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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This preliminary evaluation of alternatives was prepared to assist the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCARRA) in understanding the scope and magnitude of environmental constraints related to the construction and operation of the proposed Doran Street and Broadway/Brazil Safety and Access Project (proposed project) and alternatives, which are located to the south of the State Route 134 (SR-134) and San Fernando Road intersection in the City of Glendale, California and traverse the railroad corridor, which currently has approximately 84 trains (73 passenger and 11 freight) per day used by Metrolink, Amtrak, Union Pacific The Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Agency has a planned service expansion that will increase rail volumes by 50% and the California High Speed Rail Authority is also proposing this railroad corridor for their Palmdale/Los Angeles segment. There are several environmental considerations to be examined for the proposed project.

At this point in project development, the initial evaluation of alternatives is a critical part of the screening process. This environmental evaluation focuses on the environmental factors, which have the most effect, and differences between the alternatives in terms of potential impacts, as well as differences in complexity related to environmental clearance documents.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve safety and mobility while maintaining suitable access to existing businesses and surrounding residential areas. The Doran Street at-grade crossing has been identified in a settlement agreement between nearby residents and Metro and the Cities of Los Angeles and Glendale as mitigation to improve the overall safety of the area. A grade-separated crossing at Doran Street would provide safety enhancements that would result in some of the most measurable benefits of all intersections within Los Angeles County. A grade separation at this location has previously been evaluated in two separate studies. The first was completed by the City of Glendale and was in connection with the Fairmont Flyover studies. This effort was limited to establish if a connection could be made between Doran Street and Fairmont under the SR-134 structure adjacent to the Los Angeles River. The study also included an alternative where Doran Street was elevated over San Fernando Road and the railroad corridor. The second study is being prepared for the California High Speed Rail Project in the development of the alternatives analysis for the railroad corridor. This evaluation has examined alternatives for a grade separation, including options that are not within the existing Doran Street footprint. Figure 1 shows the study area that contains all of the project alternatives. The following text and figures describe and depict each of the project alternatives.

Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Under Alternative 1, the Doran Street crossing would be closed so that no at-grade traffic would cross the railroad corridor between San Fernando Road and West San Fernando Road. Eastbound traffic crossing the railroad corridor would be re-routed just south of Doran Street west of West San Fernando Road to access the aerial structure that would cross over the railroad corridor and San Fernando Road back onto Doran Street east of San Fernando Road (Figure 2). The roadway loop of the aerial structure would be located on the west side of San Fernando Road and the connection ramp would span eastward across the railroad corridor and San Fernando Road and return to grade along Doran Street, at Commercial Street. Commercial Street would be restriped and reconfigured to facilitate the flow of traffic to and from the grade separation.
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**Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass.** Under Alternative 2, the Doran Street crossing and the Broadway/Brazil crossing would be closed so that no at-grade traffic could cross the railroad corridor between San Fernando Road and West San Fernando Road at both locations. Two new access points are proposed: the overpass and Fairmont Connector (Figure 3). From West San Fernando Road the access point would be north of Brazil Street at Sperry Street. An access point would also be available on Sperry Street to the west. On the east on San Fernando Road, the access point would be located at Salem Street. This access point could occur from both San Fernando Road and Salem Avenue to the east. For Alternative 2, the roadway loop of the aerial structure would span between Sperry and Brazil Streets on the west side of West San Fernando Road and the railroad corridor and across Wilson Avenue on the east side of San Fernando Road.

*Figure 3* also shows that Alternative 2 includes modifications to the existing Fairmont Avenue aerial crossing over the railroad corridor and San Fernando Road, north of SR-134 (Fairmont Connector). This modification would entail a roadway loop that would extend north off of Fairmont Avenue out over the Verdugo Wash which would circle to the south traveling under SR-134 and connecting to West San Fernando Road. Access off of West San Fernando Road to the industrial businesses to the west would be maintained.

**Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector.** Under Alternative 3, the Doran Street crossing would be closed so that no at-grade traffic would cross the railroad corridor between San Fernando Road and West San Fernando Road. Westbound traffic would be diverted south along San Fernando Road to cross the railroad corridor at the Broadway/Brazil crossing. Eastbound traffic crossing the railroad corridor would be re-routed to the Broadway/Brazil crossing or head north under SR-134 and use the Fairmont Connector as described under Alternative 2 (Figure 4). An additional access point to the area west of the railroad corridor and San Fernando Road would be created through the western extension of Doran Street to a bridge that would be extended west over the Los Angeles River and connect to Zoo Drive.

### 3.0 METHODOLOGY

The focus of this analysis is an initial review of applicable and available resources (e.g., conceptual plans, web sites, aerial photos, planning documents) to identify key environmental issues for each of the topics relevant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The following environmental issues were considered in this analysis:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas (GHG)
- Acquisition, Displacement, and Fiscal Effects
- Circulation
- Land Use
- Noise and Vibration
- Construction

Effects related to biological resources, cultural resources, geology, and water quality evaluated in a separate analysis are also incorporated into this evaluation to provide a comprehensive assessment of relevant environmental topic areas.
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4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

This evaluation focuses on identifying the environmental constraints associated with implementation of the project alternatives. The emphasis is on determining the potential effects of a project related to aesthetics, air quality and GHG, resources, acquisition and displacement, business access and parking, circulation, land use, noise and vibration, and construction. The analysis is based on a comparative analysis among alternatives to identify the different negative and positive effects of each alternative. During the more detailed environmental documentation, a comparison of the alternatives with existing conditions would be assessed to comply with the requirements of CEQA.

