operational Impacts

The operational impacts of Alternative 4 would be the same as those described above for Alternative 3, with the exceptions noted below.

Mobility and Access Impacts

Changes in Access to Public Transportation, Businesses, and Community Resources

Under this alternative, vehicle movements and parking would be maintained along San Fernando Road and Truman Street where the LRT alignment would run along the Metro-owned railroad right-of-way. While restrictions on vehicle movements and loss of parking on Van Nuys Boulevard would present an inconvenience for vehicles traveling along the project corridor, vehicles would continue to have access to either side of the roadway at signalized intersections, and mobility and access by public transit would be enhanced under Alternative 4; therefore, vehicle access would be maintained under this alternative, and this impact would be minor and adverse under NEPA and less than significant under CEQA.

Changes in Pedestrian and Bicycle Access

The existing 13-foot-wide sidewalks on each side of the roadway would be narrowed to 10 feet to accommodate the installation of the LRT facilities, while providing two travel lanes in each direction, along Van Nuys Boulevard north of the subway portal near Rayen Street in Panorama City, where the LRT vehicles would resume a surface alignment in the roadway median and proceed to El Dorado Avenue in Pacoima.

These modifications to pedestrian movements and sidewalk widths would not be expected to substantially interfere with pedestrian access along the project corridor. In addition, all stops would include design elements that would be ADA compliant. A pedestrian bridge would also be provided at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station from the LRT platform to the parking lot. Therefore, impacts would be minor and adverse under NEPA and less than significant under CEQA.

An existing bikeway designated as part of the County's Master Bicycle Plan, located along the Metro-owned railroad right-of-way in the City of San Fernando, would remain under this alternative. This bicycle path, also known as the Mission City Trail located in the City of San Fernando along the Metro-owned railroad right-of-way, would be maintained under this alternative because the right-of-

way is sufficiently wide enough to allow the bicycle path to remain alongside a pair of LRT tracks and relocated tracks for Metrolink and Union Pacific trains. At the point where Alternative 4 crosses the bicycle path, near the intersection of Pinney Street and San Fernando Road, a signalized grade crossing would be provided. The bike path would be shifted from the east side of the railroad alignment to the west side of the tracks through the City of San Fernando to reduce the number of bike-rail crossings, reduce the amount of right-of-way acquisitions, and provide a better alignment of the railroad and LRT tracks.

Alternative 4 would result in bicycle access and safety impacts within the communities and neighborhoods in the project study area from the increased potential for bicycle collisions due to the removal of Class II bike lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard. This impact would be adverse under NEPA and significant under CEQA.

Social and Economic Impacts

Displacement of Housing and People

The majority of the LRT alignment would be constructed in the median of an existing roadway and would not require the displacement of businesses or residences along the majority of the project corridor. However, some areas of the project alignment would require commercial/industrial property acquisitions to accommodate the LRT facilities, including at the Sherman Way Station at Van Nuys Boulevard and Sherman Way, the Keswick Street Station at Van Nuys Boulevard and Keswick Street, the Roscoe Boulevard Station at Van Nuys Boulevard and Roscoe Boulevard, at the Pacoima Station at Van Nuys Boulevard and El Dorado Avenue, at San Fernando Road and Pinney Street, and along the Metro-owned railroad right-of-way between Maclay Avenue and Workman Street, and between Lazard Street and the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station. Partial property acquisitions would also be required at the Vanowen Station at Van Nuys Boulevard and Hartland Street, and along the Metro-owned railroad right-of-way between Wolfskill Street and Maclay Avenue. No residential properties would be displaced to accommodate the LRT alignment.

The MSF site at Aetna Street would require 64 full property acquisitions, which includes two parcels for a connection to the LRT alignment. The MSF site at Keswick Street would require 48 full property acquisitions, which includes 11 parcels for a connection to the LRT alignment. The MSF site at Arminta Street would require 53 full property acquisitions, which also includes 11 parcels for a connection to the LRT alignment.

Physical Impacts

Safety Impacts and Other Physical Intrusions

The LRT would run in a dedicated guideway along Van Nuys Boulevard from the Metro Orange Line to San Fernando Road, and then within the existing Metro-owned railroad right-of-way on separate dedicated tracks from Van Nuys Boulevard to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station. Therefore, this alternative would not be expected to result in a substantial increase in accidents or collisions between LRT vehicles and other motor vehicles. Therefore, this impact would not be adverse under NEPA and would be less than significant under CEQA.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts that could occur due to implementation of Alternative 4 would be the same as those described above for Alternative 3.

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures mentioned and discussed for Alternative 3 also apply to Alternative 4.

Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

NEPA Finding

The potential operational effects on bicycle access and safety, construction and operational effects on social and community interactions from business displacements, and operational visual impacts on sensitive viewers in communities and neighborhoods would be adverse after mitigation. All other effects would not be considered adverse.

CEQA Determination

The potential operational impacts on bicycle access and safety, construction and operational impacts on social and community interactions from business displacements, and operational visual impacts on sensitive viewers would be significant after implementation of proposed mitigation measures. All other impacts would be less than significant.