

2.0 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

This chapter describes the alternatives that are evaluated in this Final SEIS/SEIR for the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor. Two basic alternatives are reviewed: (1) the No-Build Alternative, and (2) the LRT Build Alternative selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA).

Following public review in the spring of 2001 of the No-Build Alternative and three LPA Options presented in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, the MTA Board adopted the LRT Build Alternative Option 1 (Indiana Street Remove Parking Option) along with the maintenance and storage facility (M&SF) site location at the existing Red Line Yard (also called Option 1). The Indiana Street Remove Parking Option and shared use of the Red Line Yard constituted the MTA Board's LPA that was to be carried forward for evaluation in the Final SEIS/SEIR. Refer to Chapter 2.0 of the Draft SEIS/SEIR for a complete description of the LRT alignment and M&SF.

Since completion of the Draft SEIS/SEIR, MTA has decided to modify some portions of the LRT Build Alternative (Option A). In addition, MTA has added one route refinement (Option B) for consideration within portions of the LRT Build Alternative alignment. All of these changes have come about in response to community concerns that were revealed during circulation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Background assumptions and the physical and operating characteristics are provided in this chapter.

2.1 EARLY PLANNING STUDIES

The initial systems planning background and context for the Eastside Corridor was developed in the *Metro Red Line Extension Systems Planning Study* prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (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. These reports document the historical framework for the definition of the Eastside/Santa Ana Transit Corridor and 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 below:

The August 1989 Metro Red Line Extension System Planning Study was prepared by SCAG for the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (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 System Planning Study identified proposed corridor extensions, which meet federal criteria for current ridership, projected transit demand and consistency with the adopted regional plan.

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 by the LACTC 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/DEIR for the east-west corridor extension.

2.2 PREVIOUS EIS/EIR AND SUSPENDED PROJECT (1990 –1998)

Eastside Corridor planning for the Red Line Extension was initiated in 1990 through the Alternative Analysis/DEIS/DEIR process. Following extensive public review of the ten alternatives presented in the April 1993 Alternative Analysis/DEIS/DEIR document, the MTA Board of Directors in June 1993 selected the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor. The LPA was subsequently incorporated into SCAG's Regional Mobility Element (RME) planning process and included as part of the regional Air Quality Management Plan. The East Side Extension Preferred Alternative was identified as a heavy rail subway line from Union Station to Whittier and Atlantic Boulevards, to be implemented in two phases.

The Final EIS/EIR for the Eastside Corridor was completed in June 1994. It evaluated the LPA to ensure that all significant environmental consequences and all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures were considered in its selection. The Record of Decision was signed on December 1994. Full Funding Grant Agreements were subsequently executed with the Federal Transit Administration and the projects were transitioned into the construction phase.

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 and Lorena Streets. Since the suspension, several planning initiatives have provided further guidance for the development of Eastside transit alternative improvements.

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 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 and Mid-City corridors as anticipated in the original Full Funding Grant Agreements for those projects. 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.

Within the Eastside and Westside corridors, 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.

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.

In a step made to obtain greater flexibility in project definition for the project corridors, the MTA sought to expand 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 and other corridors. 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).

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 will 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 or Mid-City/Westside corridors.

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 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 a new subway in the Eastside or other areas.

2.3 RE-EVALUATION/MAJOR INVESTMENT STUDY (1999 –2000)

In June 1999, the MTA initiated a Re-Evaluation/Major Investment Study (MIS) for the Eastside Transit Corridor. The MTA also authorized parallel Re-Evaluation/Major Investment Studies for the Mid-City/Westside and San Fernando Valley corridors.

There were two major objectives for the Eastside Corridor Re-Evaluation/MIS study: (1) develop alternatives to the Suspended Project, and (2) identify the corridors long-term transportation needs to be addressed in the MTA Long Range Plan. The Re-Evaluation/MIS Report provided the public and MTA Board of Directors the technical information needed in order to make an informed decision related to selecting an alternative or alternatives that satisfy the needs of the Eastside Corridor. The selected alternatives will then be subject to the next phase of analysis, which is the preparation of this Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIS/SEIR).

2.3.1 First-round Screening of Alternatives

The MIS included not only alignments but also three different transit modes: Bus Guideway (also called Bus Rapid Transit or Busway and predominately at-grade or surface running); Light Rail Transit (mainly at-grade or surface running); and Heavy Rail Transit (mainly subway). The first task was to assemble and

document the alternatives that had been considered over the last ten years. Six major relevant studies (listed below) have been conducted in the Eastside Corridor.

1. Regional Transit Alternatives Analysis, November 1998, MTA.
2. East Los Angeles Study for 1st District, October 1998, ACG Environments.
3. 1998 RTP Transit Restructuring Evaluation, East Los Angeles, Transit Corridor Technical Report, July 1998, SCAG.
4. Los Angeles East Side Extension, FEIS/FEIR, September 1994, MTA.
5. Route 10/60 Corridor Preliminary Planning Study, June 1993, MTA.
6. Los Angeles Eastside Corridor, AA/DEIS/DEIR, April 1993, MTA.

From these six studies as well as input from the public and staff, 47 alternatives were identified. The goal was to reduce the identified alternatives to eight fixed guideway alternatives for analysis in the MIS in addition to the No Build and Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternatives. The eight alternatives had to consider the three possible modes of fixed guideway transit and service the full length of the Eastside Corridor.

As part of the federal and local project development and environmental clearance process, a local and federal process called “scoping” was initiated, in addition to a very aggressive public involvement program. The scoping process was initiated with the cooperation of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and was properly noticed through a federal Notice of Intent (August 13, 1999) and the State required Notice of Preparation (August 10, 1999) by MTA. The purpose of the intensive scoping process was to invite interested individuals, organizations, and federal, state, and local agencies to participate in defining the alternatives to be evaluated in the Re-Evaluation Major Investment Study (MIS) and the subsequent environment impact statement and report and identifying any significant social, economic, or environmental issues related to the alternatives. The study area was defined in the scoping information booklets and the 47 alternatives were shown at the scoping meetings.

Three official community scoping meetings were noticed and conducted on August 24, 1999, August 26, 1999, and September 2, 1999. Seven major follow-up community meetings were also conducted over the course of the study and discussed in Chapter 6 of this document. Over 270 persons attended the three community scoping meetings and the comments are fully documented in the *Scoping Meeting Summary Report* dated September 24, 1999. In addition to the three community scoping meetings a separate governmental agency scoping meeting was conducted on August 25, 1999 at MTA Headquarters. Their comments are also documented in the *Scoping Meeting Summary Report*.

To further enhance the initial community outreach program for the MIS, meetings with the MTA Review Advisory Committee (RAC) for the Eastside were conducted on July 21, 1999, August 4, 1999, and August 18, 1999. These meetings brought the committee up to date on the efforts that had been initiated by MTA and presented the study process and schedule leading to a decision for an Eastside fixed guideway transit project by the MTA Board of Directors. The meeting agendas, distributed materials, and meeting minutes are also included in the *Scoping Meeting Summary Report*.

In addition to the above meetings with the community, meetings were held with the MTA Elected Officials Committee (representing the Eastside communities). A number of community ad-hoc meetings were conducted during the scoping period. Throughout the whole MIS process, a very extensive and expensive public outreach program was conducted and is summarized in Chapter 6 of this Draft SEIS/SEIS document.

In order to reduce the number of identified alternatives, the first task was to identify a list of screening evaluation criteria that could be applied to the 47 alternatives. This was a very difficult and controversial

undertaking by the staff and consultant team. A number of staff and consultant team work sessions were undertaken after scoping to identify the eight fixed guideway alternatives to be analyzed. Some 32 measures, or criteria, listed below, were used in the first round of screening.

1. Alternative considered in formal MTA study process.
2. Scoping meetings input – support.
3. Right-of-way acquired by the MTA is not used.
4. Alternative eliminated by previous studies.
5. Alternative does not penetrate the corridor.
6. Alternative does not serve major activity centers.
7. Section 4(f) or 106 properties (recreational or cultural resources) potentially affected.
8. Parking for businesses is removed.
9. Sensitive resources are affected by noise, vibration, etc.
10. Connections with existing transit facilities are non-existent.
11. Access is provided to high-density areas.
12. Major right of way impacts anticipated.
13. Major traffic impacts anticipated resulting in slow travel times.
14. Redevelopment/development potential low.
15. Major impacts on utilities.
16. Construction implementation difficult.
17. Major new structures or other high cost items are needed.
18. Major existing structures will be impacted.
19. Community supports the alternative.
20. Elected officials support for the alternative.
21. Equity is an issue.
22. Major visual impacts on surroundings.
23. Potential high contaminated lands affected (from previous studies).
24. Geotechnical/seismic issues.
25. Lane miles of traffic lanes removed.
26. Lane miles of parking lanes removed.
27. Provisions for north-south bus interface connections (major MTA, Montebello, and other community bus systems).
28. Cultural resources potentially impacted; schools, parks, churches, hospitals and cemeteries.
29. Street curb-to-curb width.
30. Street right of way width.
31. Serves the study goals and objectives.
32. Conceptual preliminary cost within reason.

From the 47 alternatives, some 15 alternatives were identified for further consideration.