4.1 Aesthetics

Aesthetic impact considerations essentially involve project elements that obstruct or change scenic vistas, damage visual resources, change visual character or have effects on shadows or glare. The project alternatives would introduce additional aerial structures that currently exist in the corridor, primarily attributable to the SR-134. At a height of approximately 25 feet above the ground, the proposed aerial structures would not cast shadows at a distance that would potentially affect the closest shade-sensitive uses that include residences or outdoor recreational areas that are dependent on the sun, such as pools or parks. Light from vehicles traveling along the aerial structure would be blocked by concrete railing and would not cast substantial spillover lighting or create glare at nearby residences. Other than the Los Angeles River, there are no scenic resources located within the project area that would be affected by the project alternatives. There are existing constrained views of scenic resources outside the project area, specifically the eastern portion of Griffith Park, which can be viewed along street corridors from the project area. While, the additional aerial structures would not be anticipated to substantially alter the views or visual character of the area, the location of these structures and proximity to residential uses or visual resources, such as the Los Angeles River, may have differing effects on views and visual character. Therefore, the evaluation will focus on the potential for the proposed alternatives to alter views and visual character.

**Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Not anticipated to be an issue.** For Alternative 1, the roadway loop of the aerial structure would be located on the west side of West San Fernando Road and the connection ramp would span eastward across the railroad corridor and San Fernando Road and return to grade along Doran Street, just east of Commercial Street. The aerial structure would be adjacent (50 feet to the south) of the existing elevated SR-134 facility which includes an engineered embankment and bridge structure and associated columns over San Fernando Road. The aerial structure for Alternative 1 would be similar in height but smaller in scale than the existing aerial structure for the SR-134 and, therefore, would not create a strong visual contrast or result in a substantial visual change to the area.

**Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass. Potential issue.** For Alternative 2, the roadway loop of the aerial structure would span across Wilson Avenue on the east side of San Fernando Road and between Sperry and Brazil Streets on the west side of West San Fernando Road and the railroad corridor. The aerial structure would not alter the views located within the area on the west side of West San Fernando Road, which contains large scale one- and two-story industrial buildings. Additionally, the aerial structure would not span across Sperry Street and would not alter existing street views in this area. Industrial and commercial land uses extend from San Fernando Road east to Concord Street, and south of Wilson Avenue, industrial and commercial uses extend further beyond Concord Street. This area would serve as a visual boundary to the neighborhood to the east of Concord Street in the City of Glendale (See Figure 5). The aerial structure for Alternative 2 would be located west of the row of properties fronting Concord Street, which would remain and serve as a buffer between the industrial commercial area and residential neighborhood. Alternative 2 would not alter the character of the area.
View of visual buffer looking west along Wilson Avenue where the edge of residential development is surrounded by commercial/industrial development south of Wilson Avenue and west of Concord Street.

View of visual buffer looking north along Concord Street where the residential development is contrasted by commercial/industrial development west of Concord Street.

The access points at Salem Street would be at or near grade and would not be elevated enough to disrupt views along Salem Street. The introduction of Alternative 2 would incrementally reduce constrained views of Griffith Park just east of Concord Street but would have no effect on views further to the east. This would primarily affect viewers traveling along Wilson Avenue.

The Fairmont Connector would entail a roadway loop that would extend on the north side of Fairmont Avenue and the SR-134 out over the Verdugo Wash, back under Fairmont Avenue and the SR-134 bridges, and connect to West San Fernando Road. There are little to no views of the Verdugo Wash and Los Angeles River as they are significantly constrained by the existing transportation infrastructure (i.e., SR-134) and vegetation. While the existing views of the Verdugo Wash are not anticipated to be substantially altered, the loop extending out over the Verdugo Wash and associated columns would add to the roadway infrastructure (SR-134, Fairmont Avenue, and West San Fernando Road), which prevents existing views of the Verdugo Wash.

Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector. Likely issue. The Doran Street at-grade crossing would be closed between San Fernando Road and West San Fernando Road and a bridge would be extended west over the Los Angeles River to Zoo Drive and provide access into the industrial area on the west side of West San Fernando Road. The bridge across the Los Angeles River is anticipated to be smaller in height and scale than the adjacent SR-134 and, therefore, would not substantially interfere or contrast with the existing views and visual character of the area. The Los Angeles River is a visual resource and Alternative 3 would add additional transportation infrastructure, which would increase the vertical mass of transportation infrastructure that would be lower to the water and further diminish the views along this resource. This would primarily affect travelers along the Los Angeles River Bike Path adjacent to the Los Angeles River. Because of this disruption in view of the Los Angeles River, Alternative 3 would have more negative visual effects than Alternative 1. Compared to Alternative 2, the diminished views would be more intensive because the views along the Los Angeles River have a higher view quality than those from the residences in the adjacent neighborhood. The disruption to viewers would be more dispersed since users of the Los Angeles River Bike Path come from around the region, where the visual effects of Alternative 2 would be localized to the adjacent neighborhood. The higher quality visual disruption to viewers using the Los Angeles River would be partially offset due to the shorter duration compared to the long-term reduction in view experienced by the more permanent residents of the neighborhood in the City of Glendale.

4.2 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

Potential negative air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) effects could result from the reconfiguration of the roadways and potential increased exposure to diesel particulate matter (DPM) from trucks and carbon monoxide (CO) and carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions from automobiles. An exceedance of the State CO standards is referred to as a CO hotspot. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) recommends a CO hotspot evaluation of potential localized CO impacts when volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios are increased by two percent or when an intersection decreases in level of service (LOS) by one level beginning when the LOS changes from C to D. Human activities in the past century have substantially increased the amount of GHGs in the atmosphere, causing the atmosphere to trap more heat and leading to changes in the Earth’s climate. CO2 is the most abundant GHG pollutant that contributes to climate change through fossil fuel combustion.

The project alternatives would not add new trips, and the increase in exposure to pollutants would either occur from the redistribution of traffic or from trucks and vehicles being in closer proximity to sensitive receptors. It is not anticipated that traffic volumes associated with the project alternatives would cause an
exceedance of the SCAQMD screening criteria at intersections in proximity to the project site, or result in a substantial increase in CO₂ emissions which would increase GHGs.

Therefore, the evaluation will focus on DPM and not CO emissions or GHGs. According to SCAQMD guidance, the volumes of trucks or location of the project alternatives would not exceed thresholds (100,000 vehicles per day for urban roads) that would trigger a Health Risk Assessment. The primary sensitive air quality receptors in the project area are residences located within the City of Glendale. Residential properties located within 500 feet would be the most likely receptors to experience increased air quality effects from the siting of the roadway in closer proximity, which would result in a potential increased exposure to DPM.

**Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Not anticipated to be an issue.** This alternative would establish a crossing at Doran Street over San Fernando Road, which would establish connections at Commercial Road in the City of Glendale and at West San Fernando Road in the City of Los Angeles. The nearest residential property to the new connections would be approximately 515 feet away. No residential properties would be located with 500 feet. The elimination of a grade crossing at Doran Street would reduce idling for the more than 4,000 daily vehicles using the crossing, which produces more emissions than traveling at posted speed limits. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in a low potential for air quality or health risk effects.

**Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass. Not anticipated to be an issue.** For Alternative 2, the Fairmont Connector would establish a connection from West San Fernando Road on a loop on the north side of SR-134 to Fairmont Avenue. The nearest residential property to the Fairmont Connector would be approximately 460 feet to the northeast. The roadway loop of the aerial structure to the south would span across Wilson Avenue on the east side of San Fernando Road and between Sperry and Brazil Streets on the west side of West San Fernando Road and the railroad corridor. For this aerial structure, the nearest residential property would be located approximately 200 feet away and 38 residential properties would be located within 500 feet. This residence would be in closer proximity than under Alternatives 1 and 3. On a more regional scale, the elimination of two grade crossings under this alternative would reduce idling to a greater extent (an additional 4,500 daily vehicles) than Alternatives 1 and 3 which each include only one crossing closure.

**Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector Zoo Drive Connector. Not anticipated to be an issue.** This alternative would establish a roadway that spans over the Los Angeles River from Zoo Drive to Doran Street west of West San Fernando Road and the Fairmont Connector would establish a connection from West San Fernando Road on a roadway loop on the north side of SR-134 to Fairmont Avenue. This alternative would reroute more trucks closer to the Griffith Park picnic areas and Zoo. This would place park users, such as those using the picnic tables, in closer proximity than the nearest residential uses described for Alternatives 1 and 2 (within 50 feet). This would expose park users to increased diesel emissions due to increased truck activity; however, the duration of exposure would be less than potential exposure to residents who have a permanent residence. The nearest residential property to the new connections would be approximately 460 feet away from the Fairmont Connector. One residential property would be located within 500 feet. Alternative 3 would have a lower potential for air quality effects on residences than Alternative 2, but slightly higher than Alternative 1.

### 4.3 Acquisition, Displacement, and Fiscal Effects

This section addresses the potential for land acquisition and the displacement and relocation of existing uses. Land acquisition usually takes the form of either a partial or full parcel take. Land required for the grade separation, as well as spoil and staging areas, is typically the basis for a take.
A partial take would occur if only a portion of the parcel was required to accommodate the proposed Doran Street and Broadway/Brazil Safety and Access Project. This would occur if, for example, a portion of a property fronting the access to the site were required but would not affect the functional use of the property. A full take could occur under two circumstances: (1) when the majority or pivotal piece of the property is required for the construction of the facilities, or (2) when a severe loss of access reduces the useful operation (e.g., driveway access or property parking that is eliminated or reduced due to construction) such that it affects the successful operation of the property or business).

Easements are often required and constitute a partial take of property. Generally, easements that are required during construction for staging and access are called a temporary construction easement (TCE) or permanent underground easement (PUE) for in relocating utilities.

Typically, displacement is considered a direct environmental effect of a proposed grade separation project. The process dictates the property owners will be fairly compensated, and tenants will be relocated to comparable facilities. Where acquisition and relocation are unavoidable, the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act) would be followed, as amended, and implemented pursuant to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Regulations for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs adopted by the United States Department of Transportation, dated February 3, 2005. All real property acquired would be appraised to determine its fair market value. Just compensation, which shall not be less than the approved appraisal made to each property owner, would be offered and each homeowner, renter, business, or nonprofit organization displaced as a result of the project would be given advanced written notice and would be informed of the eligibility requirements for relocation assistance and payments. Adherence to these acquisition and relocation policies would ensure compliance with the Uniform Act and Amendments and would not result in significant impacts.

However, there are unique circumstances that may have indirect impact implications. The project alternatives have the potential to acquire industrial property along San Fernando Road. It may be difficult to acquire these properties because the space for similar industrial land in the surrounding Los Angeles area is at a premium. The displacement of businesses from the heavy industrial area west of San Fernando Road in the City of Los Angeles may provide challenges to relocation efforts. As a result, the acquisition process could require extensive coordination and time commitments. Therefore, the evaluation will focus on the potential for the project alternatives to affect property owners and tenants and the local economy for the Cities of Glendale and Los Angeles.

According to the 2011 Census, there are approximately 3,877 full-time jobs located in the industrial area west of West San Fernando Road in the City of Los Angeles (from approximately SR-134 to Los Feliz Boulevard - Census Tract 188100). This results in an average employment density of approximately one job per 270 square feet of building space. According to the 2011 Census, there are approximately 624 jobs located in the commercial/industrial area east of San Fernando Road in the City of Glendale (from approximately SR-134 to Broadway Street, east of Concord Street - Census Tract 301702). This results in an average employment density of approximately one job per 992 square foot of building space. For planning purposes, the density factors will be used to provide an estimated order of magnitude for the number of jobs lost due to property acquisition for each of the project alternatives.

**Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Likely issue.** Alternative 1 would result in the full acquisition of 16 parcels, and a partial acquisition of one additional parcel. Nine of these parcels would be located in the City of Los Angeles, and seven parcels, along with the partial acquisition, would be located in the City of Glendale. The total acquisition area would be 349,783 square feet, 82 percent of which would be located in the City of Los Angeles. This would displace four businesses in the City of Los Angeles and
six businesses in the City of Glendale. The total estimated cost for this acquisition process would be approximately $37 million. Based on building square footage lost, the acquisition required would eliminate approximately 227 jobs in the Los Angeles portion of the industrial area and 29 jobs in the Glendale portion. Within the City of Los Angeles, these businesses would include a recycling facility, a milk factory, and solar energy and air system company. Within the City of Glendale, the businesses would include an animal hospital, a fabric flame proofing company, an auto paint and repair, a moving company, and a gas and equipment supplier. The size of businesses affected in the Los Angeles area are much larger in size, and based on their more intensive industrial use, are anticipated to encounter more difficulty in finding comparable relocation sites. This would affect approximately five to six percent of the jobs in the area defined by Census Tracts 188100 and 301702 and would have an incremental effect on the local economies of Los Angeles and Glendale.

Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass. Potential issue. Alternative 2 would result in the full acquisition of ten parcels and the partial acquisition of two parcels. Two full parcel acquisitions and the two partial acquisitions would be located in the City of Los Angeles, and eight parcels would be located in the City of Glendale. The total acquisition area would be 200,420 square feet, 62 percent of which would be located in the City of Los Angeles. This would displace two businesses in the City of Los Angeles and at least eight businesses in the City of Glendale. The total estimated cost for this acquisition process would be approximately $46 million. While the exact distribution of jobs within the area defined by the Census Tracts above is not known at this time, based on building square footage lost and the employment density in the area, the acquisition required would relocate approximately 245 jobs in the Los Angeles portion of the industrial area and 46 jobs in the Glendale portion. Within the City of Los Angeles, these businesses would include a party supply company and a cabinet manufacturing and carpet sales company. Within the City of Glendale, the businesses would include a commercial strip center, an auto parts yard, a printing company, and two small food manufacturing/distribution companies. The size of businesses affected in the Los Angeles area are much larger in size, and based on their more intensive industrial use, are anticipated to encounter more difficulty in finding comparable relocation sites. This would affect approximately seven percent of the jobs in the area defined by Census Tracts 188100 and 301702 and would have an incremental effect on the local economies of Los Angeles and Glendale.

Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector. Potential issue. Alternative 3 would result in the full acquisition of nine parcels and the partial acquisition of three parcels, all of which would be located in the City of Los Angeles. The total full acquisition area would be 254,660 square feet. This would displace two businesses in the City of Los Angeles, and two businesses would be affected by the partial acquisition. The total estimated cost for this acquisition process would be approximately $25 million. Based on building square footage lost, the acquisition required would eliminate approximately 147 jobs in the Los Angeles portion of the industrial area associated with the recycling and manufacturing facility. This would be a reduced acquisition and displacement effect compared to Alternative 1. However, the size of businesses affected is large and the intensive industrial use would result in more difficulty in finding comparable relocation sites. This would affect approximately four percent of the jobs in the area defined by Census Tracts 188100 and 301702 and would have an incremental effect on the local economies of Los Angeles.
4.4 Circulation

The project alternatives would eliminate up to two at-grade crossings along San Fernando Road. Overhead structures (i.e., road bridges) would be built to allow trains to pass under the roadways. Under the current configuration, vehicles traveling on and across San Fernando Road must stop at signals to accommodate crossing vehicles and trains. This current configuration leads to vehicle delay and adds to total delay and congestion in the area. Implementation of the proposed project would minimize this delay and create a safer circulation system that would be a beneficial impact. However, the configurations of the project alternatives could lead to changes to intersection operations, which could affect queuing and turns along San Fernando Road and to local circulation patterns that could induce cut-thru traffic into a residential neighborhood in order to reach SR-134. Therefore, the evaluation will focus on the potential for the project alternatives to disrupt signalization geometry or create cut-thru traffic through the residential neighborhood in the City of Glendale.

Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Not anticipated to be an issue. This alternative would establish a crossing at Doran Street over San Fernando Road and the railroad corridor, which would establish connections at Commercial Street in the City of Glendale and at West San Fernando Road in the City of Los Angeles. This alternative is not anticipated to result in changes to the geometry of intersections in the area. This alternative could result in the redistribution of vehicles that would normally cross at the Broadway/Brazil at-grade crossing to the Doran Street overpass but would not be likely to result in residential neighborhood cut-thru traffic as this is located adjacent to the SR-134.

Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass. Potential issue. For Alternative 2, the loop of the aerial structure would span across Wilson Avenue on the east side of San Fernando Road and between Sperry and Brazil Streets on the west side of West San Fernando Road and the railroad corridor. Access to San Fernando Road would occur at Salem Street, and access to West San Fernando Road would occur at Sperry Street. The access point at Salem Street would provide additional spacing between the eastern access points to San Fernando Road, which would potentially improve queuing and turning movements. The Fairmont Connector would establish a connection from West San Fernando Road on a loop on the north side of SR-134 to Fairmont Avenue. With this alternative, the connection to Salem Street is proposed to be limited turning movements or eliminated with a cul-de-sac to avoid cut-thru traffic.

Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector. Potential issue. This alternative would establish a crossing at Zoo Drive over the Los Angeles River to Doran Street west of West San Fernando Road, and the Fairmont Connector would establish a connection from West San Fernando Road on a loop on the north side of SR-134 to Fairmont Avenue. Similar to Alternative 1, this alternative would not be likely to result in residential neighborhood cut-thru traffic as the connections are located adjacent to the SR-134. However, traffic would be significantly diverted from existing circulation routes and be re-directed through Griffith Park.

4.5 Land Use Plans

The proposed change for the crossing from at grade to aerial would eliminate the potential conflict for vehicles, trains, bicycle and pedestrians at the two at-grade crossings in the project area, which would result in greater access and improved travel time by eliminating waiting and queuing during train, vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian crossings. All of the project alternatives would be consistent with policies identified in the applicable plans of the Cities of Glendale and Los Angeles aimed at improving transportation and safety. The two issues where the project alternatives have the potential to conflict with existing plans and policies are the preservation of existing industrial land identified in the City of Los
Angeles General Plan Framework and City of Los Angeles Northeast Community Plan and the expansion of the Los Angeles River footprint identified in the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan. Policies associated with the preservation of more intensive industrial land uses focus on the areas located away from residences like the area west of West San Fernando Road. Industrial uses allowed in commercial/industrial areas, like the area east of San Fernando Road are typically less intensive and more compatible with residential uses. These less intensive industrial uses are easier to relocate, and the City of Glendale does not have any relevant policies for the preservation of these types of uses. Therefore, the evaluation will focus on the potential for the proposed alternatives to create to be inconsistent with plans and policies related to the preservation of industrial land west of West San Fernando Road and the Los Angeles River expansion.

**Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Likely issue.** Alternative 1 would establish an overpass at Doran Street over San Fernando Road, which would establish connections at Commercial Street in the City of Glendale and at West San Fernando Road in the City of Los Angeles. This alternative would require the full acquisition of nine parcels in the City of Los Angeles that would displace four businesses, and two additional industrial businesses could be potentially affected due to lack of access. The loss of industrial land would result in an inconsistency with the preservation of industrial land.

This alternative would result in an encroachment into the eastern end footprint of the proposed improvements envisioned in the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan with placement of columns and overhead structure. The placement of columns would not pre-empt the implementation of the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan but would affect the footprint contained within the Plan.

**Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass. Potential issue.** Alternative 2 would span across Wilson Avenue on the east side of San Fernando Road and between Sperry and Brazil Streets on the west side of West San Fernando Road and the railroad corridor. This alternative would require the full acquisition that would displace two businesses in the Los Angeles portion of the industrial area. The loss of industrial land would result in an inconsistency with the preservation of industrial land. The fewer number of industrial businesses affected would result in less inconsistency with industrial preservation than identified for Alternatives 1 and 3.

This alternative would provide a linkage from West San Fernando Road at Sperry Street, which could act as a gateway to the proposed Los Angeles River improvements envisioned in the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan.

**Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector. Likely issue.** Alternative 3 would establish a roadway that spans the Los Angeles River from Zoo Drive to Doran Street west of West San Fernando Road, and the Fairmont Connector would establish a connection from West San Fernando Road on a loop on the north side of SR-134 to Fairmont Avenue. The same parcels within the City of Los Angeles identified under Alternative 1 would be affected under Alternative 3. This would result in an inconsistency with the preservation of industrial land.

This alternative would result in a more severe encroachment onto the footprint of the proposed Los Angeles River improvements with placement of pier walls, columns and overhead structure and also requires crossing of the existing Los Angeles River compared to Alternative 1. The placement of columns would not pre-empt the implementation of the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan but would affect the footprint contained within the Plan. In addition, this alternative would reroute truck trips to a local collector street that is primarily used for recreational access and would be less compatible with surrounding land uses than Alternatives 1 and 2.
4.6 Noise and Vibration

Operational noise activity associated with the project alternatives would potentially increase traffic noise in the project area. It is anticipated that the project alternatives would eliminate the need for trains traveling along the railroad corridor to use their horns at the existing grade crossings. This would result in the substantial reduction of noise exposure near the railroad corridor. Operational vibration would be generated by vehicular travel on the local roadways. However, similar to existing conditions, based on the traffic volumes and vehicle mix, vibration levels resulting from the project are not anticipated to be perceptible at sensitive receptors. Therefore, the focus of the analysis will be concentrated on noise. In addition, the project alternatives would not substantially alter traffic patterns in the project area. Removal of the grade crossings would increase the average vehicle speed along the segments immediately adjacent to the railroad corridor. However, the speed limit posted along San Fernando Road is 35 miles per hour. The speed increases associated with the project alternatives would not exceed the existing maximum speeds and would not be expected to result in a perceptible difference. However, the siting of the connectors in closer proximity to residences in the City of Glendale could potentially increase noise levels. Similar to air quality, the primary noise effects are anticipated to be within 500 feet of the project alternatives. Therefore, the evaluation will focus on the potential for the project alternatives to create increases in noise levels at nearby residences in the City of Glendale.

Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Not anticipated to be an issue. This alternative would establish an overpass at Doran Street over San Fernando Road, which would establish connections at Commercial Street in the City of Glendale and at West San Fernando Road in the City of Los Angeles. The nearest residential property to the new connections would be approximately 515 feet away. No residential properties would be located with 500 feet. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in the least potential for noise level increases.

Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass. Potential issue. For Alternative 2, the loop of the aerial structure would span across Wilson Avenue on the east side of San Fernando Road and between Sperry and Brazil Streets on the west side of West San Fernando Road and the railroad corridor. The Fairmont Connector would establish a connection from West San Fernando Road on a loop on the north side of SR-134 to Fairmont Avenue. The nearest residential property would be located approximately 200 feet away from the aerial structure which extends out approximately 300 feet from the east side of San Fernando Road near Wilson Avenue. Approximately 38 residential properties would be located within 500 feet of this overpass.

Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector. Potential issue. This alternative would establish a roadway that spans over the Los Angeles River from Zoo Drive to Doran Street west of West San Fernando Road and the Fairmont Connector would establish a connection from West San Fernando Road on a loop on the north side of SR-134 to Fairmont Avenue. More trucks would be rerouted near the Griffith Park area, which would result in additional noise exposure at the park; however, the adjacent park and picnic area is already within an area characterized by high ambient noise levels due to its proximity to SR-134 and would not be characterized as noise sensitive as residences. The nearest residential property to the new connections would be approximately 460 feet away. One residential property would be located within 500 feet. Alternative 3 would have a lower potential for noise level increases to residences than Alternative 2 but slightly higher than Alternative 1.
4.7 Construction

The above environmental resource areas addressed the long-term effects of the project alternatives. Construction of the project alternatives also has the potential to create short-term effects that can affect businesses, residents, and travelers along San Fernando Road. This evaluation of short term construction will focus on the potential to disrupt visual quality, circulation, business access and parking, air quality, and noise in the project area.

Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Likely issue. Under this alternative, construction activity would occur in a primarily industrial area, and, as such, the visual effects of staging areas, the stockpiling of materials, and spoil areas would not substantially contrast with the surrounding character of the area. In addition, because this location is located approximately more than 500 feet to the closest residential property, air quality and noise effects during construction would be less disruptive than Alternative 2. Temporary nighttime construction would be required for construction of the structure spanning the railroad corridor which would be located approximately 700 feet from the nearest residences to the north. This would require mitigation to reduce noise effects to the greatest extent feasible. The other primary issue with the construction of this alternative would be the disruption to the street network within the industrial area, where existing access is already constrained. For this alternative, the interim one-way westbound direction only at the Doran Street crossing would have to be closed for the construction of the grade separation; all traffic would have to be directed to the Broadway/Brazil crossing during construction. Construction activity would exacerbate these conditions, and the disruption to the street network would make access and parking more difficult. A robust construction management plan would be required to mitigate these effects.

Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass. Likely issue. Under this alternative, construction activity would occur in close proximity to the residential neighborhood in the City of Glendale, and, as such, the visual effects of staging areas, the stockpiling of materials, and spoil areas have the potential to contrast with the surrounding character of the area if not properly screened and located. However, the businesses along Concord Street would remain and act as a buffer to limit views of the visual effects from construction activity. The proximity of residential properties (200 feet) to construction activity would also expose residences to short-term air quality and noise effects. Temporary nighttime construction would be required for construction of the structure spanning the railroad corridor which would be located approximately 520 feet from the nearest residences to the east. This would require mitigation to reduce noise effects to the greatest extent feasible. Construction of this alternative would also have the potential to disrupt the street network which could make access and parking in both the Glendale and Los Angeles areas more difficult, but not to the extent described under Alternative 1. These construction effects related to noise and air quality would be greater than those described for Alternatives 1 and 3 due to the closer proximity of residences. A robust construction management plan would be required to mitigate these effects.

Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector. Likely issue. Similar to Alternative 1, construction activity would occur in a primarily industrial area, and, as such, the visual effects of staging areas, the stockpiling of materials, and spoil areas would not substantially contrast with the surrounding character of the area. In addition, because this location is located approximately more than 500 feet to the closest residential property, air quality and noise effects during construction would be less disruptive than Alternative 2. No nighttime construction would be required under this alternative. The primary issue with the construction of this alternative would be the disruption to the street network which would make access and parking for recreational users along Zoo Drive more difficult. In addition, construction of the connection from Zoo Drive would disrupt users of the Los Angeles River Bike Path as changes would be
required to accommodate the connection. Access along Zoo Drive could be constrained or detoured for several months. Construction activity would exacerbate these conditions, and a robust construction management plan would be required to mitigate these effects.

One important distinction in the evaluation of alternatives is that the future implementation of High Speed Rail will require the closure of all adjacent grade crossings. In the case of the Doran area, both the Doran and Broadway/Brazil crossings would be ultimately be closed. These closures have been evaluated in the environmental documentation for the High Speed Rail Project. Alternatives 1 and 3, described above, do not include the closure of the second at-grade crossing at Broadway/Brazil in the near term. The effects of the this second at-grade closure would be similar as described under Alternative 2, except that the timing and sequencing of this closure would occur at a later time. Comparatively, Alternatives 1 and 3 would result in construction activity over two time periods, resulting in construction effects that would be substantially more disruptive than the construction of both grade separations at one time.

4.8 Other Environmental Studies

Baseline conditions for Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazardous Materials

The following is a summary of the Characterization of Baseline conditions for Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazardous Materials in Support of the Alternatives Analysis for the Doran Street and Broadway/Brazil Safety and Access Project, which was prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc.

Biological Resources

The potential for constraints related to biological resources is primarily associated with the Verdugo Wash and the Los Angeles River. Special-status plant and wildlife species and natural communities of special concern have a low to moderate potential to occur in the project area. The Verdugo Wash and the Los Angeles River are subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. The waters and any associated riparian habitats would also be subject to the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Potential issue. Due to proximity to the Los Angeles River, this alternative could potentially affect sensitive biological resources. Biological resources may be more diverse and abundant compared to alternatives that are surrounded by urban development.

Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass. Potential issue. For Alternative 2, the loop of the aerial structure would span across Wilson Avenue on the east side of San Fernando Road and between Sperry and Brazil Streets on the west side of West San Fernando Road and the railroad corridor. This part of the project would be entirely contained within an urban/commercial/industrial area. The area contains very little vegetation or trees to provide a sensitive habitat, and, as such, no sensitive biological resources are likely to be present. The Fairmont Connector portion of the project has a potential to affect biological resources due to the crossing of the Verdugo Wash. Alteration of the channel could affect the riparian and aquatic habitats where the majority of highly sensitive biological species are located. In addition, the existing bridge has the potential to provide a roosting habitat for sensitive bat species.

Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector. Likely issue. This alternative has the greatest potential to affect biological resources due to the crossing of the both the Los Angeles River and the Verdugo Wash. Alteration of the channel could affect the riparian and aquatic habitats where the majority of highly sensitive biological species are located. In addition, the existing bridges across the Verdugo Wash and Los Angeles River have the potential to provide a roosting habitat for sensitive bat species.
Cultural Resources

The paleontological research indicates that the project alternatives are unlikely to uncover any significant fossil vertebrate remains in the project area. The project alternatives have the potential to significantly impact two significant architectural resources: San Fernando Road and an industrial/office building located at 5121 West San Fernando Road. San Fernando Road extends through the study area; it starts from Sierra Highway in the north and continues south through Los Angeles County to its terminus at North Main Street in downtown Los Angeles. San Fernando Road is a historic roadway that dates to the 1880s, possibly earlier, serving as a wagon/foot trail between Los Angeles and San Fernando. The office building at 5121 West San Fernando Road, located south of Brazil Street, is an excellent intact example of Mid-Century Modern architecture applied to an industrial/office building. The project area was determined to have a low potential to yield Native American human remains and/or Native American cultural resources.

Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Potential issue. San Fernando Road is identified as an architectural resource eligible for listing in both the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. San Fernando Road extends through the study area, and Alternative 1 would require an aerial crossing of this cultural resource, as well as a reconfiguration of the Milford Street intersection to accommodate the realigned Commercial Street. Appropriate design would be required to ensure that the crossing is visually consistent with the resource.

Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass. Potential issue. Similar to Alternative 1, an aerial crossing of Segment C of San Fernando Road, which has been identified as a cultural resource, would occur. Appropriate design would be required to ensure that the crossing is visually consistent with the resource. In addition, this alternative would be located in proximity to one additional resource identified in the project area, 5121 West San Fernando Road, south of Brazil Street, which is outside the project area. This resource would not be directly affected by the project footprint, and appropriate measures may be necessary to ensure no indirect effects, which may include substantial impairment of the resource, would occur.

Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector. Not anticipated to be an issue. This alternative would not require an aerial crossing of Segment C of San Fernando Road, which has been identified as a cultural resource. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The identified constraints associated with hazardous materials were based on the desktop review of historical data (i.e., Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps and aerial photographs) dated from 1919 to 2012 and review of a compilation of environmental regulatory databases. The results of the review of these sources of information indicated that the properties within the study area that may have been impacted by hazardous materials could potentially affect all of the project alternatives. The identified sites predominantly occur along the entire length of San Fernando Road within the study area with a significantly lesser portion of these properties occurring along Doran Street, Commercial Street, Wilson Avenue, and Milford Street. The identified properties consist of hazardous waste sites, landfills, or sites with registered and/or leaking underground storage tanks containing gasoline, diesel, waste oil and various other volatile organic compounds. It should be noted that the current status of the identified sites should be verified through review of files maintained by the responsible regulatory agencies that have may have more current records regarding (1) the disposition identified sites, (2) the degree of environmental impact caused by the identified sites (i.e., affected media, vertical and horizontal extent of contamination, etc.), if any, and (3) the status of any remedial activities regarding contamination originating from these tanks.
Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass. Likely issue. Alternative 1 would require the acquisition of a recycling center and based on the nature of use, could require remediation. In addition, the following properties could pose constraints for this alternative based on a review of regulatory databases which identify previous land uses and facilities that had registered underground storage tanks, hazardous materials, or landfills:

- 100 San Fernando Road (former gasoline station-southeast corner San Fernando Road/Broadway)
- 870 Doran Street (former gasoline station-southeast corner of San Fernando Road/Doran Street)
- 829 and 841 Doran Street (former warehouses between San Fernando Road and Commercial Street)
- 5500 San Fernando Road (former auto wrecking-northeast corner San Fernando Road/Milford Street)
- 5430-5454 San Fernando Road (PCR-DeSoto International)
- 772 Wilson Avenue (Brock Bus Lines)
- 747 Wilson Avenue (Lanco Metals)
- 815 Milford Street (Plating, Inc.)
- 955 Doran Street (Moulder Brothers)
- 800 West Doran Street (Frank T. Howard Company, Inc.)
- 521 Commercial Street (Kennedy Hydraulics)
- 976 Doran Street (Doran Street Wastewater Pumping)

Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass. Potential issue. The following properties could pose constraints for this alternative based on a review of regulatory databases which identify previous land uses and facilities that had registered underground storage tanks, hazardous materials, or landfills:

- 4560 Doran Street (American Reclamation CDI Processing Facility)
- 5415 San Fernando Road (L.A. Piece and Dye Works)
- 5440 San Fernando Road (Sunland Chemical & Research Company)
- 5375 San Fernando Road (Levitz Furniture)
- 5181 San Fernando Road (Mikael Aghajanian)
- 5201 San Fernando Road (Isbell Materials Company, Inc.)
- 5375 San Fernando Road (Conwin Carbonic Company)
- 5471 San Fernando Road (AIRCO Engineering, Inc.)
- 5487 San Fernando Road (AAA Paper Stock Company)
- 5439 San Fernando Road (Products Research & Chemical Company)
- 5431 San Fernando Road (E.L. Flemming Dump)
- 5439 San Fernando Road (MacDermid, Inc.)
- 5430 San Fernando Road (Courtwald Corporation)

Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector. Likely issue. Alternative 3 would include the same potential hazardous sites as identified under Alternative 1, as they would be located in the same general vicinity. Alternative 3 would extend across the Los Angeles River to land that is undeveloped other than transportation infrastructure and would not involve additional potential hazardous land uses.
5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE IMPLICATIONS

A summary of the potential environmental effects evaluated in more detail above for each of the proposed project alternatives is described below.

**Alternative 1 – Doran Overpass.** Alternative 1 would involve the most amount of property acquisition and displacement, would have minor land use inconsistencies with an aerial encroachment in the footprint of the Los Angeles River under the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan and potential effects from biological, resources. Potential effects to cultural resources and hazards and hazardous materials would be similar for all alternatives, except where described below. This alternative would have fewer effects to visual quality, air quality, and noise attributable to the longer distance to the nearest sensitive receptors than identified for Alternative 2.

**Alternative 2 – Fairmont Connector and Salem/Sperry Overpass.** Alternative 2 would involve the second lowest amount of acquisition and displacement cost, would be consistent with all land use policies, would not affect biological resources, but would have greater construction, air quality, noise, and visual effects on residential properties than would occur with Alternatives 1 and 3 due to its location in closer proximity to residences.

**Alternative 3 – Fairmont Connector and Zoo Drive Connector.** Alternative 3 would involve a lower amount of property acquisition and displacement than identified for Alternatives 1 and 2 but would have greater land use inconsistencies with the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan and biological resources than identified for Alternatives 1 and 2. This alternative would not require an aerial crossing over Segment C of San Fernando Road, which has been identified as a cultural resource. This alternative would redirect more traffic near Griffith Park picnic and recreation areas, but effects to users of the park would be more temporary than compared to the residents in the area that would be exposed to longer term effects. This alternative would have fewer effects to visual quality, air quality, and noise attributable to the longer distance to the nearest residential receptors compared to Alternative 2.

The above described effects for the Doran Street and Broadway/Brazil Safety and Access Alternatives will influence the CEQA and/or NEPA environmental processing. When analyzing the implications of the differing effects for each of the alternatives, the factors, including the overall complexity, agency coordination requirements, level of detail needed for appropriate discretionary decision, potential for public controversy, and potential for approval delays, will influence the associated processing for each of the project alternatives.

It is anticipated that Alternatives 1 and 2 could be processed as an Environmental Assessment (EA) to satisfy federal environmental requirements. The EA would address each of these alternatives at an equal level of detail. It should be noted that in accordance with the Executive Order pertaining to floodplains, Alternative 3 could only be pursued as a viable option if Alternatives 1 and 2 were determined to be infeasible (see discussion above). Under the CEQA, all of the alternatives would qualify under a statutory exemption (Public Resources Code 2180.13), however, this level of environmental documentation could become more complex if the acquisition of property involves unwilling sellers, which would require condemnation. With this anticipation, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is more technically appropriate for the alternatives since all involve full acquisitions of multiple parcels. It is worth noting that one drawback of using an MND would be the ability to only address a single alternative. However, if there is enough technical documentation to support the justification of a single alternative, this would be an appropriate process.
In an abundance of caution, with the acquisition of a large number of private parcels and potential difficulty in relocating businesses, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would provide a more comprehensive analysis, which would include a detailed evaluation of alternatives. This more conservative process path could be pursued for all three alternatives in the context of significant public opposition.

While all three levels of CEQA documentation could be pursued (statutory exemption, MND, or EIR), when evaluating the amount of acquisition and the probably absence of significant environmental effects, the MND approach would appear as the most appropriate path to address the issues discussed above for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 under CEQA.