

1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED

1.1 OVERVIEW OF PURPOSE AND NEED

1.1.1 Eastside Study Area

The Eastside Corridor study area is shown in Figure 1-1, extending from Alameda Street in Central Los Angeles east through the Boyle Heights community in the City of Los Angeles and the City Terrace, Belvedere and East Los Angeles communities of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The study area also includes a portion of the City of Monterey Park.

1.1.2 Regional Context

Los Angeles has a regional rail network that consists of heavy rail, light rail, and commuter rail components. The Los Angeles Rail Rapid Transit Project (Metro Red Line) is an 18-mile heavy rail rapid transit subway project extending from Union Station to North Hollywood. The final North Hollywood segment was completed and opened for revenue service on June 24, 2000. Opened for service in 1990, the 22-mile Metro Blue Line light rail system operates between Downtown Los Angeles and Long Beach. In 1994, the 19-mile Metro Green Line light rail system opened for service between Redondo Beach and Norwalk, primarily operating in the median of the Century Freeway (I-105). In 1992, commuter rail service was initiated with Metrolink, a regional rail network that connects Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and San Diego counties utilizing existing rail right-of-way. In 2003, the 13.8-mile Metro Blue Line to Pasadena will open for service and will connect Downtown Los Angeles with East Pasadena. All told, the region will have over 400 miles of commuter rail and over 70 miles of urban rail (Table 1-1) by the year 2003.

Line	Length (Mi.)	Start	End
Blue Line (Long Beach)	22	Downtown Los Angeles	Downtown Long Beach
Green Line	19	Redondo Beach	Norwalk
Red Line	18	North Hollywood/Wilshire Center	Union Station
Blue Line (Pasadena)	13.8	Union Station	Pasadena

Source: MTA, 2000.

In 1994, the Metro Red Line Eastern Extension was selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), and final design was begun on this project. The project was to be an extension of the heavy-rail Red Line subway system from Union Station to Whittier and Atlantic Boulevards through Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles. The project was split into two phases, with a minimum operable segment initially to be constructed to 1st and Lorena Streets. This 3.7-mile first phase extension was to have stations located at Little Tokyo/Arts District near 3rd Street and Santa Fe Avenue, 1st Street and Boyle Avenue, Cesar Chavez Avenue and Soto Street, and 1st and Lorena Streets. Construction activities began on Phase 1 in 1997.

Figure 1-1 Eastside Corridor Study Area.

Work on the planned Eastside extension of the Metro Red Line subway was suspended by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) in January 1998, due to local financial difficulties. The MTA Restructuring Plan (adopted in May 1998) called for the MTA to study "viable and effective options" for all parts of Los Angeles County, with an emphasis on the corridors in which rail projects had been suspended. Within the Eastside Corridor, this necessitated the examination of alternative fixed guideway options to the suspended heavy rail subway project.

Based on the results of the November 1998 Draft Regional Transit Alternatives Analysis (RTAA Study), the MTA Board approved the concept of a rapid bus plan in March 1999, which included a rapid bus demonstration project on the Eastside. The Board also reaffirmed its commitment to fund fixed guideway transit improvements beyond rapid bus in the suspended rail corridors. The Board subsequently authorized the preparation of the Re-Evaluation/Major Investment Study (MIS) and Draft and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the suspended Metro Red Line Eastside Transit Corridor Project. The Re-Evaluation/ MIS was completed in February 2000 and analyzed several alternatives which are discussed in Section 1.2.3.7. This SEIS/SEIR identifies both beneficial and adverse environmental impacts associated with the Light Rail Transit (LRT) Build Alternative that was selected for further study following completion of the Re-Evaluation/MIS and compares them with those associated with the No-Build Alternative.

1.1.3 The Mobility Problem

The East Los Angeles Transit Corridor Technical Report was prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in July 1998 and provides an overview of community transit needs for the area. The Eastside Corridor communities of Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles are characterized by a large and growing population (over 212,000 according to the 1990 census; 275,000 are expected by 2020) of predominantly Latino ethnic origin, a high percentage of low income households, and relatively high rates of transit use and transit dependence. In these communities, nearly 20 percent of workers use the bus system on their journey to work (as compared to 6.5 percent for Los Angeles County as a whole), and rates of carpooling and walking to work are also higher than the County average.

East Los Angeles and Boyle Heights are served by a significant number of bus routes, primarily operated by the MTA, and generally organized in a grid pattern. There are approximately 40,000 weekday transit boardings in the area, with several heavily used bus transit corridors that include Soto Street, Cesar Chavez Avenue, 1st Street, Whittier Boulevard, and Olympic Boulevard. New Metro Rapid bus service was initiated on Whittier Boulevard on June 24, 2000, and provides limited stop service and buses equipped with devices to extend the green phase of traffic signals to make for speedier trips. The heaviest bus routes carry passengers in an east-west direction. The average speed for all bus routes in the area is 12.9 MPH, and the typical passenger trip length for transit riders is between one and three miles.

The existing bus system has very high ridership on many routes during peak periods and moderate to low levels of ridership on other routes during peak, as well as off-peak, periods. Adequate transit services are not being provided to some locations of high transit demand. Most person trips to key activity centers within the study area require at least one transfer. This can result in longer travel times, less convenience, and an ultimate compromise in mobility for the traveler.

1.1.4 Eastside Corridor Alternatives

The Re-Evaluation/MIS identified a range of fixed guideway transit service extensions, including heavy rail, light rail and bus rapid transit. The primary study objectives of this SEIS/SEIR are (1) to analyze the

environmental impacts of the LRT Build Alternative and to provide mitigation where feasible for adverse impacts, and (2) to determine if a fixed-guideway transit project is justified and if the LRT Build Alternative is to become the LPA for the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor.

The Re-Evaluation/MIS yielded two alternatives for further consideration. They included one LRT alternative and one bus rapid transit (BRT) alternative along the same alignment. On June 22, 2000, the MTA Board re-examined the BRT mode and determined that this mode should be dropped from further consideration, in part because the new State Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) committed to funding only light rail. The Draft SEIS/SEIR studied the LRT Build Alternative and its three options (1, 2, and 3) as presented in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. On May 24, 2001, the MTA Board adopted Option 1 of the LRT Build Alternative as the LPA. Since completion of the Draft SEIS/SEIR circulation period, MTA has decided to modify some portions of the LPA that was adopted and to add one route refinement option for consideration within portions of the LPA alignment. All of these changes came about in response to community concerns that were revealed during circulation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR. This is discussed in more detail in Section 2.4.3.