2.3.2 Second-Round Screening of Alternatives

A second round of evaluation was conducted in order to reduce the number of alternatives to eight. The eight alternatives were chosen based on a review of previous alternatives and studies, three fixed guideway technologies (Bus Rapid Transit, Light Rail Transit, and Heavy Rail Transit), a workshop by the consultant team to consider the initial screening criteria in reducing the number of alternatives, discussion with the MTA/consultant study team, identification of logical termini (Union Station and Whittier/Norwalk Boulevards) to serve the identified study area, and the basic objective to recommend eight build alternatives for analysis in the Re-Evaluation/MIS Report.

Other assumptions included the provision that no traffic lanes would be replaced for the at-grade alignments, as much on-street parking would be retained as possible, and that the fixed guideway technologies would operate on exclusive rights-of-way. In addition, a key assumption was that the alternatives presented be implementable, even though they may have impacts and capable of being constructed in phases over time, based on the resources available.

2.3.3 Alternatives Considered for Evaluation in Re-Evaluation/MIS

Based on the community, technical staff, and consultant team inputs, eight fixed guideway build alternatives, the No-Build Alternative, and the TSM Alternative were developed for environmental and technical analysis in the study. The alternatives are summarized below.

The No-Build Alternative includes all highway and transit projects and operations that the region and MTA expect to be in place in the year 2020 (the future analysis year for this SEIS/SEIR). These include improvements to the local bus system and the completion of the Red Line to North Hollywood and the Pasadena Blue Line to Sierra Madre Villa in Pasadena.

The Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative is defined by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as the No-Build Alternative, plus lower cost transit capital and operational improvements that are intended to enhance the performance of the transportation system within the study corridor. The TSM Alternative, in comparison to the “build” alternatives, should be a relatively low cost approach to addressing the transportation problems. The TSM should represent the best that can be done to improve transit mobility, in the corridor without the construction of major new transit facilities. The TSM Alternative for the Eastside Corridor includes additions in bus service frequencies to the major east-west and north-south existing transit routes, as well as the implementation of the Whittier/Wilshire Rapid Bus line from Whittier and Garfield (Montebello) to Colorado and Ocean (Santa Monica). This Rapid Bus Line was approved for implementation in June 2000 and provides a combined operating frequency of 1.75 minutes during the peak periods and five minutes during the off-peak periods. There are 24 stops along the route, with six on the stops within the Eastside Corridor study area. This service would provide a strong linkage (no transfers) between a portion of the Eastside Corridor study area to Downtown, Mid-Wilshire, and the far westside of Los Angeles. The TSM Alternative also includes more frequent service for the Metro Red Line.

The eight fixed guideway build alternatives are listed below and shown in Figures 2-1 and 2-2.

1. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) (Dedicated Busway), At-Grade. 1st/Alameda to Union Station (northside) to Whittier and Norwalk Boulevards via Cesar Chavez, Soto, 4th, 3rd, Beverly, and Whittier.
2. Bus Rapid Transit (Dedicated Busway), At-Grade. Union Station (southside) to Whittier and Norwalk Boulevards via Alameda, 1st, Soto, 4th, 3rd, and Whittier.
3. Light Rail Transit (LRT), At-Grade. Union Station (southside) to Whittier and Norwalk Boulevards via Alameda, 1st, Soto, 4th, 3rd, and Whittier.
4. Bus Rapid Transit (Dedicated Busway), At-Grade. Union Station (southside) to Whittier and Norwalk Boulevards via Alameda, 1st, Soto, 4th, 3rd, Beverly, and Whittier.
5. Light Rail Transit, At-Grade. Union Station (southside) to Whittier and Norwalk Boulevards via Alameda, 1st, Soto, 4th, 3rd, Beverly, and Whittier.

6. Light Rail Transit. At-grade Union Station (southside) to 1st/Boyle. LRT (subway) 1st/Boyle to 1st/Lorena. LRT (at-grade) from 1st/Lorena to Whittier and Norwalk Boulevards via Alameda, 1st, Indiana, 4th, 3rd, and Whittier.
7. Heavy Rail Transit and Light Rail Transit. Heavy Rail (subway) from Union Station to 1st/Lorena subway station with a subway station at 1st/Boyle and 1st/Lorena. Light Rail Transit (at-grade) from 1st/Lorena to Whittier and Norwalk Boulevards via Indiana, 4th, 3rd, Beverly, and Whittier.
8. Heavy Rail Transit and Bus Rapid Transit (Dedicated Busway). Heavy Rail (subway) from Union Station to Chavez/Soto subway station with a subway station at 1st/Boyle. Bus Rapid Transit (at-grade) from Chavez/Soto to Whittier and Norwalk Boulevards via Soto, 4th, 3rd, Beverly, and Whittier.

In the Re-Evaluation/MIS study each of the eight fixed guideway alternatives, the TSM Alternative, and the No-Build Alternative were analyzed with respect to each of the environmental conditions or potential impacts listed below. In addition, preliminary mitigation measures were discussed for each of the potentially adverse impacts identified.

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| ◆ Transit Service Levels | ◆ Visual and Aesthetic | ◆ Energy |
| ◆ Transit Ridership | ◆ MTA Arts Program | ◆ Cultural/Paleontologic Resources |
| ◆ Traffic | ◆ Air Quality | ◆ Parks and Recreation Facilities |
| ◆ Parking | ◆ Noise and Vibration | ◆ Major Utilities |
| ◆ Land Use and Development | ◆ Geotechnical | ◆ Safety |
| ◆ Population and Employment | ◆ Hazardous Substances | ◆ Capital Costs |
| ◆ Residences and Businesses Displaced | ◆ Water Resources | ◆ Operating and Maintenance Costs |
| ◆ Environmental Justice | ◆ Wetlands | ◆ Community Involvement Response |

Figure 2-1 MIS Alternatives 1 – 4

Figure 2-2 MIS Alternatives 5 – 8

2.3.4 MTA Board Action (February 24, 2000)

In February 2000, the MIS study recommendations were presented to the MTA Board of Directors. The Board considered the environmental and technical information contained in the MIS study in making their decision. On February 24, 2000, the Board adopted a Light Rail Transit (LRT) Build Alternative that would extend from Union Station (as an extension of the Pasadena Blue Line) to Beverly and Atlantic Boulevards, utilizing Alameda St., 1st St., Indiana St, 3rd St. and Beverly Boulevard, with a tunnel under Boyle Heights from approximately Utah St. to Lorena St. under 1st St. In selecting the LRT Build Alternative, the Board considered the reduced environmental impacts associated with tunneling through Boyle Heights as represented by the chosen alternative. The Board-adopted alternative was a combination of alignments and station locations from the MIS Alternatives 5 and 6. The Board also directed that Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) be studied further in the EIS phase of project development, subject to financing availability for the LRT Build alternative.

2.3.5 MTA Board Action (June 22, 2000)

On June 22, 2000, the MTA Board of Directors officially dropped the Bus Rapid Transit technology from any further analysis, consideration in the project development phases, and in this Draft SEIS/SEIR. The basis for the Bus Rapid Transit technology to be officially dropped from further consideration was based on the project funding being approved for the LRT Build Alternative in the state's Traffic Congestion Relief Program.

In addition, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) found the MIS study process and technical work effort conducted for the Eastside Transit Corridor in full compliance with SCAG's adopted procedures. A Letter of Completion has been approved by SCAG. SCAG has also determined that the LRT Build Alternative, as the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor, is part of the currently adopted Regional Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program.

2.4 DRAFT SEIS/SEIR PROCESS, SELECTION OF THE LPA, AND RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

2.4.1 Alternatives Considered in the Draft SEIS/SEIR

The alternatives considered in the Draft SEIS/SEIR process included the No-Build Alternative and the LRT Build Alternative. These alternatives are described in detail in Chapter 2 of the Draft SEIS/SEIR. A brief summary is presented below.

2.4.1.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative, as defined by FTA, represents the baseline case consisting of existing and committed elements of the region's transportation plan, excluding the proposed fixed guideway transit (bus and light rail transit) investments for the study corridor. The No-Build Alternative includes all highway and transit projects and operations that the region and MTA expect to be in place by the year 2020. These include improvements to the local bus systems and operation of the existing Red, Blue, and Green lines, as well as completion of the Pasadena Blue Line from Union Station to Sierra Madre Villa in Pasadena.

2.4.1.2 LRT Build Alternative

The LRT Build Alternative introduces the light rail transit (LRT) mode to the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor. The LRT fixed guideway concept would operate in a dual track configuration in the center of selected streets and provide for high platform center station arrangements for the at-grade LRT segments (similar to that in use on the Long Beach Blue Line) and cut-and-cover station boxes for the subway segment (similar, but of shorter length, to that in use on the Metro Red Line subway). LRT is electrically powered and receives its electric power from overhead power lines (like the Long Beach Blue Line and Green Line) within the street rights-of-way or in the tunnel for the subway segment. LRT operations would include a traffic signal priority system, to allow for faster travel times, similar to other MTA in-street running operations.

The LRT Build Alternative is approximately six miles long with eight new stations from a connection with the Pasadena Blue Line currently under construction at Union Station to Beverly and Atlantic Boulevards via Alameda Street, 1st Street, Indiana Street (with the exception of the options discussed below), 3rd Street, and Beverly Boulevard (Figure 2-3).

From about Lorena Street to about Hicks Avenue, three alignment options were studied as shown in Figure 2-3. They include: 1) Indiana Street Remove Parking Option; 2) Indiana Street Acquire Additional Right-of-Way Option; and 3) Extended Subway Option. The Indiana Street Remove Parking Option (Option 1) includes an at-grade segment traversing 1st Street east from Lorena Street to Indiana Street where it turns south and continues along Indiana Street to 3rd Street. At 3rd Street, the alignment turns eastward to Hicks Avenue. This option removes the existing parking lanes on both sides of Indiana Street and results in narrower sidewalks along that street. The Indiana Street Acquire Additional Right-of-Way Option (Option 2) is similar to Option 1 except that an additional 26-foot width of right-of-way on the west side of Indiana Street would be required to accommodate the two LRT tracks. However, the parking lanes and current sidewalk widths would be preserved with implementation of Option 2. Indiana Street has a narrower right-of-way than the other streets along the alignment, thus the LRT double-track facility requires additional area from the parking lanes or adjacent right-of-way to accommodate it. The Extended Subway Option (Option 3) involves continuation of the tunnel from Lorena Street in a southerly and easterly direction under several properties, including Ramona High School, to a point along 3rd Street just east of Hicks Avenue where the alignment again becomes at-grade.

The LRT Build Alternative also included provisions for an eight to ten acre maintenance and storage facility (M&SF), to house the required new light rail vehicles using Ducommun and Commercial Streets as the possible connections to the three optional sites considered. Three alternative sites were considered for the maintenance and storage facility (M&SF) for the new light rail cars for the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor LRT extension. The locations considered are shown in Figure 2-4. Refer to Chapter 2 of the Draft SEIS/SEIR for a complete description of each location considered.

As a major component of implementing Light Rail Transit service in the Eastside Corridor, MTA designed a corresponding increase in feeder bus and increased service to existing routes that would serve the LRT stations. Increased service is proposed for MTA bus services in the Eastside Corridor, as well as increased service for routes operated by the City of Monterey Park and Los Angeles County. This increase in bus service will require an increase of over 40 peak period buses.

Figure 2-3 LRT Build Alternative.

Figure 2-4 Alternatives Sites for Eastside Yard.

2.4.2 Selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)

The public review of the Draft SEIS/SEIR began on March 2, 2001, through the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register, and with a Notice of Completion filed with the California State Clearinghouse. Public notices also appeared in local newspapers and through an extensive mailing to provide the public advance notice of the three community public hearings held on March 29, April 4, and April 5, 2001. The public hearings and other information community meetings were held to discuss the contents and comparisons presented in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Considerable public input has been sought through additional community meetings, station area meetings, etc. during the Final SEIS/SEIR development process regarding the modified options.

At the Board meeting of May 24, 2001, the MTA Board of Directors considered the comments received from the meetings, public hearings, and public testimony. The MTA Board formally adopted the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Eastside Corridor to be the Light Rail Transit project with Option 1 (transition from 1st Street and Lorena, via Indiana Street at-grade in the existing right of way, to 3rd Street) and the shared use of the existing Red Line Yard, Option 1, for the Eastside LRT Maintenance and Storage Facility (M&SF). The selection of the existing Red Line Yard, Option 1, for the Eastside M&SF facility was based on the requirement that additional property and/or construction of a bridge over the Los Angeles River would be needed for M&SF Options 2 or 3. The existing Red Line yard was considered to have sufficient capacity to handle the Eastside requirements. The Board also directed staff to prepare the Final SEIS/SEIR, taking into account the comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR and directed staff to “continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and the residents of Little Tokyo to mitigate their concerns about the alignment on Alameda and 1st Streets and to continue to further study the transition at Indiana Street and the impacts to parking at the end of the alignment on Beverly Boulevard.”

2.4.3 Response to Public Comments and Modifications to the LPA (Option 1)

Since completion of the Draft SEIS/SEIR circulation period, MTA has decided to modify some portions of the LPA adopted by the MTA Board on May 24, 2001. In addition, MTA has added one route refinement option for consideration within portions of the LPA alignment. All of these changes have come about in response to community concerns that were revealed during circulation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Since that time, some portions of the MTA Board-approved route of the LRT Build Alternative have been modified (Option A), and one refinement option (Option B) has been added to respond to public comments and direction of the MTA Board when they approved the preferred alternative to be carried forward. Option A responds to the Board’s direction to “...continue to work with the City and the residents of Little Tokyo to mitigate their concerns about the alignment on Alameda and 1st Streets.” Option B responds to the board’s direction to “...continue to further study the transition at Indiana Street and the impacts to parking at the end of the alignment on Beverly Boulevard.”

The two options, A and B, are described in Section 2.5 and Sections 2.4.3.1 and 2.4.3.2 discuss the modifications made to the adopted LPA based on community concerns and comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR and by the MTA Board direction. Chapters 6 and 7 discuss the public involvement program and the written response to all written and verbal comments received.

In a report submitted to FTA by MTA in October 2001, MTA updated FTA regarding the modified Options A and B and identified potential impacts that may be associated with the changes. The report, presented in final form as Appendix H, concluded that following implementation of recommended mitigation, neither Option A nor Option B will result in any significant adverse impacts that were not already evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. In some cases, as further described in Appendix H, the options will result in a lessening of adverse impacts. Although the report is addressed to FTA and addresses

NEPA issues and the standard set forth in 23 CFR Part 771, the standard set forth by CEQA is substantially similar to that set forth in 23 CFR Part 771.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 states “A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review... but before certification... New information added to an EIR is not ‘significant’ unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect...that the project’s proponents have declined to implement.” Application of the standard set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 to the impacts described in Section 3 of the report to FTA in Appendix H yields the same conclusions as set forth in the checklist in Section 4 of that report, i.e., no further CEQA documentation is required.

2.4.3.1 Modifications to the LRT Build Alternative Since Completion of the Draft SEIS/SEIR and MTA Board Approval – Option A

The changes below are included in Option A, Figure 2-5 (discussed in more detail in Section 2.5):

- ◆ Alameda Street—Alignment has been moved from the middle of the street to the east side necessitating some additional partial acquisitions and full acquisition of a gas station along the east side of that street from Commercial Street to 1st Street. This will provide higher traffic capacity on Alameda Street and address other LADOT concerns.
- ◆ 1st/Alameda Station—Station has been moved a short distance from 1st Street just east of Alameda to off-street right-of-way on the east side of Alameda just north of 1st Street. The movement of the station responds to Little Tokyo businesses’ concerns to provide a more convenient location.
- ◆ 1st Street from Alameda to Vignes Street—Two lanes of traffic in each direction will be provided instead of one traffic lane in each direction to provide higher traffic capacity.
- ◆ 1st Street Bridge—LADOT intends to widen both ends of the bridge that they will environmentally clear as part of a separate project. The bridge itself will not be widened within the time frame of this project. The overhead catenary system for the LRT will use center poles over the bridge instead of span wire to address LA Bureau of Street Lighting concerns. (See Section 4.15 for additional information.
- ◆ 1st Street Bridge— The 1st Street Bridge will require retrofitting to meet the current seismic codes and will be part of this project.
- ◆ 1st/Soto Station (Underground)—Station has moved 13 feet south of the previous planned location. The stairway configuration has been changed so that all of the station entrance will be under MTA property and not Soto Street. This reduces the need to excavate Soto Street for the station. A large storm drain on the north side of 1st Street will eliminate the need to acquire property on the northeast corner. Instead a property on the southeast corner will be acquired to accommodate the subway vent shafts and other facilities.
- ◆ 1st/Lorena Station—Station is in an open cut as before but has been moved to the north side of 1st Street. No property will be acquired from Evergreen Cemetery to accommodate the station. The station has been moved to respond to the LADOT concern that split lanes on both sides of the station box will not satisfy their fire/life safety criteria. This will require a traffic signal to be installed at Cheesbroughs Lane (east of Lorena) to accommodate traffic on 1st Street and the transition of the LRT alignment from the north side to the middle of 1st Street.
- ◆ Traction Power Substations (TPSS)—Four TPSSs were assessed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Engineering refinements have determined that a total of six TPSSs are required.
- ◆ Construction Staging—A new staging area has been added at Chavez/Soto on property currently owned by MTA. The other staging areas assessed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR remain the same.

Figure 2-5 LRT Build Alternative, Option A

- ◆ 3rd Street Overcrossing of the I-710 Freeway—The overcrossing will require substantial structural strengthening or alteration in order to support the LRT vehicles. The current approach intends to reduce the dead load of the bridge to compensate for the increased live load, thereby allowing the foundations to remain unchanged for both live load and seismic forces. However, some seismic retrofit is anticipated to be required.
- ◆ Parking Loss Mitigation—MTA will provide replacement parking for areas with high utilization. The areas include: 1) 1st Street from Anderson to Utah Streets; 2) 1st Street east of Lorena Street; and 3) Indiana Street. For the first area, there is currently active redevelopment by the City of the Pico-Aliso complexes. The parking requirements of new developments, redevelopments, and new uses will be taken care of as part of the development approval process of the City. MTA will contribute an appropriate parking space replacement fee (to be negotiated) to the City for the 24 spaces of high utilization that will be removed between Anderson and Utah Streets. For 1st Street just east of Lorena Street, nine spaces currently have high utilization. These spaces will be replaced on property currently owned by MTA at that location. To accommodate the parking losses along Indiana Street under Option A only, three parcels located on the east side of that street just north of Ramona High School will be purchased to provide replacement parking.
- ◆ Park and Ride—Based on further evaluation, the park-and-ride site locations at Beverly and Atlantic have been modified to use the former Kaiser facility on the northwest corner of Pomona and Atlantic as a replacement site for the southwest corner location at Beverly and Atlantic. The joint use of the Pep Boys parking lot as recommended in Option 1 is still being considered.
- ◆ Maintenance and Storage Facility (M&SF) – The existing Red Line maintenance yard will be used for the M&SF for the Eastside Corridor LRT. Excess capacity currently exists at the Red Line yard and is available to provide the needed facilities. The yard lead will consist of dual tracks branching off the LRT mainline at Alameda Street/Ducommun Street. The lead tracks will continue eastward on Ducommun Street to a point just east of Center Street where it will turn and traverse in a northeasterly direction for a short distance to the point where it enters the Red Line maintenance yard. At this point, the lead tracks turn south and continue into the yard. This is slight change to the yard lead location as described in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. All curb parking will be eliminated on Ducommun Street to allow for the dual track lead to the M&SF. This will impact 97 mostly-metered curb parking spaces. MTA will develop a metered parking lot on the northwest corner, and also possibly the northeast corner, of Ducommun and Garey Streets in the parcels that will be acquired for this project. The lot will be administered by the LADOT in a manner similar to that of the metered curb parking currently in place. In addition, the remaining property to be acquired at Commercial and Alameda Streets will also be used for replacement parking.

2.4.3.2 Option B – Option A including Modifications to the Indiana Street Transition and Eastern Terminus

Option B (Figure 2-6) basically follows the same alignment as Option A except that there is an off-street at-grade alignment between 1st and 3rd Streets (on the eastern side of Indiana Street outside the current street right-of-way), and Ramona High School (located at the northeast corner of 3rd Street/Indiana Street) will either be relocated to another site acceptable to the LAUSD and MTA or reconstructed on the existing site. The 1st/Lorena, 3rd/Rowan, and Beverly/Atlantic Stations would be moved to 3rd/Indiana (off-street location on the Ramona High School property), 3rd/Ford, and Pomona/Atlantic (west of Atlantic), respectively. Therefore, the following stations will be included in this alternative: Union Station, 1st/Alameda, 1st/Utah, 1st/Boyle, 1st/Soto, 3rd/Indiana, 3rd/Ford, 3rd/Mednik, and Pomona/Atlantic. Because the eastern terminal station has been moved from Beverly/Atlantic to Pomona/Atlantic, the alignment for Option B does not traverse the short distance from 3rd Street along Beverly Boulevard to just east of Atlantic. Instead, the alignment continues east on 3rd Street and a short distance on Pomona Boulevard to the optional eastern

Figure 2-6 LRT Build Alternative, Option B

terminal station west of Atlantic Boulevard. However, the revised station is within walking distance of the former site. Two areas for park-and-ride facilities are also associated with this alternative. Like Option A, the first is the existing lot at Union Station. The second includes surface parking to be built on land adjacent to Kaiser Hospital, which is located near the eastern terminal station at Pomona/Atlantic. Unlike Option A, Option B would not require shared use of the existing Pep Boys lot.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THIS FINAL SEIS/SEIR

2.5.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative, as defined by FTA, should represent the baseline case consisting of existing and committed elements of the region's transportation plan, excluding the proposed fixed guideway transit (bus and light rail transit) investments for the study corridor. The No-Build Alternative includes all highway and transit projects and operations that the region and MTA expect to be in place by the year 2020. These include improvements to the local bus systems and operation of the existing Red, Blue, and Green lines, as well as completion of the Pasadena Blue Line from Union Station to Sierra Madre Villa in Pasadena.

2.5.1.1 Transit Service

Figure 2-7 shows the Eastside bus routes by MTA, Montebello, Monterey Park, Commerce, LADOT, and Los Angeles County in the Eastside service area. Section 1.3.2 of this document presents additional detail about the existing transit service. Table 2-1 shows the existing weekday service frequencies for the major bus routes in the Eastside Corridor as well as the frequencies planned for the No-Build Alternative. The development of the No-Build Alternative was based on a fiscally constrained local and regional plan. Additional service improvements are proposed for a number of the major east-west and north-south transit routes as well as more frequent service for the MTA operated rail lines as shown in Table 2-2.

2.5.1.2 Highway/Roadway Improvements

Within the Eastside Corridor, no major arterial street or freeway improvements are planned. Studies have identified the need for substantive improvements to the operations and capacity of the Santa Ana Freeway (I-5), the Pomona Freeway (SR 60), the Long Beach Freeway (I-710), and the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10), but agreement on the improvements to be made and the source of funding have not been agreed upon.

The only improvement planned is the widening of the U.S. 101 in the vicinity of Union Station, including relocation of the freeway entrances and exits at Vignes St. In this same area, the City of Los Angeles has proposed to widen Commercial Street from Alameda to Santa Fe Avenue, which is parallel to the U.S. 101 freeway in this area.

2.5.1.3 Other Committed Improvements

The only other committed transportation improvement is the proposed extension of the Amtrak service tracks from Union Station, over U.S. 101 and parallel to the Eastside LRT Build Alternative, to the mainline Amtrak tracks in the vicinity of Jackson Street.

Figure 2-7 Eastside Bus Routes

**TABLE 2-1
FREQUENCY OF WEEKDAY BUS TRANSIT SERVICE (IN MINUTES)**

Operator	Route	Destinations	Existing		No-Build		LRT Build		
			Peak	Off-Peak	Peak	Off-Peak	Peak	Off-Peak	
MTA	18	Wilshire Center - Whittier	10	15	6	10	6	10	
	30/31	Mid City – East Los Angeles	4-5	7.5	4	6.5	3.5	5	
	31A	East Los Angeles – 1 st /Lorena	-	-	-	-	10	15	
	65	Downtown Los Angeles - CSULA	15-25	30	13	45	10	15	
	66	Wilshire Center - Montebello	3-7	8	5.5	12	5.5	12	
	68	West LA Transit Ctr - Montebello Towne Center	8-12	12	8	10.5	8	10.5	
	250	LAC+USC - Boyle Heights	40	40	40	40	15	20	
	251	Cypress Park – Watts	12	24	15	24	10	20	
	252	El Sereno - Lynwood	12	24	12	24	10	20	
	253	LAC+USC - Boyle Heights	40	40	40	40	15	20	
	254	LAC+USC - Willowbrook	30-60	55	45	60	10	20	
	255	Montecito Heights - East Los Angeles	45	50	45	50	10	20	
	256	Altadena - East Los Angeles	35	50	30	50	30	50	
	258	Alhambra - South Gate	45	60	45	60	30	30	
	258A	Olympic - Floral	-	-	-	-	15	20	
	259	El Sereno - South Gate	45	60	45	60	30	30	
	260	Altadena – Compton	12-15	15	5.6	20	5.5	20	
	530	Panorama City – East Los Angeles	-	-	15	30	15	30	
	L.A. County	605	LAC+USC - Boyle Heights	15	30	22	30	10	12
		620	LAC+USC - Boyle Heights	0-12	12	0-12	14	10	12
720		Santa Monica – Montebello	8	10	6	10	6	10	
Gold		East Los Angeles	60	60	45	45	10	15	
Green		East Los Angeles	60	60	45	45	10	15	
Orange		East Los Angeles – CSULA	60	60	45	45	10	15	
Monterey Park		1	Community Circulator	40	40	35	35	20	30
	2	Community Circulator	40	40	35	35	20	30	
	5	Community Circulator	50	50	35	35	20	30	
Montebello	10	East LA College – Whittier	8-15	10	8	12	8	12	
	40	Whittier – Downtown LA	10-30	12	12	20	10	20	
	341(2) (3)	Downtown LA – Montebello Express Routes	30-60	-	30-60	-	30-60	-	
LADOT	Dash A	Little Tokyo – Convention Center	5	5	5	5	5	5	
	DashD	South Park	5	5	5	5	5	5	

**TABLE 2-2
FREQUENCY OF WEEKDAY RAIL TRANSIT SERVICE (IN MINUTES)**

Operator	Route	Destinations	Existing		No-Build		LRT Build	
			Peak	Off-Peak	Peak	Off-Peak	Peak	Off-Peak
MTA	Blue	7 th /Flower to Long Beach	6	12	5	12	5	12
	Blue	Union Station – Sierra Madre Villa	-	-	5	12	5	12
	Blue	Beverly/Atlantic – Union Station (Eastside) through to Pasadena (no transfer required at Union Station)	-	-	-	-	5	12
	Red	Union Station – North Hollywood	5	10	4	8	4	8
	Red	Union Station – Wilshire/Western	5	10	4	8	4	8
	Green	I-105/I-605 – El Segundo (Marine)	8	15	5	12	5	12

2.5.2 LRT Build Alternative

This section describes the two options (Option A and Option B) that are being considered in this Final SEIS/SEIR. The process leading to the decision to consider these options is described in Section 2.4.3 and shown in Figures 2-5 and 2-6.

2.5.2.1 LRT Build Alternative – Option A

LRT Build Alternative Option A introduces the light rail transit (LRT) mode to the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor. The LRT fixed guideway concept would operate in a dual track configuration in the center of selected streets and provide for high platform center station arrangements for the at-grade LRT segments (similar to that in use on the Long Beach Blue Line) and cut-and-cover station boxes for the subway segment (similar, but of shorter length, to that in use on the Metro Red Line subway). LRT is electrically powered and receives its electric power from overhead power lines (like the Long Beach Blue Line and Green Line) within the street rights-of-way or in the tunnel for the subway segment. The LRT operations would include a traffic signal priority system, to allow for faster travel times, similar to other MTA in-street running operations. Fiber optics communications lines will be provided. The necessary communications connections between the LRT vehicle detectors and traffic signals will also be provided. Also additional space will be provided in the piping to allow for future expansion of fiber optic lines.

Option A is approximately six miles long, with eight new stations from a connection with the Pasadena Blue Line currently under construction at Union Station to Beverly and Atlantic Boulevards via Alameda Street, 1st Street, Indiana Street, 3rd Street, and Beverly Boulevard (Figure 2-5). Appendix E, *LRT Build Alternative Option A Design, December 31, 2001*, shows the plans and profiles and station site plans for Option A. Appendix E also shows the proposed property acquisitions and easements for Option A.

Option A also includes provisions for the shared use of the existing Red Line maintenance facility as the needed maintenance and storage facility (M&SF) to house the required 26 new light rail vehicles using Alameda Street and Ducommun Street as the connection to the Red Line yard. An emergency power generator will also be provided at the M&SF facility in order to provide emergency power for the tunnel segment and subway stations. There are six traction power substations along the six-mile route. They are located in the Red Line yard, near the 1st/Soto Station (Appendix E, Sheet PI-005), near the 1st/Lorena

Station on property owned by MTA (Appendix E, Sheet PI-007), at 3rd/Sunol (Appendix E, Sheet PI-008), at 3rd/Arizona (Appendix E, Sheet PI-011), and at Beverly/Atlantic (Appendix E, Sheet PI-012).

The subway or tunnel segment of Option A includes a number of ventilation and emergency exit areas for the subway segment in the vicinity of the subway stations. The locations for emergency exits and exhausts on MTA property and public rights-of-way (sidewalks or street) are shown in Appendix E. In Appendix E, Drawing No. A-3001 shows the locations for the area around the 1st/Boyle subway station; Appendix E, Drawing No. A-4001 shows the locations around the 1st/Soto subway station; and Appendix E, Drawing No. A-5002 shows the emergency exhaust location for the 1st/Lorena at-grade station area.

The three stations will house emergency ventilation fan shafts, as well as separate emergency exit shafts at both ends of the stations. Ventilation fans are used for extracting smoke from the tunnels and stairs for evacuation in the event of an emergency – such as a fire in the underground areas. The two-level vent structure is generally a 45-foot-wide, approximately 70-foot-deep concrete box at two ends of the station, joining openings in the top of the tunnels to a vertical shaft penetrating the ground in a convenient location. Ventilation fans and their control equipment, as well as the emergency exit stairs, would be housed in this horizontal concrete box. The area of the shaft will be dependent on the height of the box. Where shafts vent at ground level the area is typically about 400 sq. ft. reducing to about half this area where towers are provided. Minimum tower height would be about ten feet. In some cases vent structures are incorporated with other structures and the height may be adjusted to match or compliment the structure. These fans are operated only for emergencies and for routine maintenance.

Each subway station at each end will have two exit hatches connected to emergency stairs. Each exit hatch is about 6 feet wide. Currently most of these hatches and gratings are shown at the station entrance plazas or right-of-way to be acquired for the construction staging areas. The construction staging areas are located on existing MTA property at the 1st/Boyle, Cesar Chavez/Soto, and 1st/Lorena sites, as well as at additional properties at the 1st/Boyle and 1st/Soto sites. During the preliminary engineering design phase, further coordination with the City of Los Angeles will be required to determine if some or all of these hatches and gratings could be located within the public right-of-way. This may require variances from City codes.

Bus Service

As a major component of implementing Light Rail Transit service in the Eastside Corridor, MTA has designed a corresponding increase in feeder bus and increased service to existing routes that would serve the LRT stations. Table 2-1 shows the increase in service frequency as well as the addition of two routes (31A and 258A) expressly recommended to support the LRT Build Alternative. Increased service is proposed for MTA bus services in the Eastside Corridor as well as increased service for routes operated by Monterey Park and Los Angeles County. This increase in bus service will require an increase of over 40 peak period buses. The capital cost of these improvements as well as the increased bus operating costs are included in the costs for the LRT Build Alternative Option A as described in Chapter 5.

In order to maintain connectivity with other transit operators and bus services within the corridor, it is important that proposed stations interface with existing and proposed bus routes. The transit operating plan for Option A provides for a connection of existing bus lines at each station location. Figure 2-8 shows how the LRT system would fit into the Eastside Corridor's bus route network. At three station locations, bus lines would be rerouted in order to provide improved access to the light rail system. These rerouted lines include:

- ◆ MTA Line 65 to 3rd/Rowan Station via 3rd Street and Rowan Avenue
- ◆ MTA Line 530 to 1st/Soto Station via Soto and 1st Street

- ◆ MTA Line 620 to 1st/Utah Station via Utah Street
- ◆ Monterey Park Lines 1, 2 and 5 to Beverly/Atlantic Station via Atlantic Boulevard

MTA Line 65 is a local bus line that currently runs north on Indiana Street in the vicinity of the LRT Build Alternative alignment and turns east on 1st Street to Rowan Avenue. In order to provide access to the 3rd/Rowan Station, this line will be rerouted onto 3rd Street east to Gage Avenue and then on Rowan to 1st Street. This minor reroute will not have a significant impact on transit ridership or transit access due to its proximity to the current routing one quarter of a mile to the west on Indiana Street. Access to the business district on 1st Street would still be provided at 1st and Rowan. Routing this bus line away from Indiana Street also will help to mitigate the impacts of Option A on Indiana Street for the transition between 1st and 3rd Streets if this option is chosen.

MTA Line 530 is a new service that will debut in 2001 as outlined in the MTA's 1998 Five-Year Plan. Line 530 is an express route that will connect East Los Angeles College and Boyle Heights with Panorama City via the County-USC Medical Center and the Burbank Media District. Line 530 currently is proposed to run south on Soto Street from the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10) to Cesar Chavez Avenue and then turn east to East Los Angeles College. In order to provide service to the 1st/Soto Station, this line will be rerouted south on Soto Street to 1st Street. It will then continue east on 1st Street to Lorena Street back to Cesar Chavez Avenue. Line 530 will also serve the 1st/Lorena Station on its amended route.

MTA Line 620 is a community shuttle service jointly operated by MTA and LADOT that currently runs on Gless Street west of the 101 Freeway between 4th and 1st Streets. It is proposed that this line be rerouted from Clarence Street to 3rd Street and Utah Street where it will continue north to interface with the 1st/Utah Station at the corner of 1st and Utah Streets. This minor reroute will not affect line patronage because of the close proximity of Utah Street to Clarence Street one block away.

Monterey Park's Spirit Transit system provides community transportation services on five routes within the City of Monterey Park. Three of its lines currently operate in the vicinity of Cesar Chavez Avenue and Atlantic Boulevard. These three routes (1, 2, and 5) will be extended southward along Atlantic to the Beverly/Atlantic Station. The extension of these three routes will provide convenient access to the LRT system from the City of Monterey Park. The three Monterey Park lines will also provide connecting service from the LRT system to the Atlantic Square shopping area as well as to East Los Angeles College.

Figure 2-8 Modified Bus System with LRT

Table 2-3 shows the interface of bus lines at each station along the alignment of the LRT Build Alternative Option A.

TABLE 2-3			
BUS ROUTE INTERFACE AT LRT STATIONS – OPTION A			
Station	Operator	Line	Destinations
Union Station	Antelope Valley LADOT MTA	785	Gateway Transit Center – Antelope Valley
		DASH D	Union Station – Grand Blue Line Station
		33	Union Station – Venice Bl.
		40	Union Station – South Bay Galleria
		42	Union Station – LA Int'l Airport
		55	Union Station – Rosa Parks Metro Rail Station
		60	Union Station – Long Beach
		333	Union Station – Venice Bl.
		434	Union Station – Malibu
		436	Union Station – Ocean Park
		439	Union Station – Redondo Beach
		442	Union Station – South Bay Galleria
		444	Union Station – Rancho Palos Verdes
		445	Union Station – San Pedro
	446	Union Station – San Pedro	
	447	Union Station – San Pedro	
	OCTA Santa Clarita	466	Union Station – La Mirada
701		Union Station – Huntington Beach	
794		Union Station – Santa Clarita	
1 st /Alameda	LADOT	DASH A	Little Tokyo – Los Angeles Convention Center
		DASH D	Union Station – Grand Blue Line Station
	MTA	30 / 31	Mid City – East LA College
		40	Union Station – South Bay Galleria
		42	Union Station – LA Int'l Airport
		58	Union Station – Washington Blue Line Station
		434	Union Station – Malibu
		436	Union Station – Ocean Park
		442	Union Station – South Bay Galleria
		445	Union Station – San Pedro
		446	Union Station – San Pedro
1 st /Utah	MTA	30 / 31 620 (reroute)	Mid City – East LA College LAC+USC – Boyle Heights
1 st /Boyle	MTA	30 / 31	Mid City – East LA College
		250	LAC+USC – Boyle/Olympic
		620	LAC+USC – Boyle Heights
1 st /Soto	MTA	30 / 31	Mid City – East LA College
		250	Cypress Park – Watts
		251	El Sereno – Lynwood
		530 (reroute)	Panorama City – East LA College
		605	LAC+USC – Boyle Heights
1 st /Lorena	MTA	30 / 31	Mid City – East LA College
		254	LAC+USC – Willowbrook
		530 (reroute)	Panorama City – East LA College
3 rd /Rowan	Montebello MTA	40	Downtown LA – Whittier
		65 (reroute)	Downtown LA – CSULA
		255	Montecito Heights – East Los Angeles

**TABLE 2-3
BUS ROUTE INTERFACE AT LRT STATIONS – OPTION A**

Station	Operator	Line	Destinations
3 rd /Mednik	Los Angeles County	Gold	East Los Angeles
		Green	East Los Angeles
		Orange	East Los Angeles – City Terrace – CSULA
		40	Downtown LA – Whittier
		258	El Sereno – South Gate
Beverly/Atlantic	Montebello MTA	259	Alhambra – South Gate
		10	East LA College – Pico Rivera
		40	Downtown LA – Whittier
		341, 342, 343	Downtown LA – Montebello Express
		1 (reroute)	Monterey Park
Monterey Park MTA	2 (reroute)	Monterey Park	
	5 (reroute)	Monterey Park – CSULA	
	260	Altadena – Compton	
	Source: 1999-2000 MTA, Montebello, Monterey Park, Los Angeles County, and Commerce bus timetables; Parsons Brinckerhoff.		

LRT Alignment

The alignment begins at Union Station and crosses over US 101 on an aerial structure (approximately 1,000 feet in length) and then gradually becomes an at-grade segment near where it intersects with Alameda Street. The alignment continues south along the east side of Alameda Street and then turns east to the center of 1st Street where it continues at grade to Clarence Street in Boyle Heights and then becomes a subway segment. The subway segment traverses underneath or adjacent to 1st Street for about 1.8 miles east to just west of Lorena Street in Boyle Heights.

For Option A, the alignment continues as an at-grade segment traversing 1st Street east from Lorena Street to Indiana Street where it turns south and continues along Indiana Street to 3rd Street. At 3rd Street, the alignment turns eastward to Hicks Avenue. This option removes the existing parking lanes on both sides of Indiana Street and results in narrower sidewalks along that street. From Hicks Avenue, the alignment travels east on 3rd Street at grade to Beverly Boulevard where it turns to the southeast and continues for a short distance on Beverly Boulevard to a point just east of Atlantic Boulevard.

For the at-grade sections, the LRT would operate mostly on existing arterial streets and would generally require removal of one general purpose travel lane in each direction. The center sections of all the designated arterial streets would require major reconstruction in order to implement the LRT system. This design configuration would allow for the retaining of a majority of the on-street parking on the arterial streets that are used. MTA will provide replacement parking for those areas where parking utilization is high (Refer to Chapter 3 for more details).

LRT Service Characteristics

The future operating plan for the LRT Build Alternative Option A is comprised of two components: 1) the LRT operating line (extension of the Pasadena Blue Line) between Sierra Madre Villa and Beverly/Atlantic Boulevards with five-minute peak service (7.5 minutes initial service) and 12-minute off-peak service; and 2) local connecting bus routes to all stations along the LRT line. Because the individual cars can be "trained" together, the train lengths can then vary from one to three cars depending on the demand and time of day. Local buses with local stops would continue to operate along the same arterial streets as the LRT but would be at lower service frequencies. This will also allow transit patrons to access areas that are not directly served by the LRT station stops. The LRT running time with making

stops at each station is estimated to be 17 minutes from Beverly/Atlantic Boulevards to Union Station. Based on the LRT operating plan, the number of trains per hour in the peak direction on the LRT track would be 12 (8 initially) during the peak times and five during the off-peak times.

The LRT operating speeds for the at-grade segments would be similar to existing street-running LRT operations in other parts of Los Angeles. Because of the placement of the LRT track and stations mainly within arterial streets, the maximum speed of operation would be limited by the streets' speed limit (varies from 25 mph to 35 mph) with a 35 mph maximum speed allowed under all circumstances by State PUC regulations. Based on experience with the Long Beach Blue Line operations, the lower speed at-grade operation has fewer fatalities than high speed (55 mph) operations even though the numbers of minor accidents are greater with the in-street operation proposed for most of the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor. The maximum LRT operating speed of the subway portion would be much faster (55 mph) than the at-grade segments because it would not operate along the existing street rights-of-way. The Eastside Corridor would not have high speed surface-running operations in a reserved right-of-way such as exists in the mid corridor of the existing Long Beach Metro Blue Line.

Table 2-4 shows the travel time between each proposed station and the total travel time from each station to Union Station.

		Option A		Option B	
Station (A)	Station (B)	Travel Time between Stations, minutes	Total Travel Time from Station (A) to Union Station, minutes	Travel Time between Stations, minutes	Total Travel Time from Station (A) to Union Station, Minutes
Beverly/Atlantic	3 rd /Mednik	1.6	17.2	-	-
Pomona/Atlantic	3 rd /Mednik	-	-	1.4	16.9
3 rd /Mednik	3 rd /Rowan	3.6	15.6	-	-
3 rd /Mednik	3 rd /Ford	-	-	1.2	15.5
3 rd /Ford	3 rd /Indiana	-	-	3.4	14.3
3 rd /Indiana	1 st /Soto	-	-	3.1	10.9
3 rd /Rowan	1 st /Lorena	2.4	12.0	-	-
1 st /Lorena	1 st /Soto	1.8	9.6	-	-
1 st /Soto	1 st /Boyle	1.6	7.8	1.6	7.8
1 st /Boyle	1 st /Utah	1.4	6.2	1.4	6.2
1 st /Utah	1 st /Alameda	1.8	4.8	1.8	4.8
1 st /Alameda	Union Station	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Total	17.2		16.9	

Automobiles and delivery vehicles would operate in a different fashion along the at-grade segments than they do now. In order to maximize the safety of the LRT operation and to minimize private vehicles conflict with the LRT trains, left turns and crossings of the LRT train track would be limited and mostly restricted to major intersecting streets where advanced traffic and train control systems can be implemented. Between major intersections, a six-inch curb next to the travel lane would protect the LRT track section and, therefore, driveways and minor or secondary streets would be limited to right-turns in and out. Private vehicles would not be able to make left turns across the LRT tracks or cross from one side to the other (no straight through movements) between intersections. Private vehicles left turns at designated intersections would be controlled and all safety measures (including the possibility of left-turn

gates) would be taken. The mountable curb for the track section would allow for emergency vehicles to park on or cross the track when necessary. MTA would arrange a permit system for non-peak hour large truck deliveries across the tracks to furniture stores and other businesses with occasional oversize deliveries. All of these changes will be similar to those encountered when a street has a raised center median of any type.

It is expected that the streets where the LRT tracks are located will become more "transit" oriented, and through traffic will be reduced and shifted to other streets within the corridor. On the narrower streets, left turns may need to be restricted at certain intersections during some portions of the day (probably peak periods) because of the lack of space for a dedicated left turn pocket. The reduction of one traffic lane in each direction in most locations would impact the level of service and possibly the ease of access by automobile to commercial buildings and other public activities. It is expected that, over time, traffic would re-orient itself because many of the streets in the corridor have some available capacity and might accept more traffic and still operate at acceptable levels of service. In addition, the LRT will provide an improved level of service of public transit service, which some may choose in preference to using an automobile.

If the LRT Build Alternative were implemented, an increase in the provision of transit service would occur in the Eastside Corridor. There would be the introduction of a premium service that would be regionally serving and provide improved service reliability and a decrease in travel times for transit patrons. Forecast data indicate that transit ridership would increase in the Corridor with the introduction of the improved service.

The introduction of a light rail system into the Eastside Corridor would provide passengers with greater access to regional transit opportunities and would provide for improved regional transit connectivity. Transfers could be made at Union Station to a variety of different transit alternatives. The Eastside Corridor Light Rail system will provide continuing service to Pasadena via the Pasadena Blue Line, which is expected to open for service in 2003. Transfers can be made to the Metro Red Line at Union Station with its subway service to Wilshire Center and North Hollywood. The Long Beach Blue Line can also be accessed via the Red Line at the 7th/Metro Center station in Downtown Los Angeles, and the Green Line to Norwalk and Redondo Beach is accessible via the Long Beach Blue Line. Dozens of local and express bus lines converge at Union Station including the Big Blue Bus's popular Line 10 express to Santa Monica. Several transit providers serve Union Station, including Santa Monica's Big Blue Bus, LADOT, Foothill Transit, Torrance Transit, Santa Clarita Transit, Orange County Transportation Authority, and the Antelope Valley Transportation Authority. Metrolink commuter rail service is also available for regional travel to Ventura, San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, and San Diego counties, as well as to northern Los Angeles County. Amtrak rail service can also be accessed at Union Station for long-distance travel to other cities in California and the nation. Impacts on regional transit access and connectivity as a result of the LRT Build Alternative are beneficial.

Passenger Stations

As discussed in the bus service section, the LRT Build Alternative Option A consists of eight new stations and one station modification: Union Station (station modification), 1st/Alameda, 1st/Utah, 1st/Boyle, 1st/Soto, 1st/Lorena, 3rd/Rowan, 3rd/Mednik, and Beverly/Atlantic. All stations are at grade with the exception of 1st/Boyle and 1st/Soto, which are within the subway segment and 1st/Lorena, which is located in an open cut. The LRT at grade station stops would entail constructing a 270-foot long platform (allows for a maximum of three-car trains) along with pedestrian walkways to allow for safe passage to crosswalks for arriving and departing passengers. The LRT underground stations will include 270-foot platforms. The subway stations are projected to have center platforms, a bridge-like mezzanine and single

entrances located in plazas adjacent to 1st Street. The at-grade stations will be similar to the Long Beach and Pasadena Blue Line stations.

Park-and-Ride Facilities (including bus interface at Beverly/Atlantic)

Two areas for park-and-ride facilities are associated with this alternative. The first is the existing lot at Union Station, which is the western terminus of the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor LRT line. The project does not involve any expansion or improvements to that lot. The second is near the Beverly/Atlantic Station at the eastern terminus of the line. Park-and-ride surface parking for a total of about 200 vehicles would be provided near the station. One location is land adjacent to the former Kaiser facility on the northwest corner of Pomona/Atlantic, which is within walking distance of the Beverly/Atlantic station. The other location is the existing parking lot behind (to the east of) the Pep Boys auto parts store that is located on the east side of Atlantic Boulevard north of Beverly Boulevard (between Beverly and Pomona Boulevards). MTA intends to enter into negotiations with the owners of Pep Boys to develop a joint use agreement with them for the existing parking lot. Minor improvements to the Pep Boys lot are anticipated. It is expected that a long-term agreement will be entered into that will allow control of the parking spaces for the expected life of the improvement.

Vehicle Fleet

The type of light rail transit (LRT) vehicles to be used for the Eastside Corridor will be the same as used on the Long Beach and Pasadena Blue lines. They will be standard conventional articulated light rail transit vehicles. In order to provide the future service level of 5-minute frequencies between trains, as well as a maximum train length of 3 cars, a total of 26 new LRT vehicles will be required for the LRT Build Alternative Option A.

Maintenance and Storage Facility – Red Line Yard

The existing Red Line maintenance yard will be used for the Maintenance and Storage Facility (M&SF) for the Eastside Corridor LRT. Excess capacity currently exists at the yard and is available to provide the needed facilities. The site was previously environmentally cleared for the Metro Red Line in the *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Los Angeles Rail Rapid Transit Project, Metro Rail*, USDOT, UMTA, and Southern California Rapid Transit District, December 1983. The yards and shops currently provide space for the following functions: storage of trains when not in mainline service; dispatch, receipt, and change in trains for mainline service; interior and exterior cleaning of trains; preventive and corrective maintenance of cars; and testing of cars before revenue service and after major repairs. The M&SF will include the addition of a blow down pit, car cleaner platform, and car wash for cleaning the light rail vehicles as well as two storage tracks. The yard lead will consist of dual tracks branching off the LRT mainline at Alameda Street/Ducommun Street (see Appendix E, Sheets C-101 to C-110). The lead tracks will continue eastward on Ducommun Street to a point just east of Center Street where it will turn and traverse in a northeasterly direction for a short distance to the point where it enters the Red Line maintenance yard. At this point, the lead tracks turn south and continue into the yard.

2.5.2.2 LRT Build Alternative – Option B

As discussed in Section 2.4.3.2 and shown in Figure 2-6, Option B basically follows the same alignment as Option A except that there is an off-street at-grade alignment between 1st and 3rd Streets (on the eastern side of Indiana Street outside the current street right-of-way), and Ramona High School (located at the northeast corner of 3rd Street/Indiana Street) will either be relocated to another site acceptable to the LAUSD and MTA or reconstructed on the existing site. MTA will provide funding to LAUSD to either purchase a new school site (whether with a new or existing building) acceptable to LAUSD or to reconstruct the school at its present location. It is not feasible for MTA to analyze the impacts of this proposed school replacement at this time because LAUSD has not undertaken any programmatic planning for the new school and the timing, location and extent of work required to undertake this replacement are unknown. MTA staff has conferred with LAUSD staff and LAUSD has agreed that upon its completion of programmatic planning and identification of potential new sites, LAUSD will conduct all required environmental studies as a condition to its determination of whether to relocate or reconstruct the school. Because of the indeterminate nature of the school project, it is beyond the scope of the analysis for the Eastside Corridor Project. However, MTA will monitor LAUSD progress with regard to Ramona High School decision-making and will work with LAUSD to address any conflicts that may arise between LAUSD's Ramona High School and MTA's Eastside Extension programs.

The 1st/Lorena, 3rd/Rowan, and Beverly/Atlantic Stations would be moved to 3rd/Indiana (off-street location on the Ramona High School property), 3rd/Ford, and Pomona/Atlantic (west of Atlantic), respectively. Therefore, the following stations will be included in this option: Union Station, 1st/Alameda, 1st/Utah, 1st/Boyle, 1st/Soto, 3rd/Indiana, 3rd/Ford, 3rd/Mednik, and Pomona/Atlantic. Because the eastern terminal station has been moved from Beverly/Atlantic to Pomona/Atlantic, the alignment for Option B does not traverse the short distance from 3rd Street along Beverly Boulevard to just east of Atlantic Boulevard. Instead, the alignment continues east on 3rd Street and a short distance on Pomona Boulevard to the optional eastern terminal station west of Atlantic Boulevard. However, the revised station is within walking distance of the former site.

Option B is approximately six miles long with eight new stations from a connection with the Pasadena Blue Line currently under construction at Union Station to Pomona and Atlantic Boulevards via Alameda Street, 1st Street, Indiana Street, 3rd Street, and Pomona Boulevard (Figure 2-6). Appendix F, *LRT Build Alternative Option B Design, December 31, 2001*, shows the plans and profiles and station site plans for the changed areas between 1st/Lorena and Pomona/Atlantic. Appendix F (Sheets PI-007 to PI-012) shows the proposed property acquisitions and easements for Option B from 1st/Lorena Streets to Pomona/Atlantic Boulevards.

Option B also includes provisions for the shared use of the existing Red Line maintenance facility as the needed maintenance and storage facility (M&SF) to house the required 26 new light rail vehicles using Alameda Street and Ducommun Street as the connection to the Red Line yard. An emergency power generator will also be provided at the M&SF facility in order to provide emergency power for the tunnel segment and subway stations. There are six traction power substations along the six-mile route. All are at the same locations as Option A, with the exception that the easternmost substation is at Pomona/Atlantic (see Appendix F, Sheet PI-012) instead of Beverly/Atlantic.

The subway or tunnel segment of Option B includes a number of ventilation and emergency exit areas for the subway segment in the vicinity of the subway stations and portal areas. The locations for emergency exits and exhausts on MTA property and public rights-of-way (sidewalks or street) are shown in Appendix E. These are the same as for Option A.

The stations will house emergency ventilation fan shafts as well as separate emergency exit shafts at both ends of the stations. Ventilation fans are used for extracting smoke from the tunnels and stairs for evacuation in the event of an emergency – such as a fire in the underground areas. The two-level vent structure is generally a 45-foot-wide, approximately 70-foot-deep concrete box at two ends of the station, joining openings in the top of the tunnels to a vertical shaft penetrating the ground in a convenient location. Ventilation fans and their control equipment, as well as the emergency exit stairs, would be housed in this horizontal concrete box. The area of the shaft will be dependent on the height of the box. Where shafts vent at ground level the area is typically about 400 sq. ft. reducing to about half this area where towers are provided. Minimum tower height would be about ten feet. In some cases vent structures are incorporated with other structures and the height may be adjusted to match or compliment the structure. These fans are operated only for emergencies and for routine maintenance.

Each subway station at each end will have two exit hatches connected to emergency stairs. Each exit hatch is about 6 feet wide. Currently most of these hatches and gratings are shown at the station entrance plazas or right-of-way to be acquired for the construction staging areas. The construction staging areas are the same locations as discussed for Option A. During the preliminary engineering design phase, further coordination with the City of Los Angeles will be required to determine if some or all of these hatches and gratings could be located within the public right-of-way. This may require variances from City codes.

Bus Service

As a major component of implementing Light Rail Transit service in the Eastside Corridor, MTA has designed a corresponding increase in feeder bus and increased service to existing routes that would serve the LRT stations. Table 2-1 shows the increase in service frequency as well as the addition of two routes (31A and 258A) expressly recommended to support the LRT Build Alternative. Increased service is proposed for MTA bus services in the Eastside Corridor as well as increased service for routes operated by Monterey Park and Los Angeles County. This increase in bus service will require an increase of over 40 peak period buses. The capital cost of these improvements as well as the increased bus operating costs are included in the costs for the LRT Build Alternative Option B as described in Chapter 5.

In order to maintain connectivity with other transit operators and bus services within the corridor, it is important that proposed stations interface with existing and proposed bus routes. The proposed transit operating plan for the LRT Build Alternative Option B offers a connection of existing bus lines at each station location. At three station locations, it is proposed that certain bus lines be considered for rerouting in order to provide improved access to the light rail system. Rerouting considerations will follow the typical MTA bus route changes process, including some type of public review and comment process. The lines considered for rerouting include:

- ◆ MTA Line 530 to 1st/Soto Station via Soto and 1st Street
- ◆ MTA Line 620 to 1st/Utah Station via Utah Street
- ◆ Monterey Park Lines 1, 2 and 5 to Pomona/Atlantic Station via Atlantic Boulevard

The first two route changes (MTA Lines 530 and 620) remain as previously described in Option A. Monterey Park's Spirit Transit system provides community transportation services on five routes within the City of Monterey Park. Three of its lines currently operate in the vicinity of Cesar Chavez Avenue and Atlantic Boulevard. It is proposed to consider extending these three routes (1, 2, and 5) southward along Atlantic to the Pomona/Atlantic Station. The extension of these three routes will provide convenient access to the LRT system from the City of Monterey Park. The three Monterey Park lines will

also provide connecting service from the LRT system to the Atlantic Square shopping area as well as to East Los Angeles College.

Table 2-5 shows the interface of bus lines at the revised stations along the alignment of the LRT Build Alternative Option B. Stations not included in the table remain the same as under Option A and as shown in Table 2-3.

Station	Operator	Line	Destinations
3 rd /Indiana	MTA	65	Downtown LA – CSULA
3 rd /Ford	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pomona/Atlantic	Montebello	10	East LA College – Pico Rivera
	Monterey Park	1 (reroute)	Monterey Park
		2 (reroute)	Monterey Park
		5 (reroute)	Monterey Park – CSULA
MTA	260	Altadena – Compton	

Source: 1999-2000 MTA, Montebello, Monterey Park, Los Angeles County, and Commerce bus timetables; Parsons Brinckerhoff.

LRT Alignment

The alignment begins at Union Station and crosses over US 101 on an aerial structure (approximately 1,000 feet in length) and then gradually becomes an at-grade segment near where it intersects with Alameda Street. The alignment continues south along the east side of Alameda Street and then turns east to the center of 1st Street where it continues at grade to Clarence Street in Boyle Heights and then becomes a subway segment. The subway segment traverses underneath or adjacent to 1st Street for about 1.8 miles east to just west of Lorena Street in Boyle Heights.

For Option B, the alignment continues as an at-grade segment traversing 1st Street east from Lorena Street to Indiana Street, where it turns south and continues along the eastern side of Indiana Street in an off-street at-grade alignment to 3rd Street. At 3rd Street, the alignment turns eastward to Hicks Avenue. From Hicks Avenue, the alignment travels east on 3rd Street at grade to Pomona Boulevard and stops at a point just west of Atlantic Boulevard.

For the at-grade sections, the LRT would operate mostly on existing arterial streets and would generally require removal of one general purpose travel lane in each direction. The center sections of all the designated arterial streets would require major reconstruction in order to implement the LRT system. This design configuration would allow for the retaining of a majority of the on-street parking on the arterial streets that are used. MTA will provide replacement parking for those areas where parking utilization is high.

LRT Service Characteristics

The LRT operating plan and service characteristics for the LRT Build Alternative Option B is the same described for Option A above. Table 2-4 shows the travel time between each proposed station and the total travel time from each station to Union Station.

Passenger Stations

As discussed in the bus service section, the LRT Build Alternative Option B consists of eight new stations and one station modification: Union Station (station modification), 1st/Alameda, 1st/Utah, 1st/Boyle, 1st/Soto, 3rd/Indiana, 3rd/Ford, 3rd/Mednik, and Pomona/Atlantic. All stations are at grade with the exception of 1st/Boyle and 1st/Soto. The LRT at-grade station stops would entail constructing a 270-foot long platform (allows for a maximum of three-car trains) along with pedestrian walkways to allow for safe passage to crosswalks for arriving and departing passengers. The LRT underground stations will include 270-foot platforms. The subway stations are projected to have center platforms, a bridge-like mezzanine and single entrances located in plazas adjacent to 1st Street. The at-grade stations will be similar to the Long Beach and Pasadena Blue line stations.

Park-and-Ride Facilities (Including Bus Interface at Pomona/Atlantic)

Two areas for park-and-ride facilities are associated with this alternative. The first is the existing lot at Union Station, which is the western terminus of the Los Angeles Eastside Corridor LRT line. The project does not involve any expansion or improvements to that lot. The second is near the Pomona/Atlantic Station at the eastern terminus of the line. Park-and-ride surface parking for a total of about 200 vehicles would be provided on land adjacent to the former Kaiser facility on the northwest corner of Pomona/Atlantic.

Vehicle Fleet

The vehicle fleet description is the same as Option A.

Maintenance and Storage Facility – Red Line Yard

The maintenance and storage facility description is the same as Option A.

2.6 OTHER ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED THAT MAY REDUCE IMPACTS

The *Re-Evaluation/Major Investment Study* along with the *Draft SEIS/SEIR* conducted a rigorous review, analysis, and screening of potential fixed guideway transit (Bus, Light Rail, and Heavy Rail) alternatives that could serve as a replacement to the suspended Red Line project and to provide an adequate level of service to the residents and businesses in the Eastside Corridor. This process included extensive public discussion of environmental impacts as well as the technical conditions. The Locally Preferred Alternative selected by the MTA Board of Directors considered all alternatives (especially the alternatives that reduced impacts in the sensitive Boyle Heights neighborhood), the transition between 1st and 3rd Streets along Indiana Street, and at the eastern terminus.

Options A and B presented in this Final SEIS/SEIR respond to and evaluate the concerns of the community based on the comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR and the direction of the MTA Board of Directors on May 24, 2001.

Only the No-Build Alternative being considered would not have any impacts but would be totally inconsistent with the Purpose and Need as well as the actions taken previously related to the Red Line suspended project.

2.7 USES OF THIS FINAL SEIS/SEIR DOCUMENT - SELECTION OF LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The preparation of this Final SEIS/SEIR, together with the required circulation, public hearings, and review of the Draft SEIS/SEIR, ensures that all significant transportation and environmental impacts have been assessed, and that public participation and comments have been solicited to help guide the decision-making process.

The identification, examination, and assessment of all reasonable and feasible alternatives (*Re-Evaluation/MIS* and the *Draft SEIS/SEIR*) are necessary to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as well as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA requires similar environmental analysis in Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) and public review for projects that will have significant effects on the environment. The State of California encourages joint preparation of EIRs and EISs and has produced guidelines to facilitate preparation of joint documents.

The purpose of this Final SEIS/SEIR is to evaluate the LRT Build Alternative along with its two options (Option A and Option B), as well as the No-Build Alternative, and for the MTA Board of Directors to select the most appropriate project for the Eastside Corridor while ensuring that potentially significant environmental consequences are considered as part of this process. This Final SEIS/SEIR document will be circulated and made available as required by NEPA and CEQA to interested and concerned parties, including private citizens, community groups, the business community, elected officials, and public agencies.

This Final SEIS/SEIR will also be used by federal, state, regional, and local agencies to make discretionary decisions regarding this project.

2.8 LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE AS IDENTIFIED BY THE MTA STAFF

Section 2.4 describes the modifications made to the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) since the circulation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR and the MTA Board of Directors (Board) action on May 24, 2001. The modifications described in LRT Build Alternative Options A and B respond to the direction of the Board. LRT Build Alternative Option A considers the changes related to the Alameda and 1st Streets concerns while keeping the balance of the original LPA in the same context adopted by the Board and as stated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR (Option 1). With the introduction of LRT Build Alternative Option B in this document, it not only includes the modifications to the Alameda and 1st Streets concerns but addresses the other concerns of the Board and the public: (1) the transition at Indiana Street; and (2) the impacts related to the station location at Beverly and Atlantic Boulevards.

Based on the comments received, the preliminary engineering activities, and the other technical studies conducted, as well as the extensive community outreach program (described in Chapter 6), the MTA staff has concluded that the option which best responds to the direction of the Board and the comments received is LRT Build Alternative Option B. Accordingly, LRT Build Alternative Option B is the MTA staff recommendation for consideration by the Board as the Locally Preferred Alternative.

LRT Build Alternative Option A includes the following modification to the Board approved LPA (presented in more detail throughout the Final SEIS/SEIR):

- ◆ **Alameda Street Alignment and 1st/Alameda Station** - the 1st St./Alameda Station has been moved from the middle of the 1st Street to a short distance on the east side of Alameda St. necessitating some additional partial acquisitions and full acquisition of a gas station along the east side of that street from Commercial Street to 1st Street. The off-street alignment will provide higher traffic capacity on Alameda Street and address other LADOT concerns. The movement of the station responds to Little Tokyo businesses' concerns to provide a more convenient location. On 1st Street from Alameda to Vignes Street, two lanes of traffic in each direction will be provided instead of one traffic lane in each direction to provide higher traffic capacity.

LRT Build Alternative Option B includes Option A, plus the following additional modifications (presented in more detail throughout the Final SEIS/SEIR):

- ◆ **Indiana Street Transition** – The LRT track alignment is moved to an off-street at-grade alignment between 1st and 3rd Streets (on the eastern side of Indiana Street outside the current street right-of-way), and Ramona High School (located at the northeast corner of 3rd Street/Indiana Street) will either be relocated to another site acceptable to the LAUSD and MTA or reconstructed on the existing site.
- ◆ **Modified Station Locations** - The 1st/Lorena, 3rd/Rowan, and Beverly/Atlantic Stations would be moved to 3rd/Indiana (off-street location on the Ramona High School property), 3rd/Ford, and Pomona/Atlantic (west of Atlantic), respectively.