The LRT Build Alternative and its two Options A and B that are evaluated in this Final SEIS/SEIR are illustrated in Figure 1-2. Both options begin at the Union Station passenger terminal (trackways 1 and 2) and follow Alameda Street south to 1st Street. The alignment then follows 1st Street east to Indiana Street. The alignment is in a tunnel profile between the US-101 Freeway and Fresno Street along 1st Street. In both options, an at-grade station is located at 1st/Utah, and subway stations are located at 1st/Boyle and 1st/Soto. The alignment follows 1st Street east to Indiana Street and then follows Indiana Street south to 3rd Street. Option A removes on-street parking and a portion of the sidewalks on Indiana Street, while Option B provides for the purchase of right-of-way on the east side of Indiana Street to accommodate an off-street alignment, standard sidewalks and on-street parking. At-grade stations are located at 1st/Lorena and 3rd/Rowan in Option A, and at 3rd/Indiana and 3rd/Ford in Option B. The alignment continues east on 3rd Street and terminates at the intersection of Beverly and Atlantic Boulevards in Option A, and Beverly and Pomona Boulevards in Option B. Chapter 2 provides a complete description of the LRT alignment and station locations for each option. The LRT line will operate as an extension of the Pasadena Blue Line with continuing service through Union Station in both directions.

1.2 BACKGROUND AND PLANNING CONTEXT

The Metro Red Line Eastern Extension has been an integral element of local, regional and federal transportation planning since the early 1990's. Eastward from the Los Angeles Central Business District (LACBD) to just east of Atlantic Boulevard, the Eastern Extension had been the subject of in-depth technical studies and extensive community involvement during this period.

An Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report (AA/DEIS/DEIR) was previously prepared in 1993, and a Final Environmental Impact Statement/Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIS/FEIR) was prepared in 1994. These documents are available for review at the offices of the MTA. The documents are hereby incorporated by reference into this Final SEIS/SEIR. Following a systems planning study reviewed in Section 1.2.3, these two documents studied several subway alignments between Union Station in Central Los Angeles and the vicinity of Atlantic Boulevard in the unincorporated community of East Los Angeles.

Figure 1-2 LRT Build Alternatives

In 1994, after completion of the FEIS/FEIR and the Record of Decision (ROD) by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the MTA Board adopted a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for Metro Red Line Segment 3 in the corridor. The first phase of the Eastside extension was to operate between Union Station and 1st Street/Lorena Street. At the same time the MTA Board also adopted a LPA for the Metro Red Line for the Mid-City Corridor. Full Funding Grant Agreements were executed with the FTA, and the projects were transitioned into the construction phase.

Subsequently, an evaluation of the current local funding available for the Eastside project and other rail projects in Los Angeles County led to a suspension of work in January 1998. Voters also approved a new County law in November 1998 that restricts the use of Proposition A and C sales tax revenues for “new subways”. The MTA Restructuring Plan (adopted in May 1998) called for the agency to study “viable and effective options” for all parts of Los Angeles County, with an emphasis on the corridors in which the rail lines had been suspended. Within the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor, this included the examination of alternative fixed guideway options to heavy rail subway. To evaluate feasible options, the MTA Board subsequently authorized preparation of a Re-Evaluation/MIS and Draft and Final SEIS/SEIRs for the suspended Metro Red Line Eastside Transit Corridor project.

1.2.1 Regional Transportation Plan

The current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the six-county Southern California region was prepared by SCAG and adopted on April 16, 1998. The RTP incorporates the Los Angeles Eastside Transit Corridor Project, consistent with the MTA’s LPA for the Eastside Corridor. The RTP recommends the following actions:

- ◆ Construct exclusive transit corridors to minimize travel time and achieve certain ridership goals.
- ◆ Perform major investment studies on potential transit corridors.

A completion schedule of 2010 is shown in the RTP for the East Los Angeles Transit Corridor Project.

The MTA has also prepared a comprehensive long range planning document to guide the development of the countywide transportation system. The MTA's 30-Year Integrated Transportation Plan identified the Eastern Extension of the Metro Red Line as a high priority funded and committed rail project. An updated Long Range Plan (LRP) is currently being prepared by the MTA, which will reflect the Eastside Corridor transit planning currently underway.

1.2.2 General Plans

1.2.2.1 County of Los Angeles Circulation Element

The Circulation Element of the County of Los Angeles General Plan outlines a number of goals and policies that support the general aim of achieving a balanced transportation system. Specifically, the following policies relate to the Eastside LRT Project:

- ◆ Support the development of a mass transportation system that will provide a viable alternative to the automobile.
- ◆ Support development of rail transit or exclusive bus lanes in high demand corridors when sufficient patronage, cost-effectiveness, and support of land use policies are assured.

- ◆ Develop alternative transportation systems and procedures that will effectively reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by automobiles.

1.2.2.2 City of Los Angeles Transportation Element

The Transportation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan addresses motorized and non-motorized transportation through the year 2010. It places emphasis on maximizing the efficiency of existing and proposed transportation infrastructure through advance transportation technology, reduction of vehicle trips, and focusing growth in proximity to public transit. The general location of major thoroughfares, transportation routes, and Scenic Highways are shown on a number of maps within this element. Street designations and related standards, as well as selection/performance criteria, are included in this element. The street designations defined in Table 1-2 are also discussed in Section 3.2.2. Finally, the Transportation Element outlines implementation programs and a monitoring and evaluation program consistent with the General Plan Framework.

Classification	Selection Criteria	Performance Criteria
Major Highway - Class I	More than 50,000 ADT.	Four travel lanes in each direction during peak hours and left turn lanes at signalized intersections. 3,200 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction during peak hours.
Major Highway - Class II	Typically located one mile apart in a grid system. 30,000 to 50,000 ADT.	Three travel lanes in each direction during peak hours and left turn lanes at signalized interstections. 2,400 vph in each direction during peak hours.
Secondary Highway	Supplement the through-traffic carrying characteristics of major highways. Typically located one mile apart midway between major highways in a grid system. 20,000 to 30,000 ADT.	Two travel lanes in each direction during peak hours and left turn lanes at signalized intersections. 1,400 vph in each direction during peak hours.
Collector Street	Assist local traffic flow to and from major and secondary highways. Up to 10,000 ADT.	One travel lane in each direction. 600 vph in each direction.

Source: Los Angeles General Plan Framework, Transportation Element

1.2.3 Systems Planning

The initial systems planning background and context for the 1999-2000 Re-Evaluation/MIS was developed in the *Metro Red Line Extension System Planning Study* prepared by SCAG in 1989, as well as in the *Los*

Angeles Metro Orange Line Extension: Transitional Analysis prepared by the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC) in 1990. The MTA is the successor agency to both the LACTC and the Rapid Transit District (RTD). These reports document the historical framework for the definition of the Eastside/Santa Ana Transit Corridor, as well as other corridors. They provide the background systems analysis that was used to justify the need for major capital expenditures in these corridors. The results of the two studies are summarized in the following sections.

1.2.3.1 SCAG System Planning Study

The August 1989 Metro Red Line Extension System Planning Study was prepared by SCAG for the LACTC to evaluate future extensions of the original 18-mile Metro Red Line subway line between Union Station and North Hollywood. The Extension Study evaluated travel corridor characteristics, reviewed existing transit operations and analyzed the proposed corridor for consistency with the adopted regional plan. Based on the analysis, the study identified proposed corridor extensions (as shown in Figure 1-3), which met federal criteria for current ridership, projected transit demand and consistency with the adopted regional plan. Note that both of the proposed Red Line extension projects shown in the figure are the lines that have been suspended.

1.2.3.2 LACTC Transitional Analysis

Based on the 1989 System Planning Study, a Central East/West Corridor was identified as the highest priority for a Metro Red Line LPA heavy rail extension. The 1990 Transitional Analysis was undertaken to demonstrate that an extension to the east and west could meet federal cost-effectiveness thresholds and provide the basis for proceeding with an Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Based on conservative assumptions for the ridership projections, the total cost per new rider was determined to be under the federal threshold. This supported the decision to proceed with a full Alternatives Analysis/DEIS for the east-west corridor extensions.

1.2.4 Corridor Planning

In January 1998, the MTA suspended work on extensions of the Metro Red Line heavy rail subway project, including the initial 3.7-mile segment of the Eastside LPA from Union Station to 1st/Lorena. Since the suspension, several planning initiatives have provided further guidance for the development of Eastside transit alternative improvements.

1.2.4.1 MTA Restructuring Plan

The MTA Restructuring Plan titled: *Analysis and Documentation of the MTA's Financial and Managerial Ability to Complete North Hollywood Rail Construction and Meet the Terms of the Bus Consent Decree*, was adopted by the MTA Board of Directors on May 13, 1998 and was subsequently approved by the FTA on July 2, 1998. The Restructuring Plan documented that the MTA did not have sufficient local matching funds to finance heavy rail subway projects in the Eastside Corridor as anticipated in the original Full Funding Grant Agreements for the project. At the same time, the Restructuring Plan called for the MTA to study "viable and effective options" for transit in all parts of Los Angeles County, with an emphasis on the corridors in which the rail lines had been suspended.

Figure 1-3 Suspended Red Line Corridor Extensions

Within the Eastside Corridor, this necessitated the examination of alternative fixed guideway options to heavy rail subway. It also committed the MTA to a re-evaluation of the financial capacities of the agency to undertake new start, fixed guideway projects. To that end, the Board authorized the Regional Transit Alternatives Analysis (RTAA) Study that commenced in July 1998 and was completed in November 1998.

1.2.4.2 Regional Transit Alternatives Analysis

The RTAA Study accomplished several important objectives for the MTA. The study identified the amount of funding available for new projects between FY1999 and FY2004. It suggested possible funding allocations, identified immediate bus transit improvements in Los Angeles County, and established a framework for further fixed guideway project development in the Eastside, Westside, and San Fernando Valley corridors.

The study included a preliminary evaluation of fixed guideway alternatives in the three corridors. The study did not make recommendations with regard to preferred fixed guideway transit modes or configurations, but recommended that a Major Investment Study (MIS) level of analysis be conducted to provide more information regarding these choices.

Results of the RTAA Study were presented to the MTA Board on November 9, 1998. At that meeting, the Board approved the concept of a recommended rapid bus system serving the Eastside, Westside and San Fernando Valley. The Board also reaffirmed its commitment to fund fixed guideway transit improvements beyond rapid bus in the suspended rail corridors. A priority funding commitment of \$220 million through FY2004 was made to the Eastside and Mid-City areas from remaining uncommitted funds.

1.2.4.3 TEA-21 Redefinition of Metro Red Line Segment 3

To obtain greater flexibility in project definition for the project corridors, the MTA expanded the definition of Metro Red Line Segment 3. Segment 3 was defined in both the Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and the Segment 3 Full Funding Grant Agreement as a "heavy rail subway" project. With the cooperation and assistance of the Los Angeles congressional delegation, the MTA obtained revised definitional language in the Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty-first Century (TEA-21), which was signed into law by the President of the United States on June 9, 1998. This action was taken with the intent to have the option available to utilize the Segment 3 funding balance in the future for any type of fixed guideway project in the Eastside Corridor. The TEA-21 legislation expanded the definition of the Segment 3 project to include "any fixed guideway project" (not necessarily heavy rail subway) in the transportation corridors to be served by the three extensions of Segment 3. It also authorized the start of final design and construction for the Segment 3 project during the FY1998-2003 funding cycle under FTA section 5309 (new starts funding).

1.2.4.4 Proposition A Ballot Initiative (Subway Funding Prohibition)

A 1998 ballot initiative sponsored by County Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, referred to as the Metropolitan Transportation Authority Reform and Accountability Act, was approved (and became effective) on November 3, 1998. The most significant provision of the new law stipulates that no local Proposition A or C sales tax monies shall be used to fund the planning, design, construction, or operation of any New Subway. The term "New Subway" is defined to mean any subway project (a rail line which is in a tunnel below grade) other than the Metro Red Line Segments 1,2 or 3 (North Hollywood). As a result, the initiative prohibits the use of these sales tax revenues to build subway extensions in the Eastside Corridor.

The initiative does not prohibit the use of sales tax revenues to design and construct light rail, at-grade rail, elevated rail systems, or busways in the Eastside, or in other areas of Los Angeles County. Nor does this initiative prevent the MTA from using state or federal revenues, or local revenues other than sales tax, to design and construct new subways in these areas.

1.2.4.5 East Los Angeles Transit Corridor and Technology Study

Additional information on Corridor transit needs was developed in the *East Los Angeles Transit Corridor and Technology Study*. This study referenced a recent SCAG report which indicated that there are an estimated 212,000 people living in East Los Angeles based on the 1990 census and that the population is expected to grow to 275,000 by the year 2020. It was also estimated that almost 20 percent of the population uses the bus system on their journey to work. This rate of bus usage is three times higher than the LA County average of 6.8 percent. East Los Angeles and Boyle Heights are served by a substantial number of MTA bus routes. The study indicated that there are 40,000 daily transit boardings with several heavily-used bus transit corridors operating on Soto Street, Cesar Chavez Avenue, Whittier Boulevard, and Olympic Boulevard.

Based on the above factors, the study found that the East Los Angeles population is heavily transit dependent and recommended that the planning and implementation of proposed public transportation systems in East Los Angeles should support the basic community needs of the local population.

The study identified ways that the East Los Angeles transit dependent community can effectively access jobs, health services, and education. The study stated that substantial "quality of life" growth within this community can be initiated with a balanced and comprehensively planned transit system improvement implemented within available funding sources.

Once the transit infrastructure plan is in place, opportunities may develop for enhancing community amenities and stimulating economic development within the Corridor. Community plans will identify areas where enhancements could be facilitated within the context of the community.

1.2.4.6 Interstate 5 Corridor Improvement Project

Additional data on Eastside Corridor transportation needs were developed in the 1998 I-5 Corridor Improvement Project. The study area for this corridor extends from SR 91 northwest along the I-5 corridor to Soto Street. The I-5 Corridor Study concluded that an effective multimodal transportation network within the I-5 study area is necessary to meet the mobility needs of residents and businesses in southeast Los Angeles County by providing vital intra- and inter-regional linkages and services.

The I-5 study area currently has severe mobility problems, and these problems are projected to worsen by the year 2015. These problems are manifested as extensive congestion on the freeway and on the local arterial network. The entire freeway segment is projected to be operating at level of service F3 (greater than three hours of congestion per day), and more than 28 percent of the major intersections will be operating below level of service E by the year 2015.

In addition, a significant proportion of the population in the study area does not have access to a private automobile and must rely on the public transportation system and/or other alternative transportation options to meet their basic travel needs.

1.2.4.7 Eastside Transit Corridor Study Re-Evaluation/MIS

The Re-Evaluation/MIS looked at eight build alternatives as well as a No-Build Alternative and a Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative within a broadened study area from that evaluated in the original AA/DEIS/DEIR and FEIS/FEIR. The expanded study area for the Eastside Transit Corridor Study extended from Alameda Street in Central Los Angeles east through the Boyle Heights community in the City of Los Angeles and the City Terrace, Belvedere, and East Los Angeles communities of unincorporated Los Angeles County. South and east of the East Los Angeles area, the study area included major portions of the cities of Montebello, Pico Rivera, and Commerce as well as portions of Monterey Park, Santa Fe Springs, and Whittier. The eight build alternatives assessed in the Re-Evaluation/MIS included: three at-grade Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) alternatives; two at-grade Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternatives; one LRT alternative consisting of an alignment combination of at-grade and subway segments; one hybrid alternative consisting of LRT at-grade alignment with heavy rail subway alignment; and one hybrid alternative consisting of BRT at-grade alignment with heavy rail subway alignment. All of the build alternatives would run along various alignments between Union Station and the intersection of Whittier Boulevard/Norwalk Boulevard in the City of Whittier. The reader is referred to the *Eastside Transit Corridor Study, Los Angeles, California, Re-Evaluation/MIS* draft report (February 24, 2000), incorporated herein by this reference, for additional information about the alternatives studied and the potential environmental impacts.

Subsequent to completion of the Re-Evaluation/MIS and an extensive public involvement program, the MTA Board directed further study of an alignment that was essentially a combination of a shortened segment of two of the LRT alternatives considered. The selected alignment runs between Union Station as its western terminus to the intersection of Beverly and Atlantic Boulevards in East Los Angeles. The Board further directed that this alignment, consisting of an at-grade alignment, as well as a subway segment through a portion of Boyle Heights, be studied comparing two alternative modes: LRT and BRT. The Board decided to eliminate the segment of the alignment east of Atlantic Boulevard that was studied in the Re-Evaluation/MIS because of the need to further study the optimal path for a fixed-guideway alternative in this portion of the study area. On June 22, 2000, the Board re-examined the BRT mode and determined that this mode should be dropped from further consideration in part because the new State Traffic Congestion Relief Plan had committed funding for the light rail mode only.

1.2.4.8 Los Angeles Eastside Corridor SEIS/SEIR

The FTA, as the federal lead agency, and the MTA, as the local lead agency, are preparing this joint SEIS/SEIR in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The SEIS/SEIR supplements the information in the 1994 Final EIS/EIR. The SEIS/SEIR assesses the impacts of the LRT Build Alternative (described in Section 1.1.4) that MTA directed for further study. In addition, the No-Build Alternative is assessed in accordance with NEPA and CEQA requirements.

There are a few differences between the regulations implementing NEPA and CEQA that affect reporting in this document. CEQA requires identification of, and mitigation for, significant adverse impacts in an EIR, while under NEPA, mitigation is considered for all of the adverse impacts of a project, regardless of significance. This combined NEPA/CEQA document identifies the impacts of the alternatives regardless of whether they would be considered “significant” under CEQA and proposes mitigation wherever practicable to reduce identified adverse effects. Specific discussion of impact significance and mitigation in accordance with CEQA is provided in Chapters 3 and 4. Chapter 4 also addresses growth-inducing and cumulative impacts analyses.

1.3 TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

The following sections provide an overview of the existing Eastside transportation system and transit services, including system performance, deficiencies and community factors related to Corridor transportation needs.

1.3.1 Roadway Conditions

The Eastside Corridor study area is served by several freeways that connect to neighboring communities and other parts of the Southern California metropolitan region. The San Bernardino Freeway (I-10), with twelve general purpose traffic lanes and two high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, runs east-west along the northern edge of the study area west of the Long Beach Freeway (I-710). To the south, the Pomona Freeway (SR-60), with ten general purpose traffic lanes, also runs in an east-west orientation. Both freeways connect the study area with the Los Angeles Central Business District (LACBD) to the west and San Bernardino and Riverside Counties to the east.

The Santa Ana Freeway (I-5 and US-101), with six to ten general purpose traffic lanes, runs in a northwest-southeast orientation and connects the study area with the LACBD and Orange County. This major regional freeway connects with the Pomona (SR-60), Santa Monica (I-10), and Golden State (I-5) freeways at the East Los Angeles interchange, one of the busiest and most congested interchanges in the region. The Long Beach Freeway (I-710), with six general traffic lanes, runs north-south and connects the study area with Alhambra to the north and Long Beach to the south. It has interchanges with the San Bernardino (I-10), Pomona (SR-60) and Santa Ana (I-5) freeways.

The Los Angeles Eastside Corridor contains a developed network of arterial and neighborhood collector streets as shown in Figure 1-4. The east-west arterials include Cesar Chavez Avenue, 1st Street, 3rd/4th Streets, Pomona Boulevard, Beverly Boulevard, Whittier Boulevard, and Olympic Boulevard. North-south arterials include Soto Street, Eastern Avenue, and Atlantic Boulevard. The Boyle Heights portion of the Corridor contains narrow roadways, as do many parts of the East Los Angeles portion. Both areas have very high levels of pedestrian activity. Lane configurations for major and minor arterial streets in the Corridor are presented in Table 1-3. Table 1-4 shows the approximate average daily traffic volumes for selected major, secondary, collector, and local streets in the study area, based on LADOT Street Designations from the Los Angeles General Plan.

1.3.1.1 Congestion Management Plan

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) for Los Angeles County includes a program for monitoring major arterial, freeway and transit system conditions in the County. For freeways, the traditional Level of Service (LOS) scale of A to F is expanded to include LOS designations F0, F1, F2 and F3, which correspond to the length of time that a freeway segment experiences level of service F. The F3 designation represents the worst conditions, with level of service F conditions (severe congestion and speeds less than 20 MPH) experienced for three hours or more per day. Table 1-5 summarizes the results of CMP freeway monitoring in the study area.

**TABLE 1-3
LANE CONFIGURATIONS OF ARTERIAL STREETS**

Street	Street Orientation	Number of Lanes	On-Street Parking	Peak Hour Parking Restrictions
Cesar Chavez	E-W	5	Yes	Yes
1st Street	E-W	5	Yes	Yes
4th Street	E-W	5	Yes	Yes
3rd Street	E-W	7	Yes	Yes
Beverly Boulevard	E-W	5	Yes	No
Whittier Boulevard	E-W	5	Yes	Yes
Olympic Boulevard	E-W	7	Yes	No
Alameda Street	N-S	5	No	Yes
Soto Street	N-S	5	Yes	Yes
Lorena Street	N-S	4	Yes	No
Indiana Street	N-S	2	Yes	No
Arizona Street	N-S	5	Yes	No
Atlantic Boulevard	N-S	7	Yes	Yes

Refer to Figure 1-4 for locations of arterial streets.

Source: Field Survey and SCAG Land Use Data Base

Figure 1-4 Eastside Corridor Street Network

Street	Designation ¹	Screenline	ADT Count
Alameda St	Major Highway Class II	South of 1 st Street	19,100
Alameda St	Major Highway Class II	South of Temple Street	26,580
Cesar Chavez	Major Highway Class II	East of Alameda	26,800
Cesar Chavez	Secondary Highway	West of I-5 Freeway	20,900
Cesar Chavez	Secondary Highway	West of Lorena	21,700
Cesar Chavez	Secondary Highway	West of Eastern	20,800
Cesar Chavez	Secondary Highway	West of Atlantic	13,600
1 st Street	Major Highway Class II	East of Alameda	17,370
1 st Street	Secondary Highway	West of I-5 Freeway	13,300
1 st Street	Secondary Highway	West of Lorena	15,300
1 st Street	Secondary Highway	West of Eastern	10,200
1 st Street	Secondary Highway	West of Atlantic	7,300
3 rd Street	Collector Street	East of Alameda	13,800
3 rd Street	Major Highway Class II	West of Eastern	19,100
4 th Street	Secondary Highway	West of Lorena	19,300
4 th Street	Major Highway Class II	East of Alameda	11,100
4 th Street	Major Highway Class II	West of I-5 Freeway	19,500
Mission Rd	Collector Street	South of 1 st Street	2,600
Boyle Ave	Secondary Highway	South of 1 st Street	12,100
Soto St	Secondary Highway	South of 1 st Street	17,500
Evergreen Ave	Collector Street	South of 1 st Street	5,700
Lorena St	Secondary Highway	South of 1 st Street	12,300
Indiana St	Secondary Highway	South of 1 st Street	10,500
Eastern Ave	Secondary Highway	South of 1 st Street	12,800
Mednik Ave	Major Highway Class II	South of 1 st Street	12,300
Atlantic Blvd	Major Highway Class II	South of 1 st Street	35,100
Pomona Blvd	Major Highway Class II	West of Atlantic	11,600
Beverly Blvd	Major Highway Class II	West of Atlantic	17,900

¹ LADOT Street Designations, City of Los Angeles General Plan, Transportation Element (Table 1-2)
Source: The Traffic Solution, 2000; LADOT, 1997-2000; Los Angeles County, 1999

Freeway	Location	Northbound/Eastbound		Southbound/Westbound	
		AM LOS	PM LOS	AM LOS	PM LOS
I-5	Ferris Ave	F1	C	D	F2
I-10	Indiana St	C	F0	D	C
SR-60	Indiana St	B	F1	F2	B
I-710	Whittier Blvd	D	E	E	F0

Source: 1999 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County

The monitoring results indicate that most freeways experience LOS F0 or worse during the AM or PM peak period in at least one direction, and in both directions at two of the four monitoring stations. The CMP data indicate that the PM peak period is the worse time period, with severe congestion on the freeways in the eastbound direction on I-10 and SR-60 (the outbound evening commute flow from Los Angeles). During the AM peak period, congested conditions exist on both I-10 and SR-60 in the westbound (inbound) direction.

1.3.2 Transit Services

The Eastside Corridor has one of the most extensive networks of bus routes in the County, as shown in Figure 1-5. The Corridor's transit routes generally follow a grid pattern and include many express and local routes as well as one limited service route. Four public agencies operate bus service in the Eastside Corridor. They include the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Montebello Transit, the City of Monterey Park, and the City of Commerce. Table 1-6 lists all the current bus transit routes operated in the Corridor with the limits of their service.

Most of the heavily-used routes are those that run in an east-west direction. These include bus routes that operate on Cesar Chavez Avenue, 1st Street, Whittier Boulevard, and Olympic Boulevard. Soto Street and Atlantic Boulevard are two north-south streets on which heavily used bus routes operate. Although north-south travel is constricted into two main through bus lines on Soto and Atlantic, the predominant flow of transit passengers in the Corridor is in an east-west orientation. There is very high ridership on many of these routes during peak periods. A service allocation mismatch is evident in the fact that some bus lines have high ridership and others have low ridership during various periods of the day. Table 1-7 shows the service frequency (headways) for all the bus lines in the Corridor. Some lines, such as the 30/31 on 1st Street and the 66 on Olympic, have very high levels of transit service.

1.3.3 Transportation System Performance

According to screenline analysis results (Table 1-8), one location had an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) level of service (LOS) D under existing conditions. This location was on Atlantic Boulevard south of 1st Street in the vicinity of the Pomona Freeway (SR-60) interchange. The remaining screenline locations exhibit levels of service A, B, and C operating conditions. Levels of service were also calculated across screenlines to provide Corridor performance for more than one street at a given point in the Corridor. These calculations reveal that each screenline operated at LOS A, which indicates good levels of service for all streets within the Corridor taken together at one screenline location. Table 1-8 shows existing ADT capacities, volumes, volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios, and corresponding levels of service for each screenline location analyzed in the Eastside Corridor. An in-depth explanation of V/C ratios can be found in Section 3.2.2.3 of this report.

The traffic intersection analysis results in Table 1-9 for the Eastside Corridor reveal that two signalized locations were operating at LOS E in the year 2000. These locations were Cesar Chavez at Mednik and Beverly at Atlantic. Five signalized locations were operating at LOS D, and the remaining signalized intersections were operating at LOS C or better. For the unsignalized intersections analyzed, two locations were operating at LOS F during the PM peak hour. These were 1st Street at Alma and 4th Street at the Southbound I-5 Ramps. One location was operating at LOS D, and the remaining unsignalized locations were operating at LOS C or better.

TABLE 1-6 BUS TRANSIT ROUTES IN THE LOS ANGELES EASTSIDE CORRIDOR		
Operator	Line(s)	Destinations
Commerce	Blue Green Orange Red Yellow	Community Circulator (Commerce) Community Circulator (Commerce) Community Circulator (Commerce) Community Circulator (Commerce) Community Circulator (Commerce)
Los Angeles County	Gold Green Orange	East Los Angeles East Los Angeles East Los Angeles - CSULA
Montebello	10 40 341,342,343	East LA College - Pico Rivera Downtown LA - Whittier Downtown LA - Montebello Express
Monterey Park	1 2 5	Community Circulator (Monterey Park) Community Circulator (Monterey Park) Community Circulator (Monterey Park)
MTA	18 30,31 65 66 68 71 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 258 259 260 362 605 620 720	Wilshire Center - Whittier Mid City - East LA College Downtown Los Angeles - CSULA Wilshire Center - Montebello West LA Transit Ctr - Montebello Towne Center Downtown Los Angeles - CSULA LAC+USC - Boyle Heights Cypress Park - Watts El Sereno - Lynwood LAC+USC - Boyle Heights LAC+USC - Willowbrook Montecito Heights - East Los Angeles Altadena - East Los Angeles Alhambra - South Gate El Sereno - South Gate Altadena - Compton Downtown Los Angeles - Hawaiian Gardens LAC+USC - Boyle Heights LAC+USC - Boyle Heights Santa Monica - Montebello
Source: 1999-2000 MTA, Montebello, Monterey Park, Los Angeles County, and Commerce bus timetables.		

Figure 1-5 Eastside Bus Routes

TABLE 1-7 FREQUENCY OF TRANSIT SERVICE (IN MINUTES)								
Operator	Line	Days	AM Peak 6-9am	Midday 9am-3pm	PM Peak 3-7pm	Evening 7-11pm	Owl 11pm- 6am	Hours of Service
Commerce	Red	Weekday	60	60	60			6am-6pm
		Saturday	60	60	60			6am-6pm
	Blue	Weekday		60	60			9am-6pm
		Saturday		60	60			9am-6pm
	Green	Weekday	60	60	60			6am-9:30pm
		Saturday	60	60	60			6am-9:30pm
Orange	Weekday	60	60	60			5:30am-6pm	
Yellow	Weekday	60	60	60			6am-9am	
Los Angeles County	Gold	Weekday	60	60	60			6am-6pm
		Saturday		60	60			9am-5pm
	Green	Weekday	60	60	60			6am-6pm
		Saturday		60	60			9am-5pm
	Orange	Weekday	60	60	60			6am-6pm
		Saturday		60	60			9am-5pm
Montebello	10	Weekday	8	10	15			5am-11pm
		Saturday	20	10	20			5am-11pm
		Sunday	20	10	20			5am-11pm
	40	Weekday	10	12	30			5am-11pm
		Saturday	15	15	30			5am-12am
		Sunday	20	20	20			5am-11pm
	341	Weekday	30					7-9:30a,3-6p
	342	Weekday	180					6-7am, 5-6pm
	343	Weekday	30					6-8am, 5-7pm
Monterey Park	1	Weekday	40	40	40			6:30am-6pm
		Saturday	40	40	40			6:30am-6pm
	2	Weekday	40	40	40			6:30am-6pm
		Saturday	40	40	40			6:30am-6pm
	5	Weekday	50	30	30			6:30am-6pm
MTA	18	Weekday	10	15	10	15	60	24 hours
		Saturday	15	12	15	20	60	24 hours
		Sunday	20	30	15	30	60	24 hours
	30 / 31	Weekday	4	7.5	5	15	60	24 hours
		Saturday	7	7	12	30	60	24 hours
		Sunday	12	7	8	30	60	24 hours
	65	Weekday	15	30	25	50		5:30am-10pm
		Saturday	60	60	60	60		6am-8pm
		Sunday		60	60	60		8am-8pm
	66	Weekday	3	8	7	30		4:30am-1:30am
		Saturday	4	10	15	30		5am-1:30am
		Sunday	15	12	12	30		5am-1am
	68	Weekday	8	12	12	40		4am-12:30am
		Saturday	15	10	15	40		4am-12:30am
		Sunday	40	15	20	40		4:30am-12:30am
	71	Weekday	12	22	20			4:30am-8:30pm
		Saturday	30	40	30			4:30am-8pm
		Sunday	40	30	30			5:30am-8pm
	250 251/252	Weekday	40	40	40			6am-7pm
		Weekday	5	12	10	30	60	24 hours
		Saturday	15	15	12	30	60	24 hours
		Sunday	30	20	20	30	60	24 hours

**TABLE 1-7
FREQUENCY OF TRANSIT SERVICE (IN MINUTES)**

Operator	Line	Days	AM Peak 6-9am	Midday 9am-3pm	PM Peak 3-7pm	Evening 7-11pm	Owl 11pm- 6am	Hours of Service
MTA, cont.	253	Weekday	40	40	40			6am-8pm
		Saturday	40	40	40			6am-7:30pm
		Sunday	35	40	40			8am-6:30pm
	254	Weekday	60	55	30	60		4:30am-8:30pm
		Saturday	60	60	60			6:30am-7:30pm
		Sunday	45	60	60			7:30am-7:30pm
	255	Weekday	45	50	45			5am-8:30pm
		Saturday		45	45			5:30am-8:30pm
		Sunday		45	45			5:30am-8:30pm
	256	Weekday	35	50	35	50		6am-10:30pm
		Saturday	60	60	60	60		5:30am-9pm
		Sunday	60	60	60	60		5:30am-9pm
	258/259	Weekday	20	30	30			5am-8pm
	260	Weekday	12	15	15	60		4am-11:30pm
		Saturday	30	25	20	60		5am-12m
		Sunday	50	25	25	60		6am-12m
	362	Weekday	20	30	25	60		5am-11:30pm
		Saturday	50	60	60	60		5am-11:30pm
		Sunday	50	60	60	60		5am-11:30pm
	605	Weekday	15	30	15	30		6am-7:30pm
		Saturday	30	30	30			6am-7:30pm
Sunday		30	30	30			6am-7:30pm	
620	Weekday		12	12			9am-6:30pm	
720	Weekday	8	10	8	20		5am-1am	
	Saturday	12	12	12	20		5am-1am	
	Sunday	12	12	12	20		5am-1am	

Source: 1999-2000 LACMTA, Montebello, Commerce, Los Angeles County, and Monterey Park bus timetables.

As mentioned in the previous section, there are high levels of transit service provided on many of the bus routes in the Eastside Corridor during peak periods. The pattern of a grid-based system of transit service provision can provide for transit to be less convenient and inefficient for many of the transit-dependent residents of the Corridor. A single trip to an activity may require at least one transfer to another bus line, and overcrowding makes the connection to other services unreliable. Transit speed reliability is another factor that hinders the mobility of the transit passenger. On MTA lines that run through the study area, average speeds range from 7.8 to 15.7 miles per hour. On the most heavily used lines, speeds average 12 to 14 mph. During congested peak periods on the major arterial streets, travel speeds decrease during the same time period where passenger loads are the highest. This creates a situation where the greatest number of people are being served at a lower level of service. The existing system of bus lines in the Eastside Corridor does not sufficiently serve the daily needs for mobility of those that are dependent on the system of public transit services.

1.3.4 Community Factors

The Eastside Corridor study area contains a low to moderate income population, which is expected to grow by 30 percent to 275,000 by 2020, according to Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) forecast data. The Eastside Corridor contains a dense concentration of households.

Screenline Location	Street	V/C¹	LOS²
1. East of Alameda	Cesar Chavez Ave	0.79	C
	1st Street	0.51	A
	3rd Street (WB street)	0.51	A
	4th Street (EB street)	0.41	A
2. West of I-5 Freeway	Cesar Chavez Ave	0.65	B
	1st Street	0.42	A
	4th Street	0.57	A
3. West of Lorena	Cesar Chavez Ave	0.68	B
	1st Street	0.48	A
	4th Street	0.54	A
4. West of Eastern	Cesar Chavez Ave	0.65	B
	1st Street	0.32	A
	3rd Street	0.56	A
5. West of Atlantic	Cesar Chavez Ave	0.40	A
	1st Street	0.22	A
	Pomona Blvd	0.34	A
	Beverly Blvd	0.53	A
6. South of Temple St	Alameda St	0.78	C
	Mission Rd	0.35	A
7. South of 1 st Street	Alameda St	0.56	A
	Mission Rd	0.17	A
	Boyle Ave	0.38	A
	Soto St	0.55	A
	Evergreen Ave	0.38	A
	Lorena St	0.38	A
	Indiana St	0.70	C
	Eastern Ave	0.40	A
	Mednik Ave	0.38	A
	Atlantic Blvd	0.88	D
¹ Volume/Capacity Ratio. ² Level of Service. Source: City of Los Angeles DOT, County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works, The Traffic Solution, Parsons Brinckerhoff, 1997-2000.			

Access to employment opportunities is one of the major mobility problems that affect Eastside Corridor residents. The 1990 Census analysis of the study area work force revealed a breakdown of home-based work trips generated from the Eastside Corridor area. Nine percent of work trips from the Eastside Corridor were destined for the Los Angeles CBD, 36 percent for areas north and west of the CBD, 13 percent for the South Bay region of the County, 24 percent for locations within the Corridor, and 18 percent for areas in the remainder of the County.

SCAG forecast data for the year 2020 show an increase in the number of trips generated in the study area as the population grows. The forecast results indicate that there will be less reliance on the Los Angeles CBD and a greater number of trips being made to other sub-areas of the Los Angeles region. Work trips to the West Los Angeles area are projected to increase by 57% from the study area, and work trips to the southern part of the County are expected to increase by 42%. While work trips to the San Fernando Valley are expected to decrease by 46%, work trips to the San Gabriel Valley are expected to increase by 100%. Work trips destined for Orange County are expected to increase by 50%. As employment and activities in

the region decentralize, greater reliance will be placed upon modes of travel that provide relatively convenient and timely service, especially in light of the increase in the amount of traffic congestion and resulting public transit delays that will be experienced in the coming 20 years.

TABLE 1-9 YEAR 2000 INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE			
No.	East-West Street	North-South Street	PM Peak Hour Level of Service
1	Cesar Chavez	Vignes St	B
2	Cesar Chavez	Mission Rd	B
3	Cesar Chavez	Boyle Ave	A
4	Cesar Chavez	State St	B
5 ¹	Cesar Chavez	I-5 SB Ramp	B
6	Cesar Chavez	I-5 NB Ramp	A
7	Cesar Chavez	Soto St	A
8	Cesar Chavez	Evergreen Ave	A
9	Cesar Chavez	Lorena St	A
10 ¹	Cesar Chavez	Indiana St	D
11	Cesar Chavez	Rowan Ave	A
12	Cesar Chavez	Eastern Ave	A
13	Cesar Chavez	Mednik Ave	E
14	Cesar Chavez	Atlantic Blvd	D
15	Commercial St	Alameda St	A
16 ¹	Commercial St	Vignes St	B
17	Temple St	Alameda St	B
18	1st Street	Alameda St	D
19	1st Street	Vignes St	A
20	1st Street	Mission Rd	C
21 ¹	1st Street	US-101 SB Ramp/Pecan St	C
22	1st Street	US-101 NB Ramp	A
23	1st Street	Boyle Ave	A
24	1st Street	Soto St	B
25	1st Street	Evergreen Ave	A
26	1st Street	Lorena St	A
27	1st Street	Indiana St	A
28 ¹	1st Street	Alma Ave	F
29	1st Street	Rowan Ave	A
30	1st Street	Eastern Ave	A
31	1st Street	Mednik Ave	A
32	1st Street	Atlantic Blvd	D
33	3 rd Street	Alameda St	A
34	4 th Street	Alameda St	B
35 ¹	4 th Street	US-101 SB Ramps	B
36	4 th Street	US-101 NB Ramp	A
37	4 th Street	Boyle Ave	A
38 ¹	4 th Street	I-5 SB Ramps	F
39	4 th Street	I-5 NB Ramps	A
40	4 th Street	Soto St	A

**TABLE 1-9
YEAR 2000 INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE**

No.	East-West Street	North-South Street	PM Peak Hour Level of Service
41	4 th Street	Evergreen Ave	A
42	4 th Street	Euclid Ave	A
43	3rd Street	Indiana St	D
44 ¹	3rd Street	Alma Ave	C
45	3rd Street	Rowan Ave	A
46	3rd Street	Eastern Ave	C
47	3rd Street	Ford Blvd	A
48	3rd Street	Mednik Ave	B
49	3rd Street	Woods Ave/Beverly Blvd	C
50	Pomona Blvd	Atlantic Blvd	D
51	Beverly Blvd	Atlantic Blvd	E
52	Beverly Blvd	Hillview Ave	A
53	SR-60 EB Off-Ramp	Atlantic Blvd	A
54	4 th Street	Atlantic Blvd	A

¹ Unsignalized intersection.

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff and Kaku Associates, 2000.

The study area's mobility problems are exacerbated by socioeconomic factors. As reported in the 1990 Census, and as shown in Table 1-10, the percentage of occupied dwelling units in the Corridor whose residents did not have access to an automobile was approximately 30 percent, which is almost three times greater than the figure for the County of Los Angeles as a whole (11 percent). Many of the area's residents were young, with 21 percent between the ages of six and 18 years, and only eight percent being elderly (over 65 years). About 26 percent of the housing units were owner-occupied, and vacancy rates were generally low, averaging less than four percent. Most of the housing units were single-family houses with an average household size of 4.0 persons, which is about 35 percent higher than the City and County of Los Angeles averages of 2.9 and 3.0 persons per household, respectively. The minority composition of the study area in 1990 was 96.7 percent, most of whom were of Latino ethnic background. Given the growing population and the number of low-income households in the Corridor (26 percent of total households), reliance on public transportation will not decrease, but will likely increase in the future.

1.3.5 Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives of the SEIS/SEIR for the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor have been developed from the extensive corridor and systems planning studies carried out over the past ten years, including the Eastside Alternatives Analysis/DEIS/DEIR process, public reviews leading to selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative, and the Re-Evaluation/MIS. Based on these planning and community involvement activities, the following goals and objectives listed were used. They are based on established transportation and land use goals and objectives of the major government jurisdictions within the study area, including the City and County of Los Angeles. These goals and objectives were utilized in the development and evaluation of the Eastside Corridor transit alternatives.

Characteristic	Location	Percentage or Number
Percentage residents without access to an automobile	Eastside Corridor	30%
	Los Angeles County	11%
Percentage persons age 6-18 years	Eastside Corridor	21%
	Los Angeles County	18%
Percentage persons age over 65	Eastside Corridor	8%
	Los Angeles County	10%
Average household size	Eastside Corridor	4.0
	Los Angeles County	3.0
Percentage low-income households	Eastside Corridor	26%
	Los Angeles County	12%
Percentage minority households	Eastside Corridor	97%
	Los Angeles County	59%

Source: U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 1990.

1. Improve access and mobility for residents, employees, and visitors to the Eastside Corridor.
 - ◆ Provide direct service to employment opportunities
 - ◆ Provide direct service to education, medical, shopping, and cultural opportunities
 - ◆ Minimize total travel times
 - ◆ Maximize transit ridership
 - ◆ Minimize transfers and changes of mode by integrating the system
 - ◆ Provide convenient access and improve connectivity to the regional transit system
 - ◆ Provide for the long-term expansion of the future transit system
2. Support land use and development goals as stated in City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles plans for:
 - ◆ Community plan consistency
 - ◆ Regional plan consistency
 - ◆ Joint development opportunities
 - ◆ Increased land use intensity in transit station areas
 - ◆ Mixed-use commercial/residential development
 - ◆ Create a pedestrian-oriented environment
 - ◆ Enhance urban design features
3. Achieve local consensus by ensuring that the process is responsive to the community and policy-makers.
 - ◆ Define the desired transit system attributes from a community perspective
 - ◆ Maximize the opportunities for community and resident input
 - ◆ Enhance the public image of the proposed transit improvements
 - ◆ Build community and political support through effective communication and integration with local and regional plans
4. Provide a transportation project that is compatible with and enhances the physical environment wherever possible.

- ◆ Implement an alternative that minimizes adverse impacts on the environment
 - ◆ Minimize air pollution
 - ◆ Minimize noise pollution
 - ◆ Minimize vibration impacts
 - ◆ Minimize the disturbance of public facilities
 - ◆ Minimize impacts on cultural resources, such as those that are historic, archaeological, or involve parkland
 - ◆ Conform to all local, state, and federal environmental regulations
5. Provide a transportation project that minimizes adverse impacts on the community.
- ◆ Minimize business and residential dislocations, community disruptions, and damage to property
 - ◆ Avoid creating physical barriers, destroying neighborhood cohesion, or diminishing the quality of the human environment
 - ◆ Minimize traffic and parking impacts
 - ◆ Minimize impacts during periods of construction
6. Provide a transportation project that is reasonably within budget constraints for both capital and operating expenses.
- ◆ Ensure adequate local funding commitments to secure federal and state contributions
 - ◆ Ensure adequate operating funds
 - ◆ Ensure fiscal consistency with the MTA's current financial plan
 - ◆ Minimize right-of-way costs by using land previously acquired by the MTA

1.3.6 Summary of Need

Travel demand forecasts prepared by SCAG and the MTA over the past decade have identified the need for transit improvements in the Southern California region, especially in Los Angeles County, to meet the mandates of the federal Clean Air Act and address the increasing mobility needs of the region. Current freeway and surface arterial street facilities cannot be expanded sufficiently to handle the forecasted demand for mobility. Regional forecasts for the year 2020 based on 1990 census data estimate that person trips will increase by over 40 percent in the region and by almost 30 percent in Los Angeles County. The MTA, in the development and adoption of its 1992 30-Year Integrated Transportation Plan, addressed the mobility deficiency issues identified in the regional plan developed by SCAG. Subsequent travel demand forecasting conducted for the update of the MTA Long Range Plan has confirmed the continuing need for improvements in mobility.

The existing population and employment density in the Eastside Corridor is high and very transit supportive. The Corridor transit work trip mode split is 2.8 times higher than Los Angeles County as a whole. The Corridor has a high concentration of low-income, minority, transit-dependent residents. Over 19 percent of workers use the bus system on their journey to work (as compared to 6.8 percent for Los Angeles County as a whole), and rates of carpooling and walking to work are higher than the County average. Employment densities are six times higher within the Eastside Corridor than Los Angeles County as a whole. The Corridor is growing (20 percent population and 30 percent employment growth between now and 2020), and a new transit investment would make the Corridor attractive for other types of urban investment in the future. This will make the Corridor even more transit supportive over time, as new investments are attracted by transit and community centers and encouraged by potential development and tax incentives offered by other agencies responsible for these issues.

All major freeways serving the Eastside Corridor area are currently operating above their design capacities during peak periods, and for significant durations during off-peak periods. No major improvements to

existing freeways in the study area are identified in the current SCAG Regional Transportation Plan except for the extension of the I-710 freeway north to Pasadena. During previous project scoping and community meetings, residents of the Eastside Corridor expressed their desire for improved transit service because many are transit-dependent and need improved access to the region's educational, employment and cultural opportunities. Current meetings with Eastside Corridor elected officials have confirmed the need for improved transit service and connections to the regional system, especially in light of community initiatives for revitalization, employment opportunities, and economic development on the Eastside. The project now under study in this SEIS/SEIR will further these goals and contribute to an improved overall transportation system for the Los Angeles region and for the Eastside Corridor specifically